

Vol 19, No 1 (2022)

The Historical Review / La Revue Historique



VOLUME XIX (2022)

Section de Recherches Néohelléniques
Institut de Recherches Historiques / FNRS

Section of Neohellenic Research
Institute of Historical Research / NHRF

George Tolia, Eleni Gkadolou, Panagiotis El Gedi

Copyright © 2023



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:

Tolias, G., Gkadolou, E., & El Gedi, P. (2023). Reconstructing the Map: 'Deep Mapping' Greece, 1821–1852. *The Historical Review/La Revue Historique*, 19(1), 115–142. Retrieved from <https://ejournals.epublishing.ekt.gr/index.php/historicalReview/article/view/35058>

RECONSTRUCTING THE MAP: ‘DEEP MAPPING’ GREECE, 1821–1852

George Tolia, Eleni Gkadolou and Panagiotis El Gedi

ABSTRACT: The article serves as introduction to this Special Section. After a brief overview of the potential of historical maps as visual memory registers, and a presentation of some analogous recent developments in the digital humanities, such as “spatial history”, “deep mapping” and “digital storytelling”, the article presents the aim of the project and the empirical methodology followed for the development of the Digital Atlas of the Greek War of Independence and the Creation of the Greek State, 1821–1852. The Atlas is based on the corpus of important maps produced during the period under examination, their exploitation as sources of information, and their reconstruction, achieved through the unveiling of the subsequent layers of the principal sources of information of each map, such as travellers’ accounts and scientific expeditions, topographic illustrations and reconnaissance itineraries, topographic or hydrographic surveys, statistics, etc. The atlas is further supplemented by additional information, a selection of first-hand testimonies on the Greek War of Independence, extracted from memoirs of combatants as well as illustrations related to the revolutionary events.

Maps and Memory

It was necessary to place the Hospital of Don Juan Tavera in the form of a model because, not only did it cover the Puerta de Visagra [Bisagra], but the dome or cupola rose up over the city and so once placed as a model and moved from its location it seemed to me to show the facade better than elsewhere, and as to how it fits within the city, this can be seen in the plan. Also in the story of Our Lady bringing the chasuble to Saint Ildefonso, in order to adorn him and to make the figures large, I have in a certain way taken advantage of their being celestial bodies, as in the case of lights, which when viewed from afar, however small, they may appear to be large.¹

The acknowledgment appears on El Greco’s *View and Plan of Toledo*, painted at the turn of the seventeenth century (fig. 1). It is inscribed on the right side of the plan of the city displayed to the viewer by a youth, who stands below and on the right of the altered view. Next to the plan and towards the centre, a “model” of

¹ See Harold E. Wethey, *El Greco and His School* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962), 2:84–85.

the Tavera Hospital is shown, floating on a cloud, and further to the left appears the allegorical figure of the river-god Tagus, painted in monochrome earthly tones. Above the view of the city and in the clouded skies, appears the Virgin Mary, escorted by angels and placing a chasuble on Saint Ildefonsus, first bishop and patron of the city.



Figure 1. Domenikos Theotokopoulos (El Greco), *View and Plan of Toledo* (1608). Oil on canvas, Museum of El Greco, Toledo.

Art historians agree that El Greco's complex and somehow unsettling view resumes the multiple layers of the city's identity, political as well as cultural, sacred as well as secular.² In order to disclose the complexity of the city's *true nature*, the artist marshalled all sorts of means of representation, such as the perspective panorama and the topographic survey, and also resorted to antiquarian and religious symbols. El Greco's wish to portray in depth his adoptive city is not an isolated case. It has to be considered against the frame of early modern visual culture, when artists, scientists, humanist scholars and practitioners explored the potential of all kinds of spatial representations – artistic, literary, empirical or scientific – in order to explore the multiple layers of meaning registered on space. It is a composite process that implores a set of

² Jonathan Brown and Richard L. Kagan, "View of Toledo," in "Figures of Thought: El Greco as Interpreter of History, Tradition, and Ideas," *Studies in the History of Art* 11 (1982): 18–30.

intellectual procedures and attitudes, a *forma mentis* that seeks to survey the manifold aspects of human adventure on Earth.

The unprecedented flow of information due to the proliferation of communication networks and the advent of printing affected mapmaking and transformed maps into a central agent of collecting, organising and communicating new and old knowledge. From the fifteenth century till the reformation of mapmaking during the Enlightenment, and the ensuing entanglement of cartography in a technological and positivistic perception, maps were conceived as visual tools that made possible the exploration of the *true nature* of places. Among the many factors that supported and sustained this stance, mention should be made of the appearance in the West of two Greek geographical works composed during the Roman imperial era: Strabo's *Geographica* and Ptolemy's *Geography*. The first was a stoic description of the inhabited world in which places are perceived as historical theatres of human action, while the latter was a guide for the construction of the mathematical map of the world and its regions, conceived as a tool for the deciphering of the mathematical coherence of the universe.³ Against the then prevailing intellectual frame of universal harmony, the mathematically constructed map was understood as a means for expressing and even exploring the workings of the World Machine.

Maps as virtual representations of natural environments were chiefly used as registers of the variety of the Creation as they displayed the natural settings of human activity. Indeed, maps responded to the desire to portray the multiple layers of accumulated meaning related to places: past and present place names, historical or religious annotations and explanatory notes, emblems and genealogies of rulers, landscapes, costumes and thematic vignettes alluding to the local customs, mythology and sacred or secular history, fictional elements such as imaginary beasts and monstrous races inherited from the *Corpus Aristotelicum* or Pliny's *Natural History*. All these composed a mass of attractive and often encrypted cartographic paraphernalia that nowadays has transformed old maps into highly decorative and collectable items.

Important maps were accompanied by analytical descriptions of the displayed places, concordance lists of ancient and modern place names and, since the first atlases, by descriptions printed on the back of each map, containing elements of geography, mythology, history, local curiosities and famous men, as well as selected textual descriptions of the charted areas. "Mirrors", "theatres" or "true portraits" of space, maps served as registers of the memory of places.

³ Patrick Gautier Dalché, *La Géographie de Ptolémée en Occident (IVe–XVI siècle)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), and Gautier Dalché, "Strabo's Reception in the West (Fifteenth–Sixteenth Centuries)," in *The Routledge Companion to Strabo*, ed. Daniela Dueck (London: Routledge, 2017), 367–84.

In the opening lines of the first modern atlas Abraham Ortelius described geography as “the eye of history”, and maps as memory theatres that enabled the understanding of history:

And when we have acquainted our selves somewhat with the use of these *Tables* or *Mappes*, or have attained thereby to some reasonable knowledge of *Geography*, whatsoever we shall read, these *Chartes* being placed, as it were certaine glasses before our eyes, will the longer be kept in memory, and make the deeper impression in us: by which meanes it commeth to passe, that now we do seeme to perceive some fruit of that which we have read. The reading of Histories doeth both seeme to be much more pleasant, and in deed so it is, when the *Mappe* being layed before our eyes, we may behold things done, or places where they were done, as if they were at this time present and in doing.⁴

The mnemonic function of maps is easy to understand. To begin with, maps can act as mnemonic *imagines agentes* (“scenes in action”), their direct visual effect and the spatial ratio of the data that they contain facilitates the recollection of events related to the region represented on the map, known to the viewer from previous readings.⁵ Then, historical events such as wars, conquests, discoveries or migrations are hard to follow outside of their geographical settings. Thanks to the enduring nature of space and the flowing complexion of history, maps were not only used in order to display the natural and still-present settings of historical events, but also to embrace the assorted historical layers of human activity by including the historical toponymy of the pictured area as well as historical vignettes, textual or visual, of important events related to the depicted areas. The constancy of space over the changeability of time echoes down to the mid-seventeenth century. In 1652 the English polymath Peter Heylyn stated that “Geography without History hath life and motion, but very unstable, and at random; but History without Geography, like a dead carkass, hath neither life, nor motion at all.”⁶

The all-embracing, encyclopaedic and mnemonic function of early maps opened the way to thematic cartographies, especially historical or “comparative”

⁴ Abraham Ortelius’ address “To the Courteous Reader,” *Theatrum orbis terrarum* (Antwerp, 1570), 1 (English translation, *The Theatre of the Whole World* [London, 1606]). The motto “historiae oculus geographia” also appears on the title page of Ortelius’s historical atlas, the *Parergon* (1592).

