

The Historical Review/La Revue Historique

Vol 18, No 1 (2021)

Historical Review / La Revue Historique

The *H*istorical Review
La Revue *H*istorique



VOLUME XVIII (2021)

Section de Recherches Néohelléniques
Institut de Recherches Historiques / FNRS

Section of Neohellenic Research
Institute of Historical Research / NHRF

Funerary Monuments of 1821 Revolutionaries in Athens First Cemetery

Dimitris Pavlopoulos, Georgia Antonopoulou, Michael Giochalias

Copyright © 2022



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

To cite this article:

Pavlopoulos, D., Antonopoulou, G., & Giochalias, M. (2022). Funerary Monuments of 1821 Revolutionaries in Athens First Cemetery. *The Historical Review/La Revue Historique*, 18(1), 193–216. Retrieved from <https://ejournals.epublishing.ekt.gr/index.php/historicalReview/article/view/31375>

FUNERARY MONUMENTS OF 1821 REVOLUTIONARIES IN ATHENS FIRST CEMETERY

Dimitris Pavlopoulos, Georgia Antonopoulou and Michael Giochalias

ABSTRACT: Previously inaccessible archival sources, as well as in situ observation, provide useful information on the corpus of funerary monuments of 1821 Revolution figures in Athens First Cemetery. These spatially dispersed monuments are mostly unknown. Being both works of art and bearers of historical contexts and narratives, they reflect the beliefs and trends of nineteenth-century Greek society. The fighters have become interlocutors with the ancient predecessors, thus dictating to the collective consciousness and subconsciousness the historical necessity of continuity and of the mission entailed in it. Within the context of the fluctuating geography and anthropogeography of Athens First Cemetery, and under the pressure of its permanent usage, issues of collective memory and preservation have emerged. Consequently, the practices of the local authorities in this regard constitute an interesting field of research.

This article focuses on the grave monuments of the fighters of the Greek War of Independence, as well as of thinkers and intellectuals who, by means of their writings, contributed to the making of the collective memory during the period of the Greek Revolution. The issues it examines are the location and identification of the funerary monuments of 1821 revolutionary figures, the consideration of them through the history of art and, finally, the investigation of the perception of memory and how it is managed. The secondary issues it raises converge on the general question: How is 1821 recounted in Athens' major necropolis? The article forms part of the research project entitled "Burial monuments in the First Cemetery of Athens: Warriors' tombs–Authors' tombs".¹

The research was based primarily on observation and inventorying in situ. The limitations on this endeavour were the immense extent of the First Cemetery, the absence of information points and markers and, finally, difficulty of access. Nearly all monuments that fall into the period under consideration were studied in order to ascertain the "identities" of those warriors, whose

¹ This research is co-financed by Greece and the European Union (European Social Fund–ESF) through the Operational Programme "Human Resources Development, Education and Lifelong Learning, 2014–2020" in the context of the project "Burial Monuments at the First Cemetery of Athens: Warriors' Tombs–Authors' Tombs" (MIS 5048128).

funerary monuments have gone largely unnoticed, at least in the context of the history of funerary art. The inscriptions on the tombs served as a guide in this endeavour: names, dates of birth and death, and epigrams proved to be notable testimonies and, in some cases, enriched our knowledge. However, many funerary monuments lack detailed inscriptions. Research in those cases was aided primarily by comparisons with similar funerary monuments, in terms of type and style, and also by bibliographic and archival research.

Valuable information was extracted from the Municipality of Athens Archives although they have not been systematically maintained. Records from the nineteenth century are missing. The existing records have suffered significant damage, most notably due to the removal or loss of pages due to their continuous use for official purposes, as well as improper handling, storage and safekeeping.

Moreover, while cemetery registers and account books mention the number of the invoice and the name of the person liable for the grave costs, they lack other data such as the dead person's capacity, or, in some cases, the place, year and date of death. Also, there is no reference to artistic matters, such as the date of erection of the monument or the name of the sculptor or workshop that carried it out. Therefore, the study of the cemetery archives required a combinative approach that included the general deeds, the grave registers (chronological as well as alphabetical ones) and the files relating to family tombs. The latter form the bulk of the available documentation.

The decisions of Athens Municipal Council regarding honorary burials, concessions for "the right of use", "recognition of a family tomb" and other administrative acts were also researched and indexed. Their study leads to conclusions as to how these fighters have been remembered. It also highlights the initiatives for the preservation of burial monuments belonging to prominent personalities. Finally, the regulations governing the functioning of the First Cemetery proved crucial in understanding the burial, use and reuse procedures.

The Surviving Funerary Monuments

The research has identified a plethora of graves of the period under consideration that belong to military leaders, members of the Sacred Band and the Philiki Etaireia, as well as thinkers, intellectuals, doctors and politicians. In the majority of cases, the warriors saw multifaceted action during the revolution, thus contributing to the struggle and its memory from several points of view. Examples include Ioannis Makriyannis; Theoklitos Farmakidis, a scholar, notable representative of the Greek Enlightenment, warrior and cleric); Dimitrios Kallifronas, a warrior, MP and mayor of Athens; and Georgios Kozakis-Typaldos from Kefalonia, a doctor, scholar, warrior and member of the Philiki Etaireia.

