

Σύγκριση/Comparaison/Comparison

Τόμ. 17 (2006)



Όμηρος και Ουόλτερ Σκοτ στον Αυθέντη τον Μορέως, την Ηρωίδα της Ελληνικής Επανάστασεως και τον Λουκή Λάρα

Michael Paschalis

doi: [10.12681/comparison.10150](https://doi.org/10.12681/comparison.10150)

Copyright © 2016, Michael Paschalis



Άδεια χρήσης [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

Βιβλιογραφική αναφορά:

Paschalis, M. (2017). Όμηρος και Ουόλτερ Σκοτ στον Αυθέντη τον Μορέως, την Ηρωίδα της Ελληνικής Επανάστασεως και τον Λουκή Λάρα. *Σύγκριση/Comparaison/Comparison*, 17, 5–27.
<https://doi.org/10.12681/comparison.10150>

MICHAEL PASCHALIS

Homer and Walter Scott
in *The Lord of Morea*,
The Heroine of the Greek Revolution,
and *Loukis Laras*

Modern Greek identity during the period of the Greek Enlightenment and the years leading up to the War of Independence (1821-1828) was constructed with reference to ancient Hellenism. Interest in classical antiquity continues after Greece won its independence from Ottoman rule. From the early 1850s, the world of Byzantine Hellenism gradually comes to the fore in the field of historical research and writing: the pattern of historical continuity introduced by Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos (in the *History of the Greek Nation*, 1860-1874) now embraces Christian and Medieval Hellenism and defines Greek identity as a unified entity of 3000 years. However, Greek novels published until 1884¹ continue to engage in dialogue primarily with classical antiquity, regardless of the period in which the action is set,² and only exceptionally with the world of Byzantium. In these novels the reception of Greek and/or Roman antiquity is most commonly unmediated, from ancient to modern times (or the dramatic time of the story), from ancient to modern Hellenism. In cases where Byzantium makes a timid appearance, the novelists' attitude tends to be hostile or derisive,³ but we may also catch a glimpse of the "Great Idea". This is a project first formulated vaguely in 1843-1844 that went through various phases and covered a wide range of aspirations, from reclaiming the Byzantine cultural inheritance and promoting the continuity of Hellenism to the re-conquest of Constantinople and the resurrection of the Byzantine Empire.

The year 1850 marks the publication by Alexandros Rangavis of *The Lord of Morea*, commonly considered the first Greek historical novel. Its action is set in the period of Frankish domination of the Peloponnese and its plot is derived partly from the medieval *Chronicle of Morea* –versions of which were published by Buchon in 1825, 1840 and 1845⁴ – and partly from Walter Scott's *Ivanhoe*. Scott's novel also constitutes the major literary influence on *The Lord of Morea*. Direct references to classical antiquity are few, but ancient Hellenism plays

nonetheless an important role from an ideological and literary aspect. The present study deals especially with the construction of the novel's plot and characters, examining the fusion of Scott's *Ivanhoe* with *The Chronicle of Morea* and the interaction with Homer's epics. Scott's historical novel already declares its debt to Homer's *Odyssey* in the epigraph for chapter 1; this study explores the complex relationship of *The Lord of Morea* to both texts, as well as to Homer's *Iliad*, to which *Ivanhoe* is also, though much less, indebted.⁵ It will turn out that the re-examination of literary issues entails the re-evaluation of ideological ones.

Discussing the construction of the plot of a historical novel modeled after Scott –the writer credited with the foundation of this novelistic subgenre– inevitably touches upon a controversial question: the extent and nature of Walter Scott's influence on the Greek historical novels of the 19th century.⁶ The view adopted here is that *The Lord of Morea* is the first and only historical novel in Scott's terms. It displays in its own way what is perhaps the cardinal plot shape of Scott's novels: a crisis in historical life with clashing political forces and a hero whose function is to bring the extremes into contact with each other.⁷ The claim to the Lordship of Morea that provokes the crisis is a story drawn from *The Chronicle of Morea*, but Rangavis, through a dramatic compression of events, weaves in a clash between the Franks and the conquered Greeks inspired by *Ivanhoe* and makes of both a single "action" (as Aristotle would have said) rounded off with the original idea of a "Great Hunt". As will be seen below, the true protagonist is Geoffrey de Villehardouin who in the end becomes Lord of Morea and achieves the reconciliation between the Franks and the Greeks; Leon Chamaretos, the hero on the Greek side, has views that are too strong (much stronger than Cedric's in *Ivanhoe*) to survive the reconciliation and so he kills himself. In a sense the tight plot of Rangavis' novel as manifested in the organization of action around Geoffrey de Villehardouin improves on the weaknesses of *Ivanhoe*'s plot, which have been pointed out more than once.⁸