⁵ George Tolias, “Maps in Renaissance Libraries and Collections,” in *The History of Cartography*, vol. 3, *Cartography in the European Renaissance*, ed. David Woodward (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 637–60 (esp. 637–42: “Maps as Memory Aids”).

⁶ Peter Heylyn, *Cosmographie in Four Bookes, Containing the Chorographie and Historie of the Whole World* (London, 1652), address to the reader.

cartography, and the production of important historical atlases,⁷ and found notable applications in education during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.⁸ It was challenged, however, and gradually vanished with the advent of the so-called “scientific” reformation in cartography, in other words, the cartography performed not by venerable scholars but by engineers *sans literature*,⁹ by young army officers working on the field, initially trained in military topography schools and, later on, in technical universities. They applied older and novel quantitative methodologies, such as geodesy and statistics, and their maps were immense works in series of multiple sheets and in scales going up to 1:80,000 or 1:50,000. Commonly called General Staff Maps, they proposed an unprecedented accuracy and detail of the actual state of things. The maps of the learned fell victim to an age of technology and became a thing of the past. Hence resulted the opposition between “field” and “cabinet” cartography, where the technological accuracy and objectivity of the former opposed the cultural (“symbolic”) and intuitive subjectivity of the latter.¹⁰ The opposition was hard to break. It took all the efforts of a series of scholars over the last decades, from Brian Harley and Denis Cosgrove to Patrick Gautier Dalché and Mathieu Edney, to restore the intellectual and scientific value of medieval and early modern maps and to deconstruct the positivistic notions of “scientific” or “technical” revolutions in the history of cartography.

In parallel and independent to these scholarly endeavours, other developments occurred. The digital age and the dazzling proliferation of data brought yet another transformation of cartographic practices through the

⁷ Jeremy Black, *Maps and History: Constructing Images of the Past* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997); Walter Goffart, *Historical Atlases: The First Three Hundred Years, 1570–1870* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).

⁸ Georges Tolias, “Géographie comparée et mémoire locale au XVIIe siècle *Les Parallela geographiae veteris et novae* de Philippe Briet,” *Orbis disciplinae: Hommages en l’honneur de Patrick Gautier Dalché*, ed. Nathalie Bouloux, Anca-Cristina Dan and George Tolias (Turnhout: Brepols, 2017), 763–77.

⁹ J.-B. Bourguignon d’Anville, *Considérations générales, sur l’étude et les connoissances que demande la composition des ouvrages de géographie* (Paris, 1777), 110.

¹⁰ See David Woodward, “The ‘Two Cultures’ of Map History – Scientific and Humanistic Traditions: A Plea for Reintegration,” in *Approaches and Challenges in a Worldwide History of Cartography*, ed. David Woodward, Catherine Delano-Smith and Cordell D.K. Yee (Barcelona: Institut Cartogràfic de Catalunya, 2001), 49–67; Matthew Edney, “Cartography’s ‘Scientific Reformation’ and the Study of Topographical Mapping in the Modern Era,” in *History of Cartography: International Symposium of the ICA Commission, 2010*, ed. Elri Liebenberg and Imre Josef Demhardt (Heidelberg: Springer for the International Cartographic Association, 2012), 287–303.

development of Geographical Information Systems (GIS). Once again mapping was among the solutions to organise the unprecedented flow of information. Among the manifold GIS applications, a peculiar trend took shape within the broader field of the digital humanities, the so-called “spatial turn” or “geospatial scholarship”, in which scholars and social scientists, geographers and internet experts met.¹¹ Sophisticated digital practices were developed, such as *spatial history*, *deep mapping* and *spatial storytelling*, while novel and impressive tools were proposed to grasp multiple sets of space-related data and to explore the cultural and social construction of space.¹²

“Deep mapping” is an experimental notion, and as such there is no consensus on its content and methodology. In a recent overview, archaeologist Tiffany Earley-Spadoni considers “deep maps” as multi-layered, digital cartographic representations that allow “map creators to annotate and illustrate geographical and social space in various ways, often using multi-media elements, commenting, and super-imposable layers.”¹³ Quoting a recent bibliography on the subject, the author attests that deep maps “can provide temporal resolution to cartographic data”, can illustrate the element of change over time and “may integrate aspirational or imaginary space”. She observes, furthermore, that the technological framework of the medium affects its functions, since the process by which a deep map is produced makes it simultaneously a platform, a product and a process. “A deep map”, she concludes, “is a complex construction composed of layers of meaning and process.”¹⁴

Geographers, social anthropologists and archaeologists were among the first to explore the potential of these novel technologies, thanks to the transdisciplinary character of their respective epistemological fields. However, the risk of adding new layers of confusion through the use of these tools is more

¹¹ Barney Warf and Santa Arias, eds., *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (New York: Routledge, 2009).

¹² “Deep Mapping,” ed. Les Roberts, special issue, *Humanities* (May 2016); Martin Dodge, “Cartography I: Mapping Deeply, Mapping the Past,” *Progress in Human Geography* 41, no. 1 (2016): 1–10. For a recent summary, see Stuart Dunn, *A History of Place in the Digital Age* (London: Routledge, 2019). For an overview and a critical assessment, see Martin Dodge, “Cartography I: Mapping Deeply, Mapping the Past,” *Progress in Human Geography* 41, no. 1 (2017): 89–98.

¹³ Tiffany Earley-Spadoni, “Spatial History, Deep Mapping and Digital Storytelling: Archaeology’s Future Imagined Through an Engagement With the Digital Humanities,” in “Archaeological GIS Today: Persistent Challenges, Pushing Old Boundaries, and Exploring New Horizons,” ed. Meghan C.L. Howey, Marieka Brouwer Burg, special issue, *Journal of Archaeological Science* 84 (2017): 95–102.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 97.

than real in historiography, a discipline compelled to ground its analyses of changes and continuities on significant and coherent corpuses of documents. In contrast, the use of these tools presents advantages in the analysis of historical maps since the rationality that lies behind these innovative and often impressive digital applications is rooted in the foundations of modern mapping practices. Indeed, digital “deep mapping” processes have similar ambitions to the multi-layered complexions and the mnemonic function of early modern mapping, though in a much more analytical scale, and with the use of modern digital tools.

One could say that mapping is a form of creating virtual environments, being a compilation and editing of all sorts of space-related data, in other words, its arrangement and communication to the public by means of analogical or mathematically structured visual representations. As graphic records of space-related data, maps are the outcome of a critical processing of available information. The reconstruction of the successive layers of their documentation, wherever possible, can shed light on the key issue of how space was conceived and how its representations were fashioned. Deep-mapping methodology can be useful in the reconstruction of historical maps, the unfolding of the successive layers of cartographic processes and documentation, the practises of compilation, and disclose the perennial patterns of mapping, a process that seeks to marshal, spatially organise and visually display information.

The Digital Atlas: Aim and Resources

The Digital Atlas of the Greek War of Independence and the Creation of the Greek State, 1821–1832, is based on the historical, cartographic and geographic documentation produced during the time period under examination. It is an open-access interactive cartographic restoration of the historical landscape of Greece during these crucial years and a search tool for first-hand testimonies on the geography and history of Greece. It is an open-ended project, conducted at the Institute for Historical Research over the last decade, a fertile collaboration between historians, digital cartographers and network engineers.¹⁵

In undertaking this exploration, our aim was to investigate some of the intellectual processes by which Greece was conceived as a political territorial entity, to investigate the means by which these processes operated, and to offer to the academic community a set of reliable historical data on the natural and inhabited landscape of the Greek state in its making, such as a portion of the always missing historical gazetteer of modern Greece.

¹⁵ See the acknowledgments at the end of this article, herein pp. @@@.