The surviving tombs of 1820s revolutionary figures in Athens First Cemetery are those of: Georgios Ainian (1.15),² Ioannis Anagnostou (5.25), Odysseus Androutsos (1.159), Georgios Antonopoulos (4.174), Onoufrios Apostolidis (1.298), Athanasios Argyropoulos (4.484), Vassileios I. Benizelos (1.237 A), Dimitrios Notis Botsaris (5.422), Georgios Boukouris (Chrysinas) (1.134), Ioannis G. Boukouris (1.134), Zenovios Charmolaos (4.371), Christodoulos Chatzipetros (4.62), Richard Church (2.28), Antonios Delenardos (7.150), Anagnostis Deliyannis (5.116), Panagos Deliyannis (1.110), Georgios I. Dyovouniotis (4.141), Theoklitos Farmakidis (4.539), Angelos Gerondas (1.76), Nikolaos Th. Ghikas (1.403), Panayotis Giatrakos (1.195), Georgios Glarakis (4.143), Stylianos Her. Gonatas (5.695), Dimitrios Kallifronas (4.583), Andrzej Kallinski (4.77), Konstantinos Kanaris (2.15), Alexandros Kantakouzenos (5.848), Georgios Karatzas (2.100), Ioannis Klimakas (1.28), Kosmas Kokkidis (1.229), Ioannis Kolettis (2.30 A), Ioannis Th. Kolokotronis (4.200), Konstantinos Kolokotronis (Kollinos) (4.130), Theodoros Kolokotronis (4.200), Andreas Koromilas (4.197), Kyriakos Koumbaris (4.161), Nikolaos I. Koutsoyannis (5.805), Georgios Kozakis-Typaldos (1.222), Konstantinos Kriaris or Benis (4.495), Dimitrios I. Kriezis (5.649), Georgios Lassanis (1.27 A), Triantafyllos Lazaretos (5.449), Konstantinos Levidis (1.290), Frangiskos I. Libritis (4.486), Athanasios Lidorikis (1.138), Ioannis Loris (5.137), Andreas Louriotis (1.466), Ioannis Makriyannis (1.25), Alexandros Mavrocordatos (1.293), Vassos Brajević Mavrovouniotis (2.32), Spyridon Melios (Spyromelios) (1.226 A), Dimitrios Mentzelidis (7.64), Andreas Metaxas (1.155), Artemios Michos (4.179), Zachos Milios (7.615), Nikolaos Mykonios (5.208), Konstantinos I. Negris (4.184), Michail Oikonomou (2.536), Ioannis O. Olympios (5.269), Andronikos Paikos (10.68), Rigas Palamidis (1.124), Panourgias (Gero-Panourgias) (4.92), Nakos Panourgias (4.92), Tzamalas Papakostas (1.28), Ioannis Paparrigopoulos (1.125), Panayotis K. Peniatis (5.359), Stylianos Peroglou (4.149), Anargyros Petrakis (4.172), Efstratios Pissas (1.369), Nikolaos Poniropoulos (4.146), Panos Rangos (1.265), Friedrich Eduard von Rheineck (4.483), Anastasios Rombotsis (2.386), Michail I. Schinas (1.278), Panayotis Sekeris (7.273), Amvrosios Skaramangas (5.259), Panayis Skouzes (1.353), Ioannis Somakis (1.26), Georgios Stavrou (1.130), Georgios K. Tissamenos (1.93), Michail Tolmidis (5.113), Heinrich Treiber (4.354), Spyridon Trikoupi (5.896), Kitsos Tzavellas (2.30), Vassiliki Tzavella (2.30), Athanasios K. Valtinos (1.27), Georgios Valtinos (1.26), Domna

² The position of each tomb in the cemetery is provided in parenthesis. The first number represents the section of the cemetery, while the second, after the full stop, the number of the tomb.

Vizvizi (8.406), Antonios Visvizi (8.406), Nikolaos A. Votsis (5.918), Dimitrios Voulgaris (4.167), Michail Vouzikis (1.196), Christos S. Vyzantios (2.135), Richard von Wissel (2.82), Emmanouil Xanthos (4.160), Andreas Zaimis (1.127 B) and Georgios Chr. Zalokostas (1.379).

Our research has revealed unfortunate losses, such as the grave of Niketas Stamatelopoulos (Nikitaras), which no longer exists. We can safely assume that other graves of revolutionary personalities have been lost as well. They were never identified as such so the need to preserve them was not obvious.

Some graves have undergone alterations in respect to their form or their extent, while others may even bear a completely different name. Finally, a particular category are the funerary monuments which have survived as cenotaphs because the remains they contained were removed for reinterment elsewhere, usually in the birthplace of the deceased. Notable cases are those of Odysseus Androutsos and General Theodoros Kolokotronis; the remains of the former were reinterred in Preveza in 1967 and the latter in Tripoli in 1930.³

Typology, Symbols, Epigrams

Given the lack of nineteenth-century documentation, as well as the continuous usage of the cemetery, changes is inevitable; thus, we cannot say with certainty what the grave monuments originally looked like in each case.

Considering the Christian tradition, which had already humbly shaped the burial typology, we assume that the graves of the warriors, in particular those from the mid-nineteenth century, around the church of St. Lazarus, were utterly plain in form. A Christian memorial, bearing the symbol of the cross, seems to have been either a conscious choice or the result of necessity in most cases. This consideration is reinforced not only by the austere attitude and way of life of the 1821 warriors, or the religious ethics of the era, but also by the poverty and anonymity that many suffered towards the end of their lives. The wooden crosses placed on the ground at the Trikoupis tomb, for example, are an aesthetic choice, which was followed by his descendants. On the other hand, Nikitaras died very poor. Although the funeral of the deceased received the highest state honours,⁴ his family's financial status precluded the construction of a monumental grave.

³ Cadastral and Property Records of Athens First Cemetery/Family Tombs/F: A/1/159 and A/4/200.

⁴ Programme for the transfer to his burial place of Major General and Senator Niketas Stamatelopoulos (Nikitaras), 25 September 1849, Benaki Museum, IA 831/11/89. Tassos Sakellariopoulos and Maria Dimitriadou, eds., *1821 Before and After* (Athens: Benaki Museum; Bank of Greece; National Bank of Greece; Alpha Bank, 2021), 820. Published in conjunction

This may also justify the fact that his tomb, which probably had an unpretending, inconspicuous form, was “lost” over time.

Nikitaras’ case recalls the speech of the writer Georgios Tertsetis, “Περί αθανασίας της ψυχής”, which he delivered in the Greek Parliament on 28 March 1848: “Go to Athens cemetery! Not a single white marble there covers the remains of Zaimis and Kolokotronis! If the undertaker dies tomorrow, we will certainly lose every bit of dust that was left from their burial.”⁵ The poet Achilleas Paraschos made similar comments, in a rather literary way, on the occasion of the burial of Ioannis (Gennaios) Kolokotronis.⁶ He remarked that the tombs of the Greek War of Independence fighters were “unobtrusive”, in striking contrast to the pompous burial monuments of other prominent personalities (politicians and benefactors). Paraschos characteristically stated: “Αν μανσωλεία γύρω σας πομπώδη θεωρήτε, κανείς Τοσίτσας υπ’ αυτά ή άλλος τις θα κείται. Ο Βάσος, ο Πετρόμπεης και του Μοριά ο Γέρως δεν έχουν τάφους ... αφανείς υπνώττουν κατά μέρος” (if you see a pompous mausoleum around you, it may belong to Tositsas or someone else. Vassos, Petrobey and Kolokotronis do not have such graves ... they sleep aside unnoticed). His elegy conveyed the overall impression that the revolutionary fighters did not receive what they deserved from the state.

Widespread sculptural types and decorative motifs were later applied selectively, following the blossoming of neohellenic art, especially funerary art, the predominance of the neoclassical idiom and, certainly, in proportion to the financial status of the family of the deceased, as mentioned above. The cemetery gradually acquired a monumental character, like corresponding European ones. Importantly, the municipal authority also sought this status.

The grave monuments of the struggle that survive today at Athens First Cemetery form a panorama of types and motifs of neohellenic funerary sculpture while also reflecting its evolution. The graves are situated in a place of remembrance, which at the same time entails religious characteristics and connotations, where the present, past and eternity meet; they make tangible visual and spoken narratives which collaborate in building up the manner we perceive historicity and temporality.

with an exhibition of the same title, organised by and presented at the Benaki Museum, 3 March–7 November 2021.