The present study examines in brief two more historical novels: *The Heroine of the Greek Revolution* by Stephanos Xenos (1861) and *Loukis Laras* by Dimitrios Vikelas (1879). Both novels satisfy the requirement of prescribed time distance from the writer's present⁹ and have fictional or fictionalized characters moving against a historical background, but they cannot be termed "historical" in the terms of Walter Scott's novels, though both have been believed to reflect Walter Scott's method of composition. They will serve as examples for showing differences in plot and character from *The Lord of Morea* as well as differences in handling the same material from classical antiquity, Homer's epics. In the first of

these novels classical material is overwhelming and the copious similes, metaphors and footnotes through which it is introduced¹⁰ function independently without creating literary depth. By contrast *The Lord of Morea* uses few references that work at an intertextual level and create a second level of reading.

I chose ancient epic to represent classical material for a variety of reasons. Epic is the founding Western narrative genre and the chief narrative genre of antiquity; the novel is the chief narrative genre of modern times; ancient and modern novelists have frequently felt the need to enter into dialogue with epic and its descendants (like the Renaissance romanzo); and theorists, especially Georg Lukács and Mikhail Bakhtin, have been eager to distinguish the modern novel from epic, thus indirectly recognizing existing affinities between the two genres. It is noteworthy that Boccaccio's *Filocolo*, considered by some to be the first modern novel, relates programmatically to Virgil's *Aeneid*¹¹ and that in the influential *Lettre-traité de l'origine des romans*, written in 1670 and considered the first systematic study of the novel, Pierre Daniel Huet praised the ancient Greeks for giving the novel its perfect form "by placing it under the rules of Epic" ("en le resserrant sous les règles de l'épopée"), by which he meant Homeric epic.

The Lord of Morea

Alexandros Rizos Rangavis¹² first published *The Lord of Morea* (*Ο Αυθέντης του Μωρέως*) in installments in the journal *Pandora*. The edition of 1850 was reprinted with revisions first in 1857 and then in 1876, in the eighth volume of the author's *Collected Literary Works*.¹³ Rangavis used his vast knowledge of antiquity very sparingly in *The Lord of Morea* in comparison with the copious material found in Stephanos Xenos' *The Heroine of the Greek Revolution* or Emmanuel Roidis' *Pope Joan*.¹⁴ Chapters 17-18 of the *Lord of Morea*, where the narrator takes advantage of Robert's unintentional wandering in order to provide archaeological and historical material for certain sites of the Peloponnese, is the closest parallel in Rangavis – but considerably less detailed and extensive. In these chapters and elsewhere Rangavis points to vestiges of ancient Greece and the heritage of ancient Hellenism at the time of the occupation of Byzantine Peloponnese by the Franks. In an authorial intervention that adapts Scott's words in *Ivanhoe*,¹⁵ Rangavis talks about the Franks that came and left without leaving traces of their presence, names and memory except for castle ruins and escutcheons; and, expanding Scott's comment, he adds that even these remnants will not attract the interest of travelers, who will instead "hasten towards the

Cyclopean walls of the glorious age [ancient Greece] and towards the inimitable creations of ancient chisels”.¹⁶ Though this is a romantic era, Rangavis is adopting a neoclassical discourse¹⁷ and, as it will be seen below, the ideological precedence of ancient Hellenism is a pervading feature in the novel. On the other hand, Leon Chamaretos aspires to restore the “holy throne of the emperors”,¹⁸ and this has led Mario Vitti to describe *The Lord of Morea* as the “literary equivalent of the Great Idea”.¹⁹ At this early stage, however, Byzantium has not yet become “an integral component of Greek identity”²⁰ and hence in Rangavis’ novel it has “no substance”: it is a mere shell that houses ancient Hellenism and Leon’s “Lacedaemonian” ideology, which I will discuss below.