Studying the mechanisms of the creation of the Greek state in its making is a complex task which implies systematic research in political, economic, social and institutional documentation. We opted to approach the issue from the perspective of geography, and to explore the ways by which Greece was conceived as a territorial entity. During the period under examination, Greek national space remained undefined and fluid. The process of its definition was quite precarious since Greece had never existed until then as a political and territorial entity, while the transfer from the ethnocultural notion of the “Greek people”, scattered for centuries in the north-eastern Mediterranean, to the political notion of “Greece” as a national state, was on the go.

The revolutionary administrations were quite elusive on the issue of the definition of the country, its extent and its internal jurisdiction. The first official document to describe the limits and the administrative structure of the country is the so-called “Hegemonic Constitution” of 1832, approved by the representatives of the Greek nation on the eve of King Othon’s arrival to Greece, when the Treaty of Constantinople and the London Conference provided international recognition to the Greek state.¹⁶ The uncertainty of things is to be expected within the context of a national revolution in progress. The war broke out simultaneously in Moldavia and the Peloponnese, while revolutionary sparks were manifested in an area stretching from Macedonia and the coasts of Asia Minor to the islands of Crete and the remote Cyprus, while only the Peloponnese, Central Greece and the Cyclades were included in the newly created state. When the representatives of the “Protecting Powers”, as they emerged after the 1827 Battle of Navarino (Russia, Britain and France), asked in 1828 the revolutionary administration on the extent of the future state, Governor Kapodistrias referred them “to the evidence of history and the opinion of geographers”, and proposed the territories included in the map of Greece, published in Paris by the French military cartographer Pierre Lapie in 1826, the most influential map at the time.¹⁷

Greece was not yet defined in political terms, but in historical and geographical ones. Therefore, the geographic and cartographic output related to Greece during the years under examination is not an anodyne learned or technological venture. The geography and the map of Greece conceived and imposed the country as a historical and geographical entity long before it was

¹⁶ Πολιτικὸν Σύνταγμα τῆς Ἑλλάδος κατὰ τὴν Εἴθνηκὴν Συνέλευσιν. Ἐκδιδόμενον νῦν τὸ πρῶτον ὑπὸ Ἀνδρέου Ζ. Μάμουκα (Athens: Typ. P.V. Melachouri and Ph. Karambini, 1843), 1.

¹⁷ Kapodistrias’ reply from Poros is dated 9 October 1828. See Andreas Z. Mamoukas, *Τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἀναγέννησιν τῆς Ἑλλάδος, ἡτοι Συλλογὴ τῶν περὶ τὴν ἀναγεννωμένην Ἑλλάδα συνταχθέντων πολιτευμάτων, νόμων καὶ ἄλλων ἐπισήμων πράξεων ἀπὸ τοῦ 1821 μέχρι τέλους τοῦ 1832* (Athens: Vasiliki Typografia, 1852), 11:256–57.

recognised as a political one. They constitute major cultural endeavours of significant political and ideological weight, as they were part of the mechanisms that supported both the international acceptance of a Greek national territory and the consolidation of the national idea. The map of the country became the image that summarised and impressed the territorial status of an independent Greece, the central claim of the fighting Greeks.

In order to place our inquiries on a coherent corpus of historical documents and a uniform set of data, we opted to assemble the digital atlas on the basis of the authoritative maps produced during the period under examination. The main corpus of our research consists therefore of the following maps:

1. Sheets 10–15 of the *General Map of Turkey in Europe*, by Pierre Lapie, in 15 sheets and a scale of 1:800,000, published by the French Dépôt de la Guerre between 1822 and 1825;¹⁸

2. A derivative, the map of Greece in four sheets and a scale 1:400,000 by Pierre Lapie, published in 1826;¹⁹

3. The map of the Peloponnese in six sheets and a scale of 1:200,000, based on the survey conducted by the French army between 1828 and 1832, published in 1832 and included in the atlas of the French Scientific Expedition to the Morea, 1835;²⁰

4. The geological and historical map of the Peloponnese by Émile Le Puillon de Boblaye, also a member of the French Scientific Expedition to the Morea, in one sheet and a scale of 1:800,000, published in 1833;²¹

5. The map of the northern frontier of Greece based on a survey conducted by the International Boundary Commission in 1832 and published in Athens, in 1837, in eight sheets and a scale of 1:150,000;²²

¹⁸ Pierre Lapie, *Carte générale de la Turquie d'Europe en XV feuilles* (Paris, 1822[–1825]).

¹⁹ Pierre Lapie, *Carte physique, historique et routière de la Grèce, dressée au 400,000e* (Paris, 1826).

²⁰ Jean-Jacques-Germain Pelet, Jean-Pierre-Eugène-Félicien Peytier, Émile Le Puillon de Boblaye and Aristide-Camille Servier, *Carte de la Morée rédigée et gravée au Dépôt Général de la Guerre, d'après les triangulations et les levés exécutés en 1829, 1830 et 1831 par les officiers d'état-major attachés au Corps d'occupation, par ordre de M. le Maréchal Duc de Dalmatie Ministre de la Guerre, sous la direction de M. le Lieutenant Général Pelet* (Paris, 1832).

²¹ Émile Le Puillon de Boblaye, *Carte générale de la Morée et des Cyclades exposant les principaux faits de géographie ancienne et de géographie naturelle rédigée au Dépôt général de la guerre par ordre de M. le Maréchal duc de Dalmatie, Président du Conseil, Ministre de la Guerre. Sous la direction de M. le lieutenant-général Pelet* (Paris, 1833).

²² *Carte de la frontière continentale entre le Royaume de la Grèce et l'Empire Ottoman fixée sur les lieux par M.M. les Commissaires del'Alliance assistés de ceux de la Grèce et de la Turquie* (Athens, 1837).

6. The final map of Greece in 20 sheets and a scale of 1:200,000, published by the French Dépôt de la Guerre in 1852 under the supervision of Jean Pierre Eugène Félicien Peytier. It contains the six sheets of the 1832 map (map no. 3) and the surveys in Central Greece conducted by Captain Peytier between 1832 and 1849.²³

These maps form the basic historical “sheets” or cartographic layers of the digital atlas, together with a modern digital map showing the communication network in the area and the distances between places in walking hours, extracted from the route guide printed in Greek in Venice in 1829.²⁴ Many other maps produced during this time span are omitted, the best of them being based on Lapie’s maps during the 1820s and the French Expedition’s map during the 1830s.

The Reconstruction of the Maps

The superimposition of the six historical maps that compose the atlas facilitates the display of the evolution of the data over time, given that the creation of the Greek state was followed by constant changes of names of settlements and of administrative jurisdictions or districts, offering a tool for the comprehension of the process of Hellenisation of the newly liberated Greek territories.²⁵ The six historical maps of the atlas are reconstructed by means of subsequent sublayers, each one dedicated to a specific source of documentation of the relevant map, quantitative or narrative, since both learned and technical mapmaking practices continued to operate at the time. The period under examination here was a period of radical change in cartography. During the last decades of the eighteenth century and the first decade of the nineteenth century, the army “engineer-geographers”, topographers, geodesists and surveyors, worked actively in western Europe. They measured territories, they created and collected systematic corpuses of quantitative data on the places and their inhabitants, in order to produce the multi-sheet, large scale and detailed maps that we usually call General Staff Maps. The army replaced the academy. During the French

²³ [Jean-Pierre-Eugène-Félicien Peytier], *Carte de la Grèce rédigée et gravée au Dépôt de la Guerre d’après la triangulation et les levés, exécutés par les officiers du Corps d’État-major* (Paris, 1852).

²⁴ *Δρομοδείκτης τῶν ἀκολουθῶν ὀκτῶ μερῶν, μεθ’ ἀξιολόγων ὑποσημειώσεων τοῦ καθενὸς μέρους: Πελοποννήσου, Βοιωτίας, Ἀττικῆς, Θεσσαλίας, Ἠπείρου, Μπόσνας, Μακεδονίας καὶ Θράκης* (Venice: Typ. Michail Glyky, 1829).