⁵ Dinos Konomos, *Ο Γεώργιος Τερτσέτης και τα ευρισκόμενα έργα του* (Athens: Hellenic Parliament Library, 1984), 358.

⁶ Achilleas Paraschos, “Ελεγείον εις τον στρατηγόν Γενναίον Θ. Κολοκοτρώνην (αφιερούται τω προσφιλεί αυτού αδελφώ Πάνω Θ. Κολοκοτρώνη) υπό Αχιλλέως Παράσχου,” *Αιών*, 27 May 1868.

Since the cemetery opened, plain grave slabs and crosses have been used in all sorts of monuments, irrespective of their size or form. The grave of Michail Schinas (1.278), intellectual and warrior, bears a slab with a characteristic decoration of the second half of the nineteenth century: its perimeter is ornamented with secondary motifs, either carved in low relief or incised; the top bears a cross and the base a lamp.⁷ The gravestone of the warrior Athanasios Lidorikis (1.138) follows a slightly different decorative manner, with details incised so smoothly that they appear to have been painted rather than carved.



Fig. 1. Unknown, Funerary monument of Triantafyllos Lazaretos, †1884, marble.

The open scroll is another form similar to the funerary slab, particularly when it is carved upright on the ground: relevant examples are the monuments of Panayotis Sekeris (7.273), a member of the Philiki Etaireia, the military officer Andrzej Kallinski (4.77), and Triantafyllos Lazaretos (5.449, figure 1), warrior and politician. Later, in the twentieth century the grave slab was used to cover an undecorated built niche; alternatively, it may be placed vertically to serve as finial of the niche, as for example the monument of the Cretan warrior Konstantinos Kriaris (4.495).

The sarcophagus is one of the most ancient grave types and saw broad dissemination and use over time in the West since the Roman era.⁸ In most of the

⁷ The first methodical record of the sculptures of Athens First Cemetery, specifically of those of the first department, was realised by Helen Angelomatis-Tsougarakis and Despoina Tsouklidou-Penna, in *Μητρών Α΄ Νεκροταφείου Αθηνών: Α΄ Ζώνη-Ιον Τμήμα* (Athens: Municipality of Athens, 1972). For the tomb of Michail Schinas: 237–38.

⁸ For the sarcophagus funerary type, see Paul Arthur Memmesheimer, “Das klassizistische Grabmal: Eine Typologie” (PhD diss., University of Bonn, 1969), 78; Stelios Lydakis, *Η νεοελληνική γλυπτική: Ιστορία-τυπολογία-λεξικό Γλυπτών* (Athens: Melissa, 1981), 226–28; Dora Markatou, Efthymia Mavromichali and Dimitris Pavlopoulos, *Νεοελληνική ταφική*

warrior monuments, however, this type forms essentially a sub-type of the grave slab. The grave slabs previously positioned on the ground as autonomous funerary monuments, now serve as the covers of the plain sarcophagi of the poet and fighter Georgios Zalokostas⁹ (1.379) and of Ioannis Boukouris (Chrysinas)¹⁰ (1.134) – both works by sculptor Iakovos Malakates – of Athanasios Valtinos¹¹ (1.27), Michail Tolmidis (5.113) and Ioannis Kolettis¹² (2.30 A). The exception to this rule is the sarcophagus of Georgios Glarakis (4.143, figure 2): it rests on a tall pedestal, its sides ending in pediments and the corners mounted by marble acroteria, thus acquiring a monumental character.

Alike the grave slab, the cross appears in different versions in accordance with the era. Simple marble crosses lie on the graves of the fighters Ioannis Somakis and Georgios Valtinos (1.26), Rigas Palamidis (1.124) and Charmolaos Zenovios (4.371). There are cases where efforts have been made to invest the primary form with an artistic status. A relevant example is the



Fig. 2. Unknown, Funerary monument of Georgios Glarakis, †1855, marble.

γλυπτική: Αρχές 19ου Αιώνα–1940 (Athens: Panayotis and Effie Michelis Foundation, 2015), 115–16.

⁹ Angelomatis-Tsougarakis and Tsouklidou-Penna, *Μητρώον Α' Νεκροταφείου Αθηνών*, 324–35; Chrysanthos Christou and Myrto Koumvakali-Anastasiadi, *Νεοελληνική γλυπτική: 1800–1940* (Athens: Commercial Bank of Greece, 1982), 194; Olga Ziro, “Το επιτύμβιο ανάγλυφο στη νεοελληνική γλυπτική (1830–1900): Η αφήγηση των μορφών” (PhD diss., National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, 2014), 458.

¹⁰ Angelomatis-Tsougarakis and Tsouklidou-Penna, *Μητρώον Α' Νεκροταφείου Αθηνών*, 112; Christou and Koumvakali-Anastasiadi, *Νεοελληνική γλυπτική*, 194.

¹¹ Angelomatis-Tsougarakis and Tsouklidou-Penna, *Μητρώον Α' Νεκροταφείου Αθηνών*, 23.

¹² Maro Kardamitsi-Adami and Maria Daniil, *Το Α' Κοιμητήριο της Αθήνας: Οδηγός των μνημείων και της ιστορίας του* (Athens: Olkos, 2017), 47.

monument of General Artemis Michos: the base bears a lamp in relief; the surface of the cross underwent further carving with the addition of ornamental rays at the intersection of the bars. This effort eventually led to the creation of “the wooden cross”, where the artist imitates the texture of wood, as we can see, for example, in the graves of Panos Rangos (1.265) and of Antonios and Domna Visvizi (8.406). The sub-type of the cross resting on an artificial rock, to which belong the graves of Georgios Ainian (1.15, figure 3), Ioannis Klimakas (1.26), Angelos Gerontas (1.76) and Emmanouil Xanthos (4.160), also became popular.

The type of the grave stele topped by a palmette or a gable thrives in the First Cemetery. Although there are earlier examples in European neoclassicism, it seems that in the context of the early modern era the Greek stele was inspired

rather directly by antiquity¹³ but without ignoring the European trends.

Stelae of the palmette type with their slender shafts, such as those of Admiral Nikolaos Votsis (5.918), Ioannis Paparrigopoulos (1.125), Vassileios I. Benizelos (1.237 A), the Doulas family, which also bears the name of Georgios K. Tissamenos (1.93) incorporate the accomplishments of the skilled neohellenic masters. Their palmettes, free or framed, gabled or stylised, are skilfully carved, drawing inspiration directly from the ancient Greek prototypes.¹⁴

The gabled stele also becomes slender and is surmounted by a projected pediment topped by fully carved acroteria, in contrast to their European parallels. Characteristic is the comparison



Fig. 3. Unknown, Funerary monument of Georgios Ainian, †1843, marble.

¹³ For the neohellenic stele, see Markatou, Mavromichali and Pavlopoulos, *Νεοελληνική ταφική γλυπτική*, 114–15.