1. *The Chronicle of Morea, The Lord of Morea, and Walter Scott’s Ivanhoe*

The plot of *The Lord of Morea* is based partly on a story found in *The Chronicle of Morea*, a medieval text dating to about 1300 A.D. It narrated in verse the conquest of Morea (i.e. the Peloponnese) by the Franks following the Fourth Crusade (1198-1205) and the capture of Constantinople. The story taken from *The Chronicle* concerns an agreement made between William de Champlitte, the departing Lord of Morea, and Geoffrey de Villehardouin.²¹ The pact ran as follows: should William fail to return or send a successor within a year and one day from the date of his departure, his rights to the Lordship of Morea would be transferred to Geoffrey. During his absence Geoffrey completed the occupation of the Peloponnese and won the love of Franks and Greeks alike, who persuaded him to use all possible means to retain power. When William named his young nephew Robert de Champlitte as his successor, Geoffrey tried everything to avert or delay his coming from France to the Peloponnese; it was a long journey that involved the crossing of the Alps and the passage to Venice, sailing to Corfu and from there to the western Peloponnese. New delays followed in the Peloponnese, when Robert vainly chased Geoffrey around in an effort to meet him and achieve a formal transfer of office. Eventually, however, the deadline in the agreement expired, Geoffrey was proclaimed the rightful Lord of Morea and Robert departed for France.²²

A major literary influence on *The Lord of Morea* is Sir Walter Scott’s *Ivanhoe*. Rangavis was married to Caroline Skene, daughter of James Skene who was a close friend of Walter Scott.²³ In an authorial intervention that appeared for the first time in the 3rd edition of *Ivanhoe*,²⁴ Rangavis openly declares his debt to Walter Scott:

“Shade of the greatest of contemporary novelists, will you rise up against my Black Knight and challenge it for being a loan from the inexhaustible treasure of your brilliant imagination? And must I suppress one of the foremost events of this memorable athletic contest only in order to avoid crossing your path? No, I must not! Forced as I am to follow your tracks, what better choice do I have but to express myself as you did? The fear that I may be criticized for imitating you is not going to stop me; on the contrary, I will take pride in attaching myself to the vehicle of your genius and will not abandon my Black Knight because he recalls one of the most beautiful creatures of your imagination”.

(*The Lord of Morea*, pp. 60-61)

The action of *Ivanhoe* takes place in 1193-4, some fifteen years earlier than the action of *The Lord of Morea*. It has been suggested that *The Lord of Morea* is a hybrid creation where two themes are clumsily brought together: the surface theme of the “pact” between William and Geoffrey deriving from *The Chronicle*, and a deeper theme, the struggle between Greeks and Franks based on the struggle between Saxons and Normans in Scott’s *Ivanhoe*, with Leon Chamaretos playing the part of Cedric the Saxon. This approach identifies also a further, third, theme consisting in “two love stories”.²⁵

The truth of the matter is that Rangavis created a tight and unified plot out of *The Chronicle*, Scott’s *Ivanhoe*, and invented material by organizing the course of events around Geoffrey. From early in the novel to its very end Geoffrey de Villehardouin strives to win the Lordship of Morea, to consolidate his power, and, by means of the marriage of his son Geoffrey II –planned secretly with the aid of Venedictos, the Latin Bishop of Olena– to serve his ulterior ambitions for the throne of Constantinople.²⁶ Through his intrigues, his scheming agents and his virtuoso moves Geoffrey masterminds three enterprises: first, the deception of Robert and the accession to the Lordship of Morea, the story adapted from *The Chronicle*; next, the marriage of his son Geoffrey II with Agnes, niece of the Latin Emperor of Constantinople, an event which in *The Chronicle* occurs *after* the death of Geoffrey I and in which it is Geoffrey II that makes all the moves;²⁷ and, finally, tracking down the Greek insurgents headed by Leon Chamaretos and achieving their surrender and his recognition by them as Lord of Morea. Thus, relying on the construction of the plot alone, we can see that the ideological model –if the novel is indeed “proposing” one– for the Greeks of Rangavis’ times who nurtured hopes for a brighter future would turn out to be not the romantic, patriotic but naïve Leon, but Geoffrey, the shrewd diplomat and efficient politician.²⁸