²⁵ Dimitris Dimitropoulos and Eleni Kyramargiou, eds., *Αλλάζοντας τον χάρτη: Ζητήματα μετονομασιῶν στη Μεσόγειο, 19ος–20ός αιώνας* (Athens: Institute for Historical Research, NHRF, 2020).

Revolutionary Wars, the Consulate and the Empire (1792–1815), the old Dépôt de la Guerre, founded by Louis XIV in 1688, was revamped. Its headquarters in Paris and its satellite offices and topographic bureaus in the countries forming the Napoleonic Empire emerged during this period as a network service for collecting, archiving and evaluating information, and producing new maps for military purposes – something between a central intelligence service, a general military archive and an army cartographic service.²⁶

The Ottoman lands in Europe were not mapped this way; the first map of a south-eastern European region to be made with modern techniques was the map of the Peloponnese, produced by French army engineers between 1828 and 1832. In the absence of a systematic topographic survey and in order to supply the army and the market with reliable maps of the region, the French military cartographic services worked on a “hypothetical triangulation”.²⁷ This was realised by using the road network of the area as a conjectural triangulation foundation for the map. In order to achieve this, they collected all the available information on the itinerary distances between places in the region, and they verified it against the descriptions of earlier geographers and travellers’ explorations, special reconnaissance missions, reports from consuls, commercial agents and missionaries, measurements of longitudes and latitudes collected by hydrographic expeditions or correspondents of the Paris Observatory.

The reconstruction of the six maps of the Digital Atlas was achieved by restoring their resources. Hence, the first two cartographic documents forming the atlas, Lapie’s 1822–1825 map of European Turkey in 15 sheets and its derivative 1826 map of Greece in four sheets (see figs. 2 and 3 in the following article), are supplemented by cartographic sublayers dedicated to their main source materials, as attested in their titles and verified in the relevant documentation. First comes the narrative of François Pouqueville, former general consul of France at the court of Ali Pasha in Ioannina. The work was published in five volumes on the eve of the Greek War (1820–1821), and then in six volumes (1826–1827) supplemented with maps by Lapie. It is the main overall geographical description of the Greek national space, a systematic

²⁶ See Robert Fulton, “Crafting a Site of State Information Management: The French Case of the Dépôt de la Guerre,” *French Historical Studies* 40, no. 2 (2017): 215–40; and Michel Roucaud, “Le renseignement militaire opérationnel sous le Consulat et l’Empire (1799–1815)” (PhD diss., Université de Panthéon Sorbonne (Paris I), Paris, 2015).

²⁷ The term was coined by the French general, politician and cartographer Frédéric Guillaume de Vaudoncourt in his *Mémoire annexé à la carte de la Turquie d’Europe à la droite du Danube, ou des Beglerbegliks de Roum-Ili, de Bosnie et de Morée en quatre feuilles* (Munich: Reinhard, 1818). See also the next article of this Special Section, herein, p. 161.

though controversial projection of the ancient countries on the Ottoman administrative districts of the region. Then comes the travel narratives and itineraries of the antiquarian scholars Sir William Gell and Edward Dodwell, and the secret reconnaissance of Jacques Boudin, comte de Tromelin, French emissary to European Turkey during the Napoleonic Wars. These thematic sublayers contain place names cited in each source, and, wherever available, the proposed census of the population and the administrative jurisdictions of the country. The thematic sublayers are further supplemented with a selection of brief descriptions of places extracted from the relevant texts as well as the rich topographic illustrations made by the authors or included in their editions (fig. 2).




Figure 2. The documentation layers of the four-sheet map of Greece by Pierre Lapie (Paris, 1826). By selecting from the menu (left), the user can visualise locations, descriptions and images drawn from the main sources of the map, namely the publications of William Gell, Edward Dodwell, François Pouqueville and J.-J. Boudin de Tromelin. The screenshot shows locations extracted from Gell's narratives and itineraries (1810–1823).

Three of the main cartographic sources of the atlas introduce “scientific” cartography, in other words the cartography based on in situ measurements produced by the army engineer-geographers. In response to Governor Kapodistrias’ request for technical assistance in mapping the country, the French expeditionary force under General Nicolas-Joseph Maison was accompanied by a corps of army engineer surveyors and a scientific commission of natural scientists, Hellenists and architects under Bory de Saint Vincent, an army geographer and natural sciences specialist. By order of General Maison, a topographic office was set up in March 1829 at the headquarters in Methoni

and a surveying platoon of engineers was detached from the occupation army in order to undertake the surveying work. Lieutenant-Colonel Barthélemy was appointed head of the topographic office.²⁸

The French scholars and technicians surveyed the country and its monuments, cities and fortresses, conducted the census of the population and studied its natural resources, flora and fauna, and minerals. In short, they supported the efforts of the revolutionary Greek authorities, offering modern tools for the administration of the country under construction. The French surveyors worked actively in the Peloponnese in 1829, despite the fact that they faced many and constant obstacles, diseases (a typhoid epidemic and the endemic malaria),²⁹ political turmoil and social unrest, as well as substantial problems of coordination. The surveying team took orders from the general staff of the French army of occupation, the Natural Sciences Section of Scientific Commission, while the central cartographer, Jean-Pierre-Eugène-Félix Peytier, was attached to the governor of Greece. A total of 18 army engineers, as well as Bory de Saint-Vincent and Puillon de Boblaye, worked in succession.³⁰

The scientists worked in close collaboration with the army topographers in the production of the 1832 map of the Peloponnese in six sheets, the 1833 geological and historical map of the Peloponnese by Puillon de Boblaye, and the 1852 final map of Greece in 20 sheets, as Peytier, assisted by a new team of six French army surveyors, continued to work after the departure of the French expeditionary force.³¹ The thematic sublayers of these maps contain quantitative geodesic and statistical data assembled and published by the members of the French Scientific Expedition to the Morea, as well as descriptions and

²⁸ Jean-Baptiste-Geneviève-Marcellin Bory de Saint-Vincent, *Expédition scientifique de Morée : Section des sciences physiques*, vol. 2, pt. 1, *Géographie* (Paris: Levraut, 1834), 50.

²⁹ Most of the young officers who mapped the Peloponnese fell ill from the typhus pandemic. Ten of them were forced into early retirement, while three lost their lives: Captain de Saint-Génis mapping Corinth (†1830), Lieutenant de Chièvres in the Argolis (†1829) and Lieutenant Caffort in Elis (†1829). His comrade Lieutenant Clausade buried him on the banks of the Alpheus before he returned, seriously ill, to France. See H.-M.-A. Berthaut, *Les ingénieurs géographes militaires (1624–1831): Étude historique* (Paris: Imprimerie du Service Géographique, 1902), 2:467–68.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 464–76; Stelios Papadopoulos, ed., *Liberated Greece and the Morea Scientific Expedition: The Peytier Album in the Stephen Vagliano Collection* (Athens: National Bank of Greece, 1971); Yannis Saïtas, ed., *Το έργο της Γαλλικής Επιστημονικής Αποστολής του Μοριά (1829–1838)*, vol. 1, *Τμήμα Φυσικών Επιστήμων* (Athens: Melissa, 2011); and Saïtas, ed., *Το έργο της Γαλλικής Επιστημονικής Αποστολής του Μοριά (1829–1838)*, vol. 2, *Τμήμα Αρχαιολογίας, Τμήμα Αρχιτεκτονικής, Γλυπτικής Επιγράφων* (Athens: Melissa, 2017).

³¹ Berthaut, *Les ingénieurs géographes militaires*, 2:475.

topographic images extracted from the narratives and the 1835 *Atlas* of the expedition or the richly illustrated archaeological editions and other relevant publications (fig. 3).




Figure 3. The documentation layers of the six-sheet map of the Peloponnese (Paris, 1832). By selecting from the menu (left), the user can visualise locations, descriptions and images drawn from the main sources of the map, namely the publications of the Natural Sciences and Section and the Architecture and Sculptures Section of the French Scientific Expedition.