¹⁴ Stelios Lydakis, “Νεοελληνικές επιτάφιος ανθεμωτές στήλες,” *Ελληνικό Μάρμαρο* (January–February 1979), 27.

between the monument of General Friedrich Eduard von Rheineck (4.483, figure 4), with the tombstones of Theodoros Louriotis¹⁵ (1.466) (the oeuvre of Georgios Fytalis), Konstantinos Levidis (1.290), Richard von Wissel¹⁶ (2.82) and Amvrosios



Fig. 4. Unknown, Funerary monument of Friedrich Eduard von Rheineck, †1854, marble.

¹⁵ Angelomatis-Tsougarakis and Tsouklidou-Penna, *Μητρώον Α' Νεκροταφείου Αθηνών*, 400–1; Tony Spiteris, *Τρεις αιώνες νεοελληνικής τέχνης, 1660–1967* (Athens: Papyros, 1979), 224; Christou and Koumvakali-Anastasiadi, *Νεοελληνική γλυπτική*, 44, 198; Ziro, “Το επιτύμβιο ανάγλυφο στη νεοελληνική γλυπτική,” 128, 456; Markatou, Mavromichali and Pavlopoulos, *Νεοελληνική ταφική γλυπτική*, 139–40.

¹⁶ Scant documentary evidence exists on Richard von Wissel. In 1895, a journal said he was of Bavarian extraction who came to Greece with Charles Nicolas Fabvier to fight in the 1821 Revolution (*Ποικίλη Στοά* 11 (1895): 387–89; see also 177 for a lithograph). However, Christos Evangelatos claimed he was an artillery officer from Hannover who died in 1849. See *Οι Φιέλληνες: Εξ επισήμων αρχείων και εγκύρων πηγών* (Athens: Typ. Kleisiouni, 1938). His headstone states he continued his military career in Greece under King Otto. He married a Greek woman, Lambrini (d. March 1896), and they had three known children: Xenofon (1837–1872), Afroditi (1843–1891) and Pinelopi (d. 1919).

Skaramangas (5.259): the former draws its origins possibly from a Western prototype, as the shaft increases in width, while the acroteria are stylised.

The pillar, a type of gravestone similar to the stele, is equally popular. The Malakates brothers choose to carve the pillar on the funerary monument of Odysseus Androutsos (1.159). The sculptor Dimitrios Philippotis gives another, more monumental version of it in the grave of General Richard Church¹⁷ (2.28, figure 5), while a very popular complex consists of the combination of the pillar with a vessel serving as finial, such as on the graves of Onoufrios Apostolidis (1.298) and General Efstratios Pissas (1.369).

There are other cases where the pillar's shaft reduces in height and becomes larger and voluminous to resemble an altar. Sometimes it serves as a base supporting a marble vessel, such as on the monuments of Nakos Panourgias (4.92) and Georgios Valtinos (1.26, figure 6), or, more rarely, it bears ornamentation of



Fig. 5. Demetrios Philippotis, Funerary monument of Richard Church, †1873, marble.



Fig. 6. Unknown, Funerary monument of Georgios Valtinos, †1837, marble.

¹⁷ Efthymia Mavromichali, "Ο γλύπτης Δημήτριος Φιλιππότης και η εποχή του" (PhD diss., Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 1999), 58–60, 189, 192, 195–97, 270–71, 301–2.

a cyma and finial with a palmette, as on the monument of Alexandros Katakouzenos (5.848, figure 7).

The commemorative column belongs to the same decorative group:¹⁸ a representative example from the workshop of the Malakates brothers is the grave of Kyriakos Koumbaris¹⁹ (4.161), member of the Philiki Etaireia, which bears a votive plain column cut on the upper part, to symbolise the end of life.

The obelisk was a grave marker used by the ancient Egyptians, whence it passed into Western art via the Romans. During the Renaissance and Baroque periods, the obelisk was encountered again in art and finally acquired a funerary character in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Europe.²⁰ In Greece, however, it is rare. One of the most impressive examples in the context under consideration is the monument of the family of Georgios Karatzas (2.100, figure 8), a general of 1821. In contrast to the latter, the monument of Panayotis Giatrakos (1.195), although humbler in scale, shows respect for its wider setting.

Following ancient practices, the bust in its various forms, either sculpted or carved in relief, or used as a finial for stelae and pillars, is a very much preferred funerary monument type.²¹ The Fytalis brothers provide a typical picture of academic neoclassicism in the monuments of Andreas Metaxas²²



Fig. 7. Unknown, Funerary monument of Alexandros Kantakouzenos, †1841, marble.

¹⁸ Stelios Lydakis, *Μια πολύτιμη γλυπτοθήκη: Το Α΄ Νεκροταφείο Αθηνών* (Athens: Melissa, 2017), 34; Markatou, Mavromichali and Pavlopoulos, *Νεοελληνική ταφική γλυπτική*, 115.

¹⁹ Christou and Koumvakali-Anastasiadi, *Νεοελληνική γλυπτική*, 29–30, 194; Ziro, “Το επιτύμβιο ανάγλυφο στη νεοελληνική γλυπτική,” 76, 125, 132, 183, 459; Markatou, Mavromichali and Pavlopoulos, *Νεοελληνική ταφική γλυπτική*, 142–43; Lydakis, *Μια πολύτιμη γλυπτοθήκη*, 20.

²⁰ Memmesheimer, “Das klassizistische Grabmal,” 127; Lydakis, *Μια πολύτιμη γλυπτοθήκη*, 33–34; Markatou, Mavromichali and Pavlopoulos, *Νεοελληνική ταφική γλυπτική*, 118.

²¹ Lydakis, *Μια πολύτιμη γλυπτοθήκη*, 38–39.

²² Christou and Koumvakali-Anastasiadi, *Νεοελληνική γλυπτική*, 198; Dimitris

(1.155), a member of the Philiki Etaireia, and of the fighters Georgios Antonopoulos²³ (4.174, figure 9) and Andronikos Paikos (10.68, figure 10): on the one hand, the physiognomy of the deceased is rendered with a certain accuracy; however, their facial features are stylised, having been viewed through the spirit of an archaic idealism: for example, the contemporary costume is combined with a gown; alternatively, sometimes the latter replaces the former; In cases, garments disappear altogether with the intention to display a heroic nudity. Examples with those features include in the monuments of Alexandros Mavrokordatos (1.293, figure 11) and Friedrich Eduard von Rheineck (4.483).



Fig. 8. Unknown, Funerary monument of Georgios Karatzas, †1882, marble.



Fig. 9. Lazaros Fytalis, Funerary monument of Georgios Antonopoulos, 1866, marble.

Pavlopoulos, *Ζητήματα νεοελληνικής γλυπτικής* (Athens: self-pub., 1998), 132, 134; Markatou, Mavromichali and Pavlopoulos, *Νεοελληνική ταφική γλυπτική*, 148–49.