Rangavis found in Scott’s *Ivanhoe* not just a narrative precedent for the

struggle between the Greeks and the Franks but also a remarkable parallel to the plot drawn from *The Chronicle*. In *Ivanhoe* the country is ruled by the wicked and ambitious Prince John, while Richard, the rightful king, is held prisoner in Austria. Prince John uses every means possible to prevent his return to the country and to power, and to reinforce his position against the legitimate successor in case Richard dies abroad. Cedric the Saxon desires to restore things as they were before the Norman conquest and for this purpose counts on the marriage of his ward Lady Rowena with Athelstane, the last descendant of the Saxon kings; Lady Rowena eventually marries Ivanhoe, Cedric's son, who has, however, adopted the ways of the Normans. The marriage is emblematic of the reconciliation between Normans and Saxons.

The exercise of power in the absence of the rightful ruler²⁹ and systematic attempts to prevent his return are major points of contact between *The Chronicle*, *The Lord of Morea*, and *Ivanhoe* – the only difference being that in *The Chronicle* and *The Lord of Morea* it is not the Lord (King) himself that returns but his successor. Under the influence of Scott, Rangavis also gives space to love: the love of Anna, daughter of the Greek Despot of Epirus, for Guy de la Roche, nephew of the Duke of Athens, who is in the Peloponnese disguised as a knight by the name Gautier (cf. Scott's *Ivanhoe*); and the unreciprocated love of Leon Chamaretos for her too. But these are not mere “romantic loves”, as has been suggested. Rangavis manipulates them in the context of dynastic plans in a distinctly subtler way than Walter Scott. The scheming Petraleifas, father-in-law of the Despot of Epirus and Geoffrey's only worthy opponent, is putting pressure on the Despot's unwilling daughter Anna to marry the successor to the Lordship of Morea, whoever he may be – initially he promotes Robert's arrival in the Peloponnese through his agent Nonnos. At the same time Petraleifas is using Anna as a lure to exercise control over Leon Chamaretos, who is in love with her and also aspires to restore past Greek glory: he persuades Leon to rise against the Franks, siding with Robert against Geoffrey.³⁰ For his part Geoffrey has other plans for the marriage of his son, is keeping an eye on the moves of Petraleifas through his agents, manages to mislead him through clever manoeuvres, and forces him, with concealed threats and vague promises, to deliver the list of the insurgents and their secret signals.³¹ Petraleifas' main intrigue fails: love triumphs in the case of Anna and Guy (Gautier), a marriage which is irrelevant to the succession in the Lordship of Morea and which occurs much later in *The Chronicle*;³² and Geoffrey's secret plan carries the day: his son and rightful successor marries the niece of the Latin emperor of Constantinople.

2. The six *Odysseys*

Critics rarely, if ever, note that Scott's *Ivanhoe*, the most popular of his novels, begins with a conscious allusion to the *Odyssey*. I quote (with minor additions) the following short summary of similarities to Homer's epic given by John Henry Raleigh, the only piece of secondary literature available:

“The epigraph ... for Chapter One is a quote from Pope's translation of the *Odyssey* ... The quotation is about the swine being driven home at evening; so we know that we are with [the swineherd] Eumaeus and that the disguised Odysseus is about to appear. Gurth, the slave of the Saxon Cedric driving home the swine helped by his dog, plays Eumaeus, and is twice so-called by Scott [“This second Eumaeus”]. *Ivanhoe*, returning home from the 3rd Crusade in the Holy Land [and disguised as a palmer] is Odysseus. Rotherwood, the ancestral home of Cedric the Saxon, is Ithaca, and Rowena, ever faithful to *Ivanhoe* as she awaits his return, is its Penelope. Antinous is played by the villain of *Ivanhoe*, the Norman Knight, Sir Brian de Bois-Guilbert. Thus at a sumptuous feast at Rotherwood, introduced by another appropriate quote from Pope's Homer, the disguised *Ivanhoe* has to endure seeing the lustful Sir Brian casting his lascivious glances at the fair and chaste Rowena. That evening, the still disguised *Ivanhoe* has an interview with Rowena who, like Penelope in Book XIX of the *Odyssey*, is for the occasion seated on a very elegant chair and has a bevy of handmaids at her service. Finally, on a different time-scale from the *Odyssey*, *Ivanhoe* reveals his true identity to Gurth. In a larger sense the Normans play the role of the suitors in the *Odyssey*, living off the best of the substance of the subjugated Saxons. Says Gurth: ‘The finest and fattest is for their board; the loveliest is for their couch’.”³³