The last map of the atlas is the map of the northern frontier of Greece. It was based on a survey conducted by the International Boundary Commission in 1832 and concluded in 1834. The map of the borderline would be the subject of an endless diplomatic tug-of-war before being accepted by the Sublime Porte in December 1835. Published in Athens by the Royal Lithography in 1837, it is the first legal cartographic document in the history of cartography of Greece. The map is supplemented by brief descriptions extracted from the proceedings of the Boundary Commission and the report made by the British commissioner, Colonel George Baker.³²

The demarcation of the borders faced many obstacles, as the Sublime Porte was not ready to recognise the independence of Greece, and Britain was worried by the creation of an independent Greek state susceptible to Russian influence.

³² Georgios Apostolides Cosmétis, ed., *Recueil des traités, actes et pièces concernant la fondation de la royauté en Grèce et le tracé de ses limites* (Nafplion: Imprimerie Royale, 1833), 86–95; George Baker, “Memoir on the Northern Frontier of Greece,” *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London* 7 (1837): 81–95. See also Ilias-Astrinos Venianakis, “Η οριοθέτηση των ελληνοτουρκικών συνόρων και η Ήπειρος – Θεσσαλία (1832–1836),” *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά* 36 (2002).

The inhabitants were also upset, especially those who suddenly found themselves on the wrong side of the frontier, as well as the Ottoman administrators of the neighbouring regions, who wished to become independent from the Porte. With their toleration or their encouragement, the border zone became soon a haven for marauding bands and disgruntled bandits, who, according to circumstances, took refuge on one side or the other of the border, a zone of anarchy where the law of the strong reigned. The adventures of the commission reveal the complexity of the conditions that arose from the creation of a centralised national state in a space that functioned for centuries within a decentralised multinational empire.

Mapping the Historical Testimonies

The restitution of the landscape of the Greek War of Independence and of the creation of the Greek state makes possible the annotation and illustration of historical events. Among the various sources of information produced during the time period in question, we opted to include in the atlas a series of map sheets containing first-hand testimonies extracted from the published memoirs of Greek combatants and philhellenes.³³ Research was conducted on 34 works, forming a total of 50 volumes (see the appendix “List of selected memoirs of combatants and philhellenes”). The excerpts were selected on the basis of a time line of the major revolutionary events that occurred between 1821 and 1832, in order to highlight the revolutionary episodes, and to illustrate the variety of perceptions of the same event. The digital atlas includes therefore a sum of more than 300 testimonies, attached to the places where the events took place, and accompanied, wherever possible, by relevant illustrations.

Published for the most part soon after the events by literate or illiterate combatants, these memoirs served multiple functions. They commemorated battles and political events, giving detail on them to a wider audience; they were evidence of the participation of their authors in the war, since after the creation of the state many veterans claimed either a position in the administration or some financial reward. Their memoirs preserved the memory of the national uprising while boosting the irredentism of the “Great Idea”.³⁴ But mainly they transmitted the personal experience of their authors who wished to say “what

³³ The corpus of the revolutionary memoirs represented a feasible option within the frame of a three-year project. The Digital Atlas is an open-ended project and can include in the future supplementary layers of source material extracted from other corpuses, such as the press, the administrative or diplomatic documents, historiography and so on.

³⁴ For the combatants’ fortunes after the war, see Elisavet Tsakanika, *Αγωνιστές του 1821 μετά την Επανάσταση* (Athens: Assini, 2019).

really happened". The retrospective recovery of "the truth" is what brings memoirs and historiographical works together in an age of historicism. As it has been noted,

Almost everyone appears with the same intentions: eyewitnesses, they want, they say, to show the naked truth, to celebrate the war, to contribute to its real knowledge or even to correct some inaccurate publications. Let's not forget, however, that "objectivity" is a completely relative concept here: everyone's personal justification remains, in the final analysis, the most important motivation. How could it be otherwise? The memoir, a genre of autobiographical account as well as an apology, always presupposes an active subject who defends, passionately or coolly, his case, settling his accounts with history.³⁵

Philhellenic memoirs form a special category. The three works which we "edited" for this occasion were published while the war was still in progress. Their aim was to make the Greek Revolution visible to the public in the West, so that it may contribute in turn, materially and morally, to the struggle of the Christian Greeks against the Muslim Ottomans. The three authors are quite different from each other. A soldier, an administrator and a student record their experiences – all wishing to show that they contributed in some way, each in its own field, to the Greek cause. Either focusing on the events, or bringing judgments about persons and situations, their narratives constitute the vital "external" view and, perhaps, the counterweight to the memoirs of the Greek fighters.³⁶

³⁵ Panos Moulas, "Η λογοτεχνία από τον Αγώνα ως τη Γενιά του 1880," *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους*, vol. 13 (Athens: Ekdotiki Athinon, 1977), 493. Thanks to their overall scope, their minute descriptions and their wide time coverage, some of the works are considered not as memoirs but as historiographical works. The debate was initiated in the mid-nineteenth century, in which the testimonies of those present at the battlefield were contrasted with those of authors of histories of the war, mostly politicians or administrators. See Eleftheria Zei, "Η Κρητική Επανάσταση του 1821 και η διπλή ματιά του Καλλίνικου Κριτοβουλίδη," in *1821 και Απομνημόνευμα: Ιστορική χρήση και ιστοριογραφική γνώση. Πρακτικά συνεδρίου*, ed. Dimitris Dimitropoulos, Vangelis Karamanolakis, Niki Maroniti and Pantelis Boukalas (Athens: Hellenic Parliament Foundation, 2020), 133–44. However, they are all subjective products of their time and as such, Trikoupis' *Ιστορία* is of the same interest as Kolokotronis' *Διήγησις* as both reflect their authors' respective personal view of the war and its challenges. Cf. Nikos Rotzokos, "Τα απομνημονεύματα του εικοσιένα ως υλικό της ιστοριογραφίας," *Δοκίμης* 2 (1994): 3–11.

³⁶ See Gunnar Hering, *Ο αγώνας των Ελλήνων για την ανεξαρτησία και ο φιλελληνισμός*, trans. Agathoklis Azelis (Heraklion: Crete University Press, 2021, first German edition in *Der Philhellenismus in der westeuropäischen Literatur, 1780–1830*, ed. Alfred Noe

Many memoirs were written by Greek fighters themselves, mostly literate combatants or politicians who put their experience on paper and published their work at the time. In other cases, the work was found posthumously, and published by learned editors and historians either in the nineteenth or twentieth centuries, with all what this implies in terms of reception and editorial accuracy.³⁷ Finally, there are those who, being illiterate, dictated their memoirs to someone literate, who also undertook the publication. Beyond these layers of temporality and mediation, we have another one, that is, when exactly the memoirs were written: Some memoirs were written during the war on the battlefield, others shortly after, but before the end of the war, and others after the establishment of the Greek state.³⁸

(Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994), 17–72; Anna Karakatsouli, “*Μαχητές της Ελευθερίας*” και 1821: *Η Ελληνική Επανάσταση στη διεθνική της διάσταση* (Athens: Pedio, 2016). For an overview, see George Tolia, “The Resilience of Philhellenism,” *The Historical Review/La Revue Historique* 13 (2016): 51–70.

³⁷ Many of the works we studied remained in a manuscript form, and they were published much later, down to the mid-twentieth century. In these cases, their effect has to be examined against the intellectual background of the time of their publication, as part of later ideological conceptions of the Greek Revolution. See Philippos Iliou, “Ο χαρακτήρας της Επανάστασης του 1821,” “Η ιδεολογική χρήση της Ιστορίας: Σχόλιο στη συζήτηση Κορδάτου–Ζεύγου,” *Αντί* 46 (1976): 28–34; Cf. Vangelis Karamanolakis, “Ιστορία και ιδεολογία στη δεκαετία του 1960,” in *Η “σύντομη” δεκαετία του ’60*, ed. Alkis Rigos, Seraphim Seferiades and Evanthis Hatzivassiliou (Athens: Kastaniotis, 2008), 84–94. For an overview, see Ioannis Koubourlis, “Η Επανάσταση του 1821 και η δημιουργία του ελληνικού εθνικού κράτους στις πρώτες μεγάλες αφηγήσεις της νεότερης ελληνικής ιστορίας: Από την πολυπαραγοντική ανάλυση στο σχήμα της εθνικής τελεολογίας,” in *Η ελληνική Επανάσταση του 1821: Ένα ευρωπαϊκό γεγονός*, ed. Petros Pizani (Athens: Kedros, 2009), 351–74.