²³ Fotos Giofyllis, *Ιστορία της νεοελληνικής τέχνης (ζωγραφικής, γλυπτικής, χαρακτηριστικής, αρχιτεκτονικής και διακοσμητικής), 1821–1941* (Athens: To Elliniko Vivlio, 1962), 249.



Fig. 10. Lazaros Fytalis, Funerary monument of Andronikos Paikos, †1880, marble.



Fig. 11. Unknown, Funerary monument of Alexandros Mavrokordatos, †1865, marble.

Opposite in terms of style are the busts of Dimitrios Voulgaris (4.167, figure 12) by Georgios VROUTOS, and Dimitrios Kallifronas (4.583, figure 13) by Georgios Papayannis, which are characterised by a near photographic realism, evident as much in the facial features as in the depiction of the outfit. Both Voulgaris and Kallifronas are depicted exactly as they have been “imprinted” in the collective memory. Their sculptural portraits are identical to their painted or engraved ones. The same is the case with the portrait of Paikos.²⁴ The garment has also a dominant role. Paikos is represented in a Western-type costume, which references his political career. Voulgaris is attributed wearing a “tzoube” (τζουμπέ), a long robe that went down to the ankles, which earned him the nickname “Tzoubis”.²⁵ Kallifronas, who bore the nickname “Fustaneloforos”, is depicted in a fustanella and a fez.²⁶ We

²⁴ For the sketch of Andronikos Paikos, see *Ποικίλη Στοά* 1 (1881): 208–9.

²⁵ For the sketch of Demetrios Voulgaris, see *Εθνικόν Ημερολόγιον* 2, no. 1 (1862): 70.

²⁶ For the portrait of Demetrios Kallifronas, see Ioannis Paraskevopoulos, *Οι Δήμαρχοι των Αθηνών, 1835–1907: Μετά προεισαγωγής περί δημογεροντίας* (Athens: Typ. Rouftani-Papageorgiou, 1907), 105.



Fig. 12. Georgios Vroutos, Funerary monument of Demetrios Voulgaris, †1877, marble.



Fig. 13. Georgios Papayannis, Funerary monument of Demetrios Kallifronas, †1897, marble.

also see the traditional fustanella in the portrait of the fighter Athanasios Argyropoulos (4.484).²⁷

Busts in relief are slightly projecting figures found usually within a carved background. Monuments such as that of Georgios Stavrou (1.130), with the face in profile within a medal, imitate Roman portraits. The same arrangement is followed in the case of Richard Church (2.28), by Dimitrios Philippotis. On the contrary, the double prosopography in relief of the fighter Panayotis K. Peniatis and his wife, Aikaterini I. Stini (5.359), by Georgios Papayannis, and those of Michail Vouzikis (1.196) and Richard von Wissel (2.82), are sternly frontal and profoundly descriptive without any sign of idealism or even heroisation.

²⁷ Due to the simplicity of both the form of the portrait and the sword on the base, it is assumed to have been constructed at a later time in the context of the creation of the family tomb, where many of Argyropoulos' descendants rest.



Fig. 14. Unknown, Funerary monument of Kitsos Tzavellas, †1855, marble.



Fig. 15. Detail of the funerary monument of Kitsos Tzavellas.

Fully modelled sculpted figures are rarer. The monument of Kitsos Tzavellas (2.30, figures 14 and 15) is ornamented with a mourning figure which embraces the cross of martyrdom. The most renowned figure, however, is undoubtedly that of Theodoros Kolokotronis (4.200), made in 1995 by the sculptor Georgios Georgiou.

Beyond secondary or symbolic motifs, entire representations or even complex narrative scenes are very frequent on all types of monuments. For example, on the slab of the sarcophagus covering the grave of Georgios Zalokostas (1.379), Iakovos Malakates carved a composition of a lyre and a tree, in order to highlight the poetic side of the fighter.²⁸ The same sculptor recalled the *dexiosis* theme on the grave of Georgios Kozakis Typaldos (1.222) entering into direct dialogue with ancient Greek funerary sculpture.²⁹

²⁸ Sandra Berresford, *Italian Memorial Sculpture, 1820–1940: A Legacy of Love* (London: Frances Lincoln, 2004), 128–36; Markatou, Mavromichali and Pavlopoulos, *Νεοελληνική ταφική γλυπτική*, 114.

²⁹ Markatou, Mavromichali and Pavlopoulos, *Νεοελληνική ταφική γλυπτική*, 156.



Fig. 16. Iakovos Malakates, Funerary monument of Kyriakos Koumbaris, 1859, marble.



Fig. 17. Georgios Fytalis, Funerary monument of Theodoros Louriotis, 1856, marble.

One theme that, however, appears largely frequently – not only in the context under consideration but by and large in funerary monuments – is that of the mourning spirit, which is based on European neoclassical funerary sculpture.³⁰ The mourning spirit appears in several versions in the graves of Nakos Panourgias (4.92), Kyriakos Koumbaris (4.161, figure 16), Konstantinos Negrís (4.184)³¹ and Theodoros Louriotis (1.466, figure 17).

Finally, wealthy families frequently chose architectural types that led to the creation of grandiose sepulchral monuments. Frequently they take the form of a temple, thus imitating relevant originals from the antiquity. The monument of

³⁰ Dimitris Pavlopoulos, *Από τον Ιερό Λόχο στον Κωνσταντίνο ΙΒ΄: Νεότερα αθηναϊκά γλυπτά* (Athens: Gutenberg, 2020), 33–34.

³¹ Christou and Koumvakali-Anastasiadi, *Νεοελληνική γλυπτική*, 44–45, 198; Miltiadis Papanikolaou, *Ιστορία της τέχνης στην Ελλάδα*, vol. 2, *Ζωγραφική και γλυπτική του 19ου αιώνα* (Athens: Vaniyas, 2002), 115–18; Ziro, “Το επιτύμβιο ανάγλυφο στη νεοελληνική Γλυπτική,” 61, 79, 132, 143, 481.

Ioannis Somakis (1.26), of relatively small dimensions and with a shallow cella, stands between a temple and a stele. Similar to that is the monument of the Panagos Deliyannis family (1.110); the latter, however, adopts a rather more Byzantine form visible in the capitals of the plain half-columns and the arch; The monument of Konstantinos Negris (4.184, figure 18), oeuvre of the Fytalis brothers, stands out with its circular plan and massive size, being one step before the transition to the fully developed architectural type of the temple-shrine.