I will argue below that the *Odyssey* also functions as a subtext for *The Lord of Morea* and for the narrative of Rangavis' coming to Greece in 1829 as given in his *Memoirs*. Inspiration probably came from different sources: (a) Scott's use of the *Odyssey*; (b) Rangavis' own reading and translation of the *Odyssey*: in 1840 Rangavis translated book 1 of the *Odyssey* into modern Greek hexameters but later gave up the plan to translate the rest of Homer's epic;³⁴ and (c) a Greek translation of *Ivanhoe*: in 1847, three years before the publication of *The Lord of Morea*, Gheorghios Lampissis translated *Ivanhoe* into Greek,³⁵ restoring the original Homeric text in the epigraphs for chapters 1, 4 and 13. Thus we end up with six *Odysseys*: the Greek original, Rangavis' translation (accomplished and originally projected), and four subtexts (in *Ivanhoe*, *The Lord of Morea*, the translation of *Ivanhoe*, and the *Memoirs*).

In *The Lord of Morea* direct allusions to Homer's *Odyssey* occur where most expected: in the section that treats Robert's journey deliberate delays engineered by Geoffrey's agent are compared to Penelope's weaving scheme and to the distracting “pleasures of Circe”.³⁶ But more important is the less obvious

intertextual relationship. The absence of the rightful ruler, the claim to his power, and the obstacles that delay the return of the ruler are central themes of Homer's *Odyssey* found both in *Ivanhoe* and in *The Lord of Morea*. In the *Odyssey* and in *The Lord of Morea* the journey of return is given great emphasis, whereas in *Ivanhoe* the plot requires that we only hear of the obstacles encountered. In the *Odyssey* and in *The Lord of Morea* the conflict of power involves respectively father and son (Odysseus and Telemachus, rightful successor) and uncle and nephew (William and Robert, rightful successor). The attempts to avert the return of Telemachus from Sparta by killing him are picked up by the attempts to avert or delay Robert's coming to the Peloponnese. In *The Lord of Morea*, however, it is Geoffrey that eventually succeeds William and not Robert, who is the legitimate successor. But there is a significant difference: in terms of his military exploits and the treatment of his subjects Geoffrey does not resemble Prince John and the Norman knights, or the suitors of Homer's *Odyssey*. Rangavis developed and enriched an image of Geoffrey he found in *The Chronicle*.³⁷ In this narrative Geoffrey appears worthy of the Lordship of Morea for being the real conqueror of the Peloponnese, for enjoying the love of most Greeks³⁸ and for being far superior to the two other claimants: the brave and noble but naïve and unsuspecting Chamaretos, and the weak-willed, foolishly ambitious and gullible Robert who had never fought a battle in his life.

Similarities of *The Lord of Morea* with the *Odyssey* and *Ivanhoe* surface also in other areas. "Disguise" plays an essential part in all three texts: Odysseus, Richard, and *Ivanhoe* coming home in disguise have their counterpart especially in Raimondos, Geoffrey's trusted agent, who returns to the Peloponnese disguised as a monk.³⁹ Also, the character of Geoffrey may have absorbed features of Odysseus. His cunning and shrewd moves, which enable him to win the succession at the expense of Robert, are viewed positively; these qualities could be construed as the counterpart of Homeric *metis*⁴⁰ and the equivalent of efficient diplomacy in Rangavis' days.

After the long delay in Venice eventually Robert sets sail aboard a ship given to him by the Doge; but when they make a stop at Corfu for repairs, the captain sails away secretly during the night abandoning Robert.⁴¹ With great efforts Robert manages to find a boat to the Peloponnese, having been forced to abandon his escort on the island.⁴² Already in antiquity Corfu became identified with Scheria, the island of the Phaeacians; it was Odysseus' last stop before his return to Ithaca, where he arrived aboard a ship of the Phaeacians and without his companions.