³⁸ For example, Christophoros Perraivos, Fotakos and Kanellos Deligiannis wrote their memoirs themselves, while Theodoros Kolokotronis dictated his to his secretary; the Bishop Germanos of Old Patras wrote his memoirs during the war while Georgios Psyllas wrote his 50 year later and Nikolaos Kasomoulis between 1832 and 1841; Anagnostis Kontakis, Dimitrios Christidis, Nikolaos Karoris and Alexandros Kriezis kept an everyday journal of the events, while Perraivos and Gennaios Kolokotronis based their memoirs on official documents; the memoirs of Konstantinos Metaxas, Deligiannis and Spyromilios were published posthumously, while Nikolaos Spiliadis and Spyridon Trikoupis published their recollections themselves; Kontakis narrates the adventures of his family, while Karpos Papadopoulos aims to rebut Dionysios Sourmelis’ inaccuracies; finally, Artemios Michos and Spyropoulos cover solely the events related to the second siege of Messolonghi, while Spiliadis covers all the events of the war.

The memoirs mainly chronicle the authors' participation in the events. Battles, sieges and other military campaigns, war logistics and general economic issues of the revolution, political events. Combats are sometimes described exhaustively and sometimes not, and details on equipment, strategy or even numbers of dead, wounded, loot, etc., may be given as well. The authors often make judgments about the competence of their fellow combatants, of the central command or on the enemy's strength. Some authors, mainly those in commanding positions, quote insistently from official documents, give the detail of financial issues, such as army salaries, national loans, etc., while special emphasis is placed on the political cementing of the nation, the national assemblies. Attacks on contemporary individuals are not absent, especially in the context of the two civil conflicts during the war, but also information on everyday life – immigration, refugees, death, sexual life, festivities – endow the combatants' memoirs with a cultural and anthropological aspect.³⁹ However, each author's point of interest reveals the ways by which he conceives his own position in local and national terms, an important indicator of the key issue of the shifting identities in revolutionary Greece.⁴⁰

The selection of the excerpts is based on a time line of the Greek War of Independence, compiled by our team. Each excerpt – and the relevant revolutionary event – is charted, being associated to a specific place. The spatialisation of the narratives largely defines our methodology: space is the ground of action of historical figures, and the spatial arrangement of their deeds and thoughts allows us to follow the movements of people, the battles and the various events, through a series of first-hand testimonies. Sometimes continuous and sometimes fragmentary, the combination of places and discourses reconstructs composite, multi-layered narratives of the revolutionary events. The insertion of the historical testimonies in their digitally reconstructed geographical setting gives a specific location to each textual testimony, while the place acquires a supplementary meaning through the narratives.⁴¹ The

³⁹ Cf. *Όψεις της Επανάστασης του 1821: Πρακτικά συνεδρίου*, ed. Dimitris Dimitropoulos, Christos Loukos and Panagiotis D. Michailaris (Athens: Mnimon, 2018).

⁴⁰ See Nikos Rotzokos, "Τοπική και εθνική ταυτότητα στα απομνημονεύματα των Πελοποννησίων αγωνιστών της Επανάστασης του 1821" and Panagiotis Stathis, "Τα σουλιώτικα απομνημονεύματα: διαπλοκές της ατομικής, τοπικής και εθνικής ταυτότητας," in Dimitropoulos et al., *1821 και Απομνημόνευμα*, 53–75 and 77–103, respectively.

⁴¹ The central concept remains the notion of *lieu de mémoire* ("site of memory"), coined in 1989 by Pierre Nora. Cf. also Aleida Assmann, "History, Memory, and the Genre of Testimony," *Poetics Today* 27, no. 2 (2006): 261–73; Jeannette A. Bastian, "Records, Memory and Space: Locating Archives in the Landscape," *Public History Review* 21 (2014): 45–69;

digital charting of some 300 historical testimonies merges a disparate set of discourses for the revolutionary events, in an attempt to build a more holistic and multifaceted narrative of the past (fig. 4).




Figure 4. Methodology of depth mapping: The successive layers of documentation of revolutionary events based on the memoirs of the Greek combatants and philhellenes. On display are all the extracts on events during 1822, as all the proposed sources have been selected from the menu on the left.

The excerpts of the memoirs are further enhanced with pictorial material relevant to the specific events. The association of space, speech and image produces a multidimensional narrative, blending a variety of temporalities and spatialities. Drawing on the works of Greek and European artists, who capture themes and motifs of the Greek War of Independence, we attempted not to bring the events of the Greek war to life through the image, but to recreate the successive layers of their reception and cultural processing. Images, maps, geographical descriptions and historical narratives are both representations and interpretations of the events. Their juxtaposition documents the multiple layers of deposited meaning while shaping a framework for further interpretations.⁴²

Dan Stone, "History, Memory, Testimony," in *The Future of Testimony: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Witnessing*, ed. Antony Rowland and Jane Kilby (London: Routledge, 2014), 17–30.

⁴² See François Hartog, "La présence du témoin," *L'Homme* 223–24, no. 3–4 (2017): 169–84, <https://doi.org/10.4000/lhomme.30694>.

Tools and Methodology

The recent and teeming bibliography on spatial humanities showed us that we were not alone in our endeavours and gave names to our experiments, such as “spatial history” “deep mapping” and “storytelling”. We made ample use of the tools they proposed in order to aggregate large sets of data and to communicate the multiple meanings of place by the combined presentation of the natural and the inhabited space, the mediation of personal experiences and of historical topographical illustrations. More specifically, some of the tools used include:

- A Geographical Information System and a spatial database in order to model the historical spatial and non-spatial data and to organise them into different layers;
- Spatial analysis for geo-inference, for example for producing statistical data or for locating the boundaries of administrative units not depicted in the maps;
- Gazetteers (existing ones) in order to correlate historical place names with modern ones;
- Text and image annotations namely to correlate texts and images with the places mentioned or depicted therein;
- Contextualisation of quantitative spatial data with information from historical texts and images;
- Story maps, as a method to correlate and rearrange the entities in space to form a story line and thus produce maps that “tell us stories”;
- Web interactive maps, now the most popular form of publishing historical spatial data that allows users to navigate, interact and retrieve information by applying their own queries.

Each of the six historical maps that form our main documentation corpus was georeferenced and digitised. At first, the reference system of each map was reconstructed (when possible) and each map sheet was georeferenced based on the map sheets (of scale 1:50,000) of the Hellenic Military Geographical Service, the modern cartographic base map of Greece. The georeferencing process allows the digitisation of the maps’ objects (spatial entities) and their systematic comparison to modern ones. Thus, it was possible to locate on the modern map the historical maps’ entities – even those that no longer exist and to correlate their names with modern ones. After the georeferencing, a spatial database with different thematic layers was created in order to store the information extracted from each map (vectorised as points, lines or polygons) following the hierarchy that each map appoints (for example, the settlements categorised as capitals of a prefecture, of a province or of a community, villages etc. The correlation of the historical geographic entities with the modern ones was implemented through a visual interpretation that considered name matching and geographic location proximity based mainly on the map sheets of the Hellenic Military

Geographical Service but also through semiautomated methods in cases where digital databases were available (for example, the Hellenic Statistical Authority database for modern settlements, the ToposText gazetteer, the Pandektis database on “Name changes of settlements in Greece”, etc.).⁴³

The database records for the geographic entities were populated with qualitative data (ancient, alternative, and current names, administrative units within which they are located, place types, bibliographic references, etc.) derived from the historical maps or the accompanying texts. For the settlements, the records were also populated with demographic data,⁴⁴ and since we linked with other existing digital databases, the information was further enriched with data from these external resources (for example, date of place-name change, current population data, url, etc.). To locate the boundaries of the administrative units that were not depicted in the maps, descriptive information from texts was used while specifically for the boundaries of the provinces of 1829–1832, the demographic tables of the French Scientific Expedition, which list the settlements by “commissariat” (επιτροπεία) and province (επαρχία), were used. Based on the proximity of those settlements to the remaining geographic entities depicted on the maps, the boundary lines could be drawn using the Thiessen polygon method.