The type of the fully developed sepulchral temple draws its origins from the Heroa of antiquity and the shrines erected over the graves of the Christian saints.³² The “eternal dwelling place” in these instances is literally well said, as the monuments are real edifices. The simplest form

of this type is represented by the grave monument of General Vassos (2.32); a simple, undecorated structure in antae with a narrow cella. Also, that of Georgios Stavrou (1.130) is of the same size but certainly more elaborated. One of the most immaculate constructions is that of General Ioannis Makriyannis (1.25): the ionic temple with a porch framed by two columns. This monument integrates other subsidiary types, such as the bust and the pillar, while in the interior, among the wealth of carved busts within medals, we find one of the very few painted ensembles in the cemetery. The architectural type does not necessarily follow neoclassicism; it may well take completely different forms: the monument of Dimitrios Mentzelidis (7.64), with the characteristic rubble masonry, bears witness to that.

The examination of the typology of the warrior monuments in the majority of cases bears witness to the effort to put forth a direct link with antiquity. The language of symbols also heads intentionally in the same direction. The



Fig. 18. Lazaros Fytalis, Funerary monument of Konstantinos Negris, †1880, marble.

³² Memmesheimer, “Das klassizistische Grabmal,” 171; Markatou, Mavromichali and Pavlopoulos, *Νεοελληνική ταφική γλυπτική*, 116.

lamp has been linked with afterlife since antiquity, as it was used during the nocturnal funerary procession of the body.³³ The butterfly–soul appears in Hellenistic funerary art and thrived during the Roman era.³⁴ The torch always had a central place in funerary rituals, chthonic rites and ancient beliefs; once held by Persephone, it served to light her descent to the dark realm of the underworld, whereas in neohellenic art its symbolic meaning is inverted and is depicted unlit to symbolise the end of life.³⁵ Similar in meaning is the motif of the falling garment, symbolising the sepulchral shroud. The wreath and the garland decorated the bases of sepulchral columns, recalling the custom of offering flowers to the deceased on the last day of the Roman feast of Parentalia. The marble wreath carved on the Ara Pacis altar has ever since been the prototype for the later executions of this component.³⁶

A recurring feature that appears as a leitmotiv particularly in the warrior graves is the heraldic composition of chariots and banners, which derives from the ancient custom of placing objects relevant to the job or the actions of the deceased on the grave. This motif, which has continued to the present in the graves of military officers, links the warriors of consecutive struggles.

In respect to the narrative scenes, the theme of the dexiosis³⁷ bears witness to the impression created by the discovery of the ancient cemetery of Kerameikos³⁸ in Athens during the third quarter of the nineteenth century. The discovery impacted on the iconographic model of the neohellenic sculptors by enhancing it with new motifs and compositions.

The mourning spirit, as a conception or idea of a winged figure linked to death, is already found in Homer and in the Theogony of Hesiod; Thanatos (Death), and his twin brother, Hypnos (Somnus–Sleep) are sons of Nyx (Night)

³³ Donna C. Kurtz and John Boardman, *Έθιμα ταφής στον αρχαίο ελληνικό κόσμο*, trans. Ourania Vizyinou and Theodoros Xenos (Athens: Kardamitsas, 2011), 136; George Siettos, *Νεκρικά ήθη και έθιμα* (Athens: Kyveli, 1997), 224.

³⁴ For the connection between the soul and the butterfly, as observed not only in the ancient Greek–Roman world but in cultures worldwide as well, see Georgios Dimitrokalis, *Η ψυχή-πεταλούδα* (Athens: self-pub., 1993).

³⁵ Evrydiki Antzoulitou-Retsila, *Μνήμης τεκμήρια* (Athens: Papazisis, 2004), 169.

³⁶ Irene Papageorgiou, entries 32 and 33, in *Επέκεινα: Ο θάνατος και η μεταθανάτια ζωή στην αρχαία Ελλάδα*, ed. Nicholas Chr. Stampolidis and Stavroula Oikonomou (Athens: Museum of Cycladic Art, 2014), 95–96.

³⁷ Markatou, Mavromichali and Pavlopoulos, *Νεοελληνική ταφική γλυπτική*, 156.

³⁸ Angeliki Kokkou, *Η μέριμνα για τις αρχαιότητες στην Ελλάδα και τα πρώτα μουσεία* (Athens: Kapon, 1977), 270; Eleni S. Banou and Leonidas S. Bournias, *Κεραμεικός* (Athens: John S. Latsis Foundation, 2015), 20–23.

and Erebus (Darkness). They are described as winged spirits.³⁹ The mourning spirit appears first on funerary art during the Roman era; its final form, which we come across at the cemetery in various versions, originates in the work of Antonio Canova.

Finally, the speech epigrams – in many cases scripted by Philippos Ioannou, scholar and professor of the University of Athens – assist the endeavour;⁴⁰ “γλύπτες ποιούσιν” (sculptors *fecerunt*), “αγωνιστές λύσαντες πατρώαν βαρβάρου τυρρανίδος, τελεύουσιν” (after setting their fatherland free from barbarian tyranny, the fighters perish), “οικείοι τεύκτουσιν τοδ’ ἀγαλμα πολλῆς τε στοργῆς μνήμα και ευσεβίης” (this memorial statue was erected by the family with much affection and reverence), “Ἑλλάς πενθεῖ μιν πάσα καποδύρεται” (Greece grieves and mourns). Many of the funerary epigrams of distinguished dead are included in Philippos Ioannou’s book *Φιλολογικά Πάρεργα* (1865 and 1874).

Most of the fighters’ sepulchral monuments reveal in every respect – be it the epigram or at the typological or symbolic levels – the predominant ideology during the first decades of the newly established Greek state and its society. New Greece was born as a direct successor of ancient Greece. The presence of the ancient Greek example is strong in funerary art as well. Thus, the fighter is associated with the hoplite, new glory with the ancient *kleos* (glory), and the River Ilissos with the Kerameikos. Even the fustanella, the sword or the pistol is combined with classic, ancient types, as it was noted earlier in relation to the Voulgaris, Kallifronas and Vouzikis monuments.

In none of the tombs is there a depiction of the struggle itself: neither snapshots of battles, nor narrative scenes, such as those on the equestrian statue of General Theodoros Kolokotronis in the centre of Athens.⁴¹ It has to be taken into consideration that they are not monuments in the public space of Athens, erected on institutional initiative or funded by public subscription. They are private tombs in the necropolis of the Greek capital, where religion, silence, mourning and peace after death prevail. Being material reference points, to which the relationship of the family with its deceased is transferred, they serve primarily family ancestral memory. What is depicted, in sculptural, linguistic or

³⁹ Athanasios P. Papadopoulos, *Οι λαϊκές περί θανάτου δοξασίες και τα ταφικά έθιμα των Ελλήνων από τον Όμηρο μέχρι σήμερα: Μεταθανάτιες αντιλήψεις και τελετουργίες στον αρχαίο ελληνικό κόσμο και τα επιβιώματά τους στη χριστιανική πραγματικότητα* (Athens: Erodios, 2007); 79, Peter Higgs, lemma 76, in Stampolidis and Oikonomou, *Επέκεινα*, 153.