In his *Memoirs* Rangavis describes his first arrival in Greece from Munich in 1829.⁴³ The route of the journey (crossing of the Alps to Trieste and from there to Venice, crossing of the Adriatic, arrival at the Ionian islands), the time of the year (late fall and winter) and especially the difficulties encountered (snow-covered Alps, delay in Venice and difficulties in finding a ship, and the long and adventurous voyage across the stormy Adriatic) remind the reader of Robert's journey in *The Chronicle* and *The Lord of Morea*. For Robert as designated successor to the Lordship of Morea and for the Phanariot Rangavis this is a kind of homecoming (*nostos*); and Rangavis exploits the *nostos* theme by providing an Odyssean intertext for his first sight of the Ionian islands, his failure to recognize the fatherland, and other features. The Odyssean fiction of Rangavis' Adriatic crossing found in the *Memoirs* replaces an earlier Argonautic one found in two short stories that describe the same voyage.⁴⁴

This Odyssean intertext surfaces first when the passengers of the storm-tossed ship sailing across the Adriatic sight from a distance "the islands of the Phaeacians and of Odysseus", just as Odysseus in *Odyssey* 5 after a voyage of eighteen days from the island of Calypso sights the island of the Phaeacians.⁴⁵ But the storm Poseidon raises causes Odysseus' raft to fall apart and it is only with divine help that the hero swims to Scheria. In the *Memoirs* Rangavis and his fellow-passengers enter with difficulty, due to the stormy seas, and just before midnight an island harbor, believing to have reached the city of Zakynthos. They experience literary dreams that echo *Odyssey* 19 and anticipate the frustration to follow.⁴⁶ The next day Rangavis wakes up to a Homeric dawn, eager to see the city of Zakynthos, famous for its beauty (an allusion to Theocritus, *Idyll* 4.32); but when he looks around it is nowhere to be seen, just as Odysseus, having woken up on Ithaca, where he had been transferred overnight by the Phaeacians, fails to recognize his home island.⁴⁷ The mystery is solved when it becomes clear that Rangavis' ship had anchored at the wrong spot away from the city. The stormy seas force them to sail to Argostoli in Cephalonia. Rangavis and his friends set foot on Greek land for the first time and at the hotel they satisfy their hunger like Homeric heroes.⁴⁸

3. The Great Hunt: Lacedaemonian, English, and Iliadic "Leons" and lions

In the *Odyssey* the confrontation with the suitors leads to an archery contest. Odysseus wins the contest and kills the suitors. In Scott's *Ivanhoe* we have an

Iliadic development: the siege of the castle of Reginald Front-de-Boeuf for the liberation of two abducted Helens, Rowena and Rebecca.⁴⁹ *The Lord of Morea* is concluded with the “Great Hunt” (η μεγάλη θήρα)⁵⁰ in the mountains around Andravida, an episode invented by Rangavis. Based on its conclusion alone, the hunt appears to be a covert military operation for the capture of the Greek insurgents. What Geoffrey announces to his guests at the end of chapter 23 is a regular hunting expedition.⁵¹ There is no mention of the insurgents, though he had been “tracking” them down for some time⁵² and, most importantly, he had been doing so *at the same time as* he was moving from place to place in order to gain time and thus win from Robert the Lordship of Morea. Above all the hunt is a combined political operation and Geoffrey’s crowning achievement: he uses it as a pretext to thwart the departure of Agnes,⁵³ niece of the Latin emperor of Constantinople, and thus engineer the marriage with his son; and as an opportunity to win the support of the Greek insurgents – where he succeeds – and especially that of Leon Chamaretos – where he fails. From a narrative viewpoint it is a brilliant move in terms of the dramatic condensation of events.