The final step was to correlate each map’s dataset of geographic entities to each other, a laborious task that, apart from resulting in a database that is unique in volume and richness, also documents each map’s original mathematical accuracy and highlights the relations between the maps of that historical period. Indeed, the maps which form the basis of the Digital Atlas constitute a coherent corpus: they are all products or subproducts of the Dépôt de la Guerre, their fabrication relies on common protocols, and Lapie, the engineer-geographer of the Dépôt, was involved in the production of most of them.⁴⁵ The overall extracted data were assembled in the first, aggregated layer of the atlas and formed the historical

⁴³ See <https://topostext.org/> and <http://pandektis.ekt.gr/pandektis/handle/10442/4968>, respectively.

⁴⁴ The main sources demographic data are those included in Pouqueville’s narrative (2nd rev. and enriched edition, 6 vols. [Paris, Didot, 1826–1827]), and the 1829 census of the Peloponnese compiled by captains Peytier, Servier and Puillon de Boblaye on the basis of the statistical data provided by the Greek revolutionary administration and published by Bory de Saint-Vincent, *Expédition scientifique de Morée: Section des sciences physiques*, vol. 2, *Géographie. Géologie* (Paris: Levraut, 1834), 64–94.

⁴⁵ After drawing and publishing his maps of European Turkey (1822–1825) and of Greece (1826), Lapie supervised the production of the 1832 map of the Peloponnese in six sheets. See Émile Le Puillon de Boblaye, *Expédition scientifique de Morée: Recherches géographiques sur les ruines de la Morée, faisant suite aux travaux de la Commission Scientifique de Morée* (Paris: Levraut, 1836), 2.

gazetteer of the period under scrutiny. Thus, an amount of circa 17,000 items of historical data, half of which consists of names of settlements presented in their equivalent provinces and, where possible, with their actual names and their demographic evolution, is offered to researchers. In order to facilitate the consultation of the atlas and to enhance its interactivity, the extracted material is organised in categories and subcategories of spatial entities, which follow the symbols, toponymy and taxonomy of our source maps, such as entities referring to the natural or the inhabited space, and then the settlements' hierarchy, the ruins, the communication networks, the natural resources, the infrastructure and so on.

Acknowledgments

The project had a long maturation and is therefore indebted to numerous people and agencies. It incorporates parts of research endeavours and digital mapping applications conducted under the supervision of George Tolia at the Institute of Historical Research (IHR) over the last decade. First in chronological order comes the charting of the communication networks in the Ottoman Balkans in the early nineteenth century. It was part of “Kripis”, an infrastructure project of the IHR funded by the General Secretariat for Research and Innovation (2012–2015). Historian Katerina Stathi worked on the printed route guides published before and during the War of Independence, while Eleni Gkadolou and Panagiotis Stratakis created the digital map.⁴⁶ A two year postdoctoral fellowship followed in 2015, granted by the Greek State Scholarships Foundation. It allowed to Gkadolou to work on the 1852 map of the Kingdom of Greece, published by the French Dépôt de la Guerre in 20 sheets.⁴⁷ By digitising and georeferencing the map, 13,807 place names (of which 9,843 are settlements) were identified within the 1832 frontiers of the Kingdom of Greece, in other words the Peloponnese, the Cyclades and Central Greece, up to the borderline leading from the Ambracian Gulf in the West coast to the Pagasetic Gulf in the East. Then, under the direction of George Tolia and Alexandra Sfoini, Panagiotis El Gedi and Anna Athanassouli charted three memoirs of philhellenes, within the framework of “Anavathmis”, a collaborative infrastructure project of the IHR (2017–2020).⁴⁸

⁴⁶ <https://kripis2.anavathmis.eu/en/> (EE 1.5: Ελληνικοί δρομοδείκτες 1824-1829).

⁴⁷ Funded by the European Structural and Investment Funds (MIS 5001552).

⁴⁸ <https://philhellenism.anavathmis.eu/> The full title of the project is “Anavathmis: Development of Historical Research: Studies and Digital Applications (MIS 5002357)”. It was part of the “Action for Strategic Development of Research and Technology Institutions”

A more decisive step was taken in 2018. Thanks to a substantial grant from Moreas SA, the digital reconstruction of the 1832 map of the Peloponnese in six sheets was made possible. Eugenia Drakopoulou, Ourania Polycandrioti and George Tolias worked on the source material, Eleni Gkadolou created the digital map, while the digital application was designed by Pavla SA. Once again, the map was georeferenced so that all the information it contains can be searchable. Its reconstruction consisted in the restoration of the corpus of its sources of information, as they appear in the volumes published the geographers and architects of the French Scientific Expedition to the Peloponnese in 1829 (*Geography, Geodesy, Statistics, Monuments and Narrative*). They appear as thematic sublayers of the map showing the settlements and the population census of 1829/1832, the ruins and the monuments, the natural resources, the geodetic data and the altitudes of the mountains, a total of 7,000 items of data on the nature, inhabitants and antiquities of the Peloponnese at the end of the War of Independence. The reconstructed map was complemented by the pictorial documentation of the Natural Sciences Section and the Architecture and Sculpture Section of the Scientific Expedition, views of cities, landscapes and monuments. Finally, selected excerpts from the publications of the expedition provide additional information on the state of the place, the conditions and the interests of the scientific exploration. A travelogue is also included, presenting the routes and impressions of the two sections of the Scientific Expedition.⁴⁹

Almost the same team worked in the creation of the Digital Atlas of the Greek War of Independence and the Creation of the Greek State, 1821–1852, funded by the Hellenic Foundation for Research and Innovation. The maps were created by Eleni Gkadolou and Panagiotis Stratakis; the memoirs of the Greek fighters were treated by Ourania Polycandrioti, Filippa Chorozi and Panagiotis El Gedi; the iconography of the Greek War of Independence by Eugenia Drakopoulou and the geographical source material by George Tolias. The digital application was designed by Pavla SA. Mention should be made here of two other undertakings that evolved in parallel to the creation of the digital atlas: A map exhibition commissioned to George Tolias by the Cultural Foundation of the National

and funded by the Operational Programme “Competitiveness, Entrepreneurship & Innovation” (EPAnEK) of the Partnership Agreement for the Development Framework 2014–2020, co-funded by Greece and the European Union (European Regional Development Fund).

⁴⁹ <https://moree1829.gr/>.

Bank of Greece on the creation of Modern Greek State (1770–1838)⁵⁰ and his seminar on the same topic at the École pratique des hautes études in 2020–2021 and 2021–2022.⁵¹ They both permitted an in-depth study on the cartographic production related to Greece during these crucial years as well as work on the original historical documents.

For providing copies of the historical material, maps and topographic illustrations and the permission to use them, thanks are due to the directors and the map curators of the Hellenic Literary and Historical Archive of the Cultural Foundation of the National Bank of Greece, the National Library of Greece, the E.J. Finopoulos Collection of the Benaki Museum, the Library of the Hellenic Parliament, the Bibliothèque nationale de France, the British Museum and the Firestone Library of Princeton University.

In August 2021 our dear colleague and art historian Eugenia Drakopoulou passed away. Her commitment to almost all of the abovementioned undertakings was as valued as heartfelt. This Special Section of the *Historical Review* is dedicated to her memory.

Institute of Historical Research / NHRF

⁵⁰ See George Tolia, in collaboration with Eleni Gkadolou and Voula Livani, *Η γένεση του ελληνικού κράτους: Χαρτογραφία και ιστορία 1770–1838* (Athens: Cultural Foundation of the National Bank of Greece, 2021).

⁵¹ See Georges Tolia, “La Grèce restaurée: Géographie et cartographie de la Grèce au temps de la guerre d’Indépendance, 1822–1827,” *Annuaire de l’École pratique des hautes études, Sciences historiques et philologiques* 153 (2022): 218–28.