⁴⁰ Markatou, Mavromichali and Pavlopoulos, *Νεοελληνική ταφική γλυπτική*, 121–26.

⁴¹ For the equestrian statue of General Theodoros Kolokotronis, see Zetta Antonopoulou, *Τα γλυπτά της Αθήνας: Υπαίθρια γλυπτική 1834–2004* (Athens: Potamos, 2003), 51–55; Pavlopoulos, *Από τον Ιερό Λόχο στον Κωνσταντίνο ΙΒ΄*, 189–207.

architectural form, is the importance of each individual and their contribution, the way their family wants them to be remembered. Within this context, they follow the prevailing typology of neohellenic funerary art.

Finally, it should be noted that the burial monument covers the body which they honour. The “essence” was underground, in the fustanella, the weapons, the medals and the flag that accompanied the deceased. A moving document of this practice is a picture captured by Spyros Kallivokas, which depicts the dead body of the Greek War of Independence fighter Vassilios Ath. Petmezas in Aigio, in 1872.⁴² This is exactly what the verse of the poet Achilleas Paraschos deals with: “κάθε σταυρός καλύπτει φουστανέλλαν ... την γραίαν φέρουν σπάθην των και κάτω των μνημείων. Δεν αφαιρεί ο θάνατος το ξίφος των ανδρείων”⁴³ (every cross covers a fustanella ... they carry their olden sword under their monument. Death does not take away the sword from the braves ones).

Collective Ancestral Memory and its Management

Conferring state honours on the deceased includes the funeral, then the interment and, in some cases, the recovery of remains; in the interim, commemoration ceremonies are held. Those steps form the formal public policy of memory. This article does not treat in detail the funerary ceremonies; suffice it to say that when they were grandiose, included pomp and ceremony, involved the public and were held at public expense, they were considered as exalting commemorations.

In the church, as well as at the grave, dignified, romantic and touching eulogies were offered, by Panayotis Soutsos, Neophytos Vamvas, Konstantinos Oikonomou as well as by other scholars and orators.⁴⁴ They connected with antiquity and, at the same time, worked on the triptych “hero’s identity–memory of 1821–national identity”. The dead and his deeds find their parallel in antiquity, in Achilles, Pericles, Cynaegirus, and in Thermopylae, while there is always a reference to the Bible.

⁴² Spyridon Kalyvokas, “Death Portrait of the Greek War of Independence Fighter Vasilis Ath. Petmezas”, 1872, albumen print, N.E. Tolis collection, as published in Sakellariopoulos and Dimitriadou, *1821 Before and After*, 827.

⁴³ Achilleus Paraschos, “Ελεγείον εις τον στρατηγόν Γενναίον Κολοκοτρώνη.”

⁴⁴ Indicative examples are “Λόγος επιτάφιος Γεωργίου Τερτσέτου επί τω Γενναίω Κολοκοτρώνη, εκφωνηθείς εν τω Νεκροταφείω Αθηνών” and “Λόγος επιτάφιος εκφωνηθείς εν τω Νεκροταφείω Αθηνών επί τω Γενναίω Κολοκοτρώνη, υπό Τιμολέοντος Ι. Φιλήμονος τη 24 Μαΐου 1868,” *Αιών*, 27 May 1868; “Νικολάου Ι. Σαριπόλου, Λόγος εκφωνηθείς την 24 Μαΐου 1868, εν τω ναώ της Μητροπόλεως Αθηνών, εις την κηδείαν του αοιδίμου αντιστρατήγου Ιωάννου Θ. Κολοκοτρώνη,” *Αιών*, 30 May 1868.

As far as the local authority is concerned, it is a strict rule of the municipal cemetery to concede space for honorary interments to distinguished persons of national significance who offered their services or even their life to the nation. As can be inferred from the surviving minutes of Athens Municipal Council, this was indeed the practice for many fighters of the Greek War of Independence who were buried in the First Cemetery. In addition, there was provision for the reinterment in the capital of the remains of fighters who had been buried elsewhere, followed by the construction of a mausoleum in their memory. Thus, in 1879, Angelos Vlachos, an Athens city councillor, proposed the honorary reinternment of the remains of the hero Georgios Karaiskakis. His proposal came at the same time a public subscription was underway for the erection of the hero's statue in Athens. Similarly, in 1895 there was a decision to erect a sepulchral monument to Prince Ypsilantis, as his heirs had expressed interest in reintering him in the First Cemetery.⁴⁵ None of the above decisions were implemented.

Additionally, it is worth noting that many times the honorary distinction was conceded to descendants, a gesture that served equally the family and collective ancestral memory. A representative example was the offering in 1911 of a free burial place to the son of Panayotis Papatsonis, Konstantinos. Athens Municipal Council recognised the great service and sacrifices of the Papatsonis family during the struggle of 1821.⁴⁶ For the municipality, the memory of the struggle was of immense significance, proved – among other things – by the fact that some streets of the First Cemetery were named after the fighters, for example Kolokotronis Street⁴⁷ and the like. The pillar-marker in the junction of Trikoupis and Koumbaris streets bears witness to this practice.

For some fighters the recognition and the honours came at the request of their family, who had to remind the city council of the sacrifices of their dead for the nation. The examples of Michail Tolmidis, Antonios Reveliotis and Anastasios Rombotsis are indicative.⁴⁸ For some others, recognition arrived later, hence the offering of an honorary grave for their remains. The case of Antonios Delenardos, who died in 1897, serves as an example; in 1901, at the request of his daughter, Christina, the city council honoured him as being one of the last fighters of the War of Independence, who had received the silver medal

⁴⁵ Minutes of Athens Municipal Council, 24 April 1895, decision no. 2373. Cadastral and Property Records of Athens First Cemetery/Family Tombs/F: A/1/214.

⁴⁶ Minutes of Athens Municipal Council, 4 November 1911, decision no. 1747.

⁴⁷ Minutes of Athens Municipal Council, 5 October 1893, decision no. 1604. Cadastral and Property Records of Athens First Cemetery/Registry books, 1893–1896.

⁴⁸ Minutes of Athens Municipal Council, 14 June 1886, decision no. 1527; 7 December 1912, decision no. 2083.

of bravery. However, after his death, he bequeathed to his children nothing else but dignified poverty.⁴⁹

There have been several cases of honorary recognition ever since. They took place during the 1930s or a bit earlier. Our view is that they accompanied the celebrations for the centenary of the revolution and the initiatives Athens Mayor Spyros Merkouris took to highlight the fighters' monuments. During the same time the monuments were inventoried, the grave cadastre was brought up to date and finances were brought under control.

The inventory process revealed cases where descendants had failed to meet the financial obligations to maintain plots. Moreover, it showed that some family graves were being used without evidence that approval had been granted. Either the relevant nineteenth-century archives had been lost or the approval was not registered properly in the first place. How can one explain the lack of evidence for the precise burial place of Nikitaras or of Theodoros Kolokotronis, whose death had moved the entire nation?