APPENDIX: LIST OF SELECTED MEMOIRS OF COMBATANTS
AND PHILHELLENES (IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)

Ainian, Dimitrios. *Απομνημονεύματα*. Edited by Emmanouil G. Protopsaltis. Βιβλιοθήκη, vol. 7. Athens: G. Tsoukalas, [1956].

Christidis, Dimitrios. P. Poulos and Nikolaos Karoris. *Απομνημονεύματα Αθηναίων Αγωνιστών*. Edited by Emmanouil G. Protopsaltis. Βιβλιοθήκη, vol. 13. Athens: G. Tsoukalas, [1957].

Chryssanthakopoulos, Fotios (Fotakos). *Απομνημονεύματα περί της Ελληνικής Επανάστασεως*. Athens: Typ. kai Vivliopoleio P.D. Sakellariou, 1858.

Deligiannis, Kanelos. *Απομνημονεύματα*. Edited by Emmanouil G. Protopsaltis. Βιβλιοθήκη, vols. 16–18. Athens: G. Tsoukalas, [1957].

Diamantopoulos, Konstantinos. *Απομνημονεύματα ή αληθή ιστορικά γεγονότα του 1821 μη αναφερόμενα εν ταις Ελληνικαίς ιστορίαις*. Tripoli: Typ. I.N. Protopoulou, 1883.

Evmorforopoulos, Dionysios. *Απομνημονεύματα*. Edited by Emmanouil G. Protopsaltis. Βιβλιοθήκη, vol. 20. Athens: G. Tsoukalas, [1957].

Filimon, Ioannis. *Δοκίμιον ιστορικόν περί της ελληνικής Επανάστασεως*, vols. 1–4. Athens: Typ. P. Soutsa kai A. Ktena, 1859–1861.

Foteinos, Ilias. *Οι άθλοι της εν Βλαχία ελληνικής επανάστασεως το 1821 έτος*. Leipzig: s.n., 1846.

Frantzis, Amvrosios. *Επιτομή της ιστορίας της αναγεννηθείσης Ελλάδος, αρχομένη από του 1715 και λήγουσα το 1835*. Vols. 1–2. Athens: Typ. I Viktoria tou Konst. Kastorchi, 1839. Vols. 3–4. Athens: Typ. K. Ralli, 1841.

Germanos, Metropolitan of Old Patras. *Υπομνήματα περί της επανάστασεως της Ελλάδος: Από το 1820 μέχρι του 1823*. Edited by Kallinikos Kastorchis. Athens: Typ. Petrou Mantzaraki, 1837.

Kasomoulis, Nikolaos. *Στρατιωτικά ενθυμήματα της Επανάστασεως των Ελλήνων (1821-1833): Προτάσσεται ιστορία του Αρματωλισμού*. Edited and introduction by Giannis Vlachogiannis. Vols. 1–3. Athens: Pageios Epitropis, 1939–1942.

Kolokotronis, Ioannis Th. (Gennaios). *Απομνημονεύματα*. Edited by Emmanouil G. Protopsaltis. Βιβλιοθήκη, vol. 1. Athens: G. Tsoukalas, [1956].

Kolokotronis, Ioannis Th. (Gennaios). *Απομνημονεύματα (χειρόγραφον δεύτερον 1821–1862)*. Edited and introduction by Emmanouil G. Protopsaltis. Athens: National Printing House, 1961.

Kolokotronis, Theodoros. *Διήγησις συμβάντων της ελληνικής φυλής από τα 1770 έως τα 1836*. Edited by Georgios Tertsetis. Athens: Typ. X. Nikolaidou Filadelfeos, 1846.

Kontakis, Anagnostis. *Απομνημονεύματα*. Edited by Emmanouil G. Protopsaltis. *Βιβλιοθήκη*, vol. 11. Athens: G. Tsoukalas, [1957].

Koutsonikas, Lambros. *Γενική ιστορία της Ελληνικής Επανάστασεως*. Vols. 1–2. Athens: Typ. tou Evangelismou D. Karakatzani, 1863–1864.

Kriezis, Alexandros D. *Απομνημονεύματα (Γκιοννάλε διά την ανεξαρτησίαν του Έθνους)*. Edited by Emmanouil G. Protopsaltis. *Βιβλιοθήκη*, vol. 8. Athens: G. Tsoukalas, [1956].

Makris, Nikolaos. *Ιστορία του Μεσολογγίου*. Edited by Emmanouil G. Protopsaltis. *Βιβλιοθήκη*, vol. 19. Athens: G. Tsoukalas, [1957].

Metaxas, Konstantinos. *Ιστορικά Απομνημονεύματα εκ της ελληνικής επανάστασεως*. Edited by Emmanouil G. Protopsaltis. *Βιβλιοθήκη*, vol. 6. Athens: G. Tsoukalas, [1956].

Michos, Artemios. *Απομνημονεύματα της δευτέρας πολιορκίας του Μεσολογγίου (1825–1826) και τινες άλλαι σημειώσεις εις την ιστορίαν του μεγάλου Αγώνος αναγόμεναι*. Edited by Spyridon P. Aravantinos. Athens: Typ. tis Enoseos, 1883.

Oikonomou, Michail. *Ιστορικά της Ελληνικής Παλιγγενεσίας ή ο ιερός των Ελλήνων αγών*. Athens: Typ. Th. Papalexandri, 1873.

Papadopoulos, Karpos. *Ανασκευή των εις την ιστορίαν των Αθηνών αναφερομένων περί του στρατηγού Οδυσσέως Ανδρούτζου του ελληνικού τακτικού και του συνταγματάρχου Καρόλου Φαββιέρου*. Athens: Typ. Petrou Mantzaraki, 1837.

Perraivos, Christophoros. *Απομνημονεύματα πολεμικά διαφόρων μαχών συγκροτηθεισών μεταξύ Ελλήνων και Οθωμανών κατά τε το Σούλιον και Ανατολικήν Ελλάδα από του 1820 μέχρι του 1829 έτους*. Vols. 1–2. Athens: Typ. Andreou Koromila, 1836.

Psyllas, Georgios. *Απομνημονεύματα του βίου μου*. Introduction by Nik. K. Louros; edited and notes by El. G. Prevelakis. Athens: Academy of Athens, 1974.

Schack, F.-R. *Campagne d'un jeune français en Grèce*. Paris: Firmin Didot, 1827.

Sourmelis, Dionysios. *Ιστορία των Αθηνών κατά τον υπέρ ελευθερίας αγώνα: Αρχομένη από της επανάστασεως μέχρι της αποκαταστάσεως των πραγμάτων*. Aegina: Typ. Andreou Koromila, 1834.

Spiliadis, Nikolaos. *Απομνημονεύματα*. Vols. 1–3. Athens: Typ. X.N. Filadelfeos, 1851–1857.

Spyromilios, Ioannis. *Απομνημονεύματα της δευτέρας πολιορκίας του Μεσολογγίου (1825–1826)*. Edited by Giannis Vlachogiannis. Athens: [Typ. S.K. Vlastou], 1926.

Stanhope, Leicester. *Greece in 1823 and 1824; being a Series of Letters, and other Documents, on the Greek Revolution, written during a Visit to that Country. Illustrated with Several Curious Fac Similes. To which is added, the Life of Mustapha Ali*. London: Sherwood, Jones, and Co., 1824.

Stephanopoulos, Stephanos. *Απομνημονεύματά τινά της Επανάστασεως του 1821*. Tripoli: Typ. tis Fonis ton Eparchion, 1864.

Trikoupis, Spyridon. *Ιστορία της Ελληνικής Επανάστασεως: Έκδοσις δευτέρα επιθεωρηθείσα και διορθωθείσα*. Vols. 1–4. London: Taylor and Francis, 1860–1862.

Voutier, Olivier. *Mémoires sur la guerre actuelle des Grecs*. Paris, Bossange frères, 1823.

Vyzantios, Christos. *Ιστορία του τακτικού στρατού της Ελλάδος από της πρώτης συστάσεως του κατά το 1821 μέχρι των 1832*. Athens: Typ. K. Ralli, 1837.