By way of legalising plot titles, it was decided that the burial had taken place as was required; therefore the tribute to the deceased was offered posthumously. Characteristic cases are those of Konstantinos Kanaris, General Makriyannis, Rigas Palamidis and Kitsos Tzavelas.⁵⁰ On the other hand, the tomb of Philiki Etaireia founding member Emmanouil Xanthos was recognised as an honorary monument in 1950, almost a century after his death.⁵¹

However, errors were unavoidable. The continuous usage of the cemetery has exacted the necessary "concessions" as the burial ground seeks to serve the needs of the expanding – in terms population as well as space – city. Frequent victims of this practice are family tombs where there are no longer descendants. As a consequence, they came under municipal control. The family tomb of Spyridon Melios (1.226 A) is no longer visible. Melios left no descendants, so the financial obligations for his grave were not met. Eventually, in 1975 it was conceded for the honorary burial of the poet Kostas Varnalis.⁵² The remains of the general remain in the grave and "converse" with those of the poet. The original form of Melios' grave – fortunately – is described in full detail in Helen Angelomatis-Tsougarakis and Despoina Tsouklidou-Penna's book *Μητρώον Α'*

⁴⁹ Minutes of Athens Municipal Council, 5 July 1901, decision no. 1514.

⁵⁰ Minutes of Athens Municipal Council, 6 November 1930, decision no. 1305; 6 November 1931, decision no. 1298 and 1300. For the tomb of Kitsos Tzavellas: Cadastral and Property Records of Athens First Cemetery/Family Tombs/F: A/2/30.

⁵¹ Minutes of Athens Municipal Council, 20 November 1950, decision no. 1093.

⁵² Minutes of Athens Municipal Council, 20 December 1974, decision no. 1060. Cadastral and Property Records of Athens First Cemetery/Family Tombs/F: A/1/226A.

Νεκροταφείου Αθηνών: Α Ζώνη-Ιον Τμήμα. Similarly, the grave of the fighter Andreas Zaimis was conceded rather unintentionally for another burial.⁵³ Later, in order to restore his memory, it was decided that another plot would be provided next to the church of St. Lazarus. There lies his tombstone with the laconic inscription “Andreas Zaimis”. Recent years have seen a serious effort at documentation, which hopefully will contribute to the rescue and maintenance of the funerary monuments.

Their preservation is also a matter of the upmost importance. Some later owners dramatically changed the form of the monument. In the case of the tomb of Nikolaos Poniropoulos, for example, the monument was initially a stele. Later, a large, overground crypt was erected and the stele was placed on top of it, stripping it of all sense of measurement and proportion (the ancient Greek *μέτρον*). Others have been abandoned to the ravages of time and environment. Some have suffered significant damage, which has altered their very existence. The bust of Andronikos Paikos, the oeuvre of Fytalis brothers, lies on the ground, as an indifferent element of the past. The cross on Panayotis Sekeres’ grave fell down decades ago. The monument of Anastasios Robotsis has collapsed. The need for their maintenance and restoration is imperative.

Therefore, the oscillation between the private and the public, which is inherent in the cemetery, as has been pointed out, concerns not only the construction of the monument, its materiality and its symbolism, but also its preservation. It generally concerns memory itself, the private and the collective. Especially in the case of historical figures, collective memory is fulfilled through the practices of commemoration in their last residence. Their grave therefore becomes a reference point for institutional memorial ceremonies, in addition to the familiar ones and, thus, the private character becomes quasi-collective.

Commemorations, ceremonies and wreath laying are actions that take place at funerary monuments, particularly on annual anniversaries. Most characteristic is the ceremony that took place in the cemetery on 25 March 1921, in the context of the celebration of the centenary. Innumerable people in procession laid wreaths on the heroes’ tombs.⁵⁴

Beyond the public commemorations, which were more frequent in the past, individual ones also occur in the necropolis. They are spontaneous, genuine expressions of homage displaying gratitude and reverence to the tombs of

⁵³ Cadastral and Property Records of Athens First Cemetery/Family Tombs/F: 2/11 and A/1/127A. Minutes of Athens Municipal Council, 28 February 1980, decision no. 140.

⁵⁴ “Η επέτειος της Εθνικής Εορτής,” *Εμπρός*, 25 March 1921; “Αι τριήμεραι εθνικαί εορταί δια την συμπλήρωσιν της Εκατονταετηρίδος της Ελληνικής Ανεξαρτησίας,” *Πατρίς*, 25 March 1921; “Μεταμεσημβρίαν εις τους τάφους των Ελευθερωτών. Η τελετή του Νεκροταφείου,”

the ancestors and their sacred remains. The Greek flag and the fresh flowers on the cenotaph of Odysseus Androutsos are only a small piece of evidence today. In parallel, visitors lay flowers daily on the grave of General Theodoros Kolokotronis, which is also a cenotaph.

The latter one, an absolute landmark in Athens First Cemetery, is in fact a late twentieth-century composition, an example of how a private grave has become a public monument. The initiative for its erection came from the Pangortynian Union. In fact, it is an amalgamation of the tombs where Theodoros, Ioannis (Gennaios) and Panos Kolokotronis, as well as their descendants, were buried. In the centre, among crosses and inscriptions, a seated marble statue of the ancestor of all, General Theodoros Kolokotronis, proudly expresses not only family but also national memory. Although the sculptural performance is not recognised as particularly successful, the importance of the statue's existence for the sense of the public is superior to any aesthetic and artistic value.

In conclusion, the surviving context of graves of the fighters of the Greek War of Independence situated in Athens First Cemetery – dispersed in various locations – allows for combinative and comparative considerations of artistic, social and historical terms. After having made clear the inherent contradiction that exists in a funerary monument – sternly private, but also public; introverted while extroverted – the graves of the revolutionary figures are regarded, on the one hand, as masterpieces of art while, on the other, as bearers of historical contexts, microhistories and embodied narratives, as mirrors of beliefs and trends of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Greek society. The fighters of the revolution are heroes – interlocutors of the ancient ancestors, dictating to the collective consciousness and subconsciousness the historical necessity of continuity and of the mission entailed in it. Within the context of the fluctuating geography and anthropogeography of Athens First Cemetery, and under the pressure of the permanent usage and the passage of time, one thing has not always attracted the necessary attention and, consecutively, perpetuation: the retention of memory, of tribute and of the moral-national debt. There are graves that no longer exist; on the other hand, apart from the graves of popular personalities that are still without markers, we have discovered monuments for which no mention, bibliographical or any other kind, exists whatsoever; they are long forgotten in a place of remembrance par excellence.

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

Εμπρός, 26 March 1921; See also Christina Koulouri, *Φουστανέλες και χλαμύδες: Ιστορική μνήμη και εθνική ταυτότητα 1821–1930* (Athens: Alexandria, 2020), 491–92.