All parties interested are present in the hunt and all look forward to it, each for his / her own reasons: Petraleifas is expecting to see Anna betrothed to the younger Geoffrey, Anna is hoping to seek the protection of Gautier, Robert sees an opportunity to display generosity of spirit, etc.⁵⁴ Only Leon Chamaretos is absent, whom the perfidious Petraleifas has imprisoned in his house.⁵⁵ Those who win the day are Gautier – who turns out to be the nephew of the Duke of Athens – and of course Geoffrey de Villehardouin. At nightfall Geoffrey leads the hunting party to a forest glade where a banquet takes place to celebrate the “double bonds” of Anna and Gautier, Agnes and the younger Geoffrey.⁵⁶ As noted above, in *The Chronicle of Morea* both marriages take place *after* the death of Geoffrey I.

Having learned from Raimondos that the insurgents have gathered inside the Wolf’s Cave and are surrounded by his soldiers, Geoffrey leads his guests to that place. In the meantime, Leon Chamaretos has escaped from his prison and is following the party unnoticed. Inside the Wolf’s Cave Voutsaras, next in line among the Greek leaders, announces that “it’s time for the *lions* to come out of the caves and chase the ravening *wolves*” and wonders where the head (chairman) of the gathering (= Leon Chamaretos) is. Then Geoffrey appears with his party, announces that they are surrounded and reads aloud the names of the insurgents finding all of them present. Chamaretos emerges from behind and protests that his name is not included; Geoffrey shows him the list and then Chamaretos

realizes that Petraleifas has betrayed him and that the upper part of the list containing his name has been torn off.⁵⁷ Geoffrey accuses the insurgents of treason but at the same time offers his forgiveness, explaining that “it is the love of the subjects that constitutes the strength of government, and government is fed on mercy”. Most of the surrounded Greeks acclaim Geoffrey as Lord of Morea and put their swords down. The reconciliation of conqueror and conquered is fully in the spirit of Scott’s *Ivanhoe* and confirms that Geoffrey, in terms of his ultimate vision, stands for King Richard and not for Prince John. But Leon Chamaretos rejects Geoffrey’s magnanimous offer of reconciliation and kills himself. Then Voutsaras addresses the following solemn comment to Geoffrey: “Your highness ... the last of the Lacedaemonians is dead;⁵⁸ it is only now that you have truly become The Lord of Morea”. With these words the novel ends.⁵⁹

Leon Chamaretos is a shadowy figure, and historians have proposed different reconstructions of the real person.⁶⁰ In my view Rangavis’ choice of him was motivated by purely literary and ideological reasons. They all come together in his name, which combines echoes of ancient history, Walter Scott and Homer. Chamaretos does not appear in *The Chronicle of Morea* but the Byzantine historian Nicetas Choniates mentions him as “ruler of *koile* Lacedaemon and tyrant of the Lacones”. In Rangavis Leon is a Lacedaemonian who tried to defend Sparta against the Franks putting up a vain five-day resistance;⁶¹ his hero is Spartan Leonidas and his three hundred that fell at Thermopylae;⁶² and his ideology is “victory or death”,⁶³ famous from the farewell words of Spartan mothers to their sons departing for battle.⁶⁴ The name *Leon* would thus evoke the desperate heroism of *Leon*-idas and his three hundred Spartans, while the name *Chamaretos* could suggest in Greek a meaning like “fall of bravery” (or “fallen bravery”).⁶⁵

During the tournament of Book 4 –an event which, like the hunt, has a function complementary, preparatory, or equivalent to war– Leon appears disguised as the Black Knight, whom Rangavis, in the authorial intervention quoted above, declares he has drawn from Scott’s famous Black Knight. The armors in both novels conceal figurative “lions”, respectively *Leon* Chamaretos and Richard *Coeur-de-Lion*, Richard *the Lionheart*; but Chamaretos’ choice of color conveys his grief for “the dark clouds of death that have spread over Greece”, as he says at one point.⁶⁶

In literary terms the Great Hunt that concludes the novel and its preparation involve a constant interplay between insurgents and wild animals. For instance,

Voutsaras has chosen to live on the mountains enjoying the freedom of wild animals, and Chamaretos talking to Anna laments the fact that he is forced to live a wolf's life;⁶⁷ the fires lit on the mountain top are signs calling the insurgents to gather but could also serve to bring the animals down from the mountain;⁶⁸ and it is certainly no coincidence that two structurally pivotal acts of the drama (chapters 14 and 28) are played out in the Wolf's Cave, the gathering place of the insurgents. One issue raised during the first gathering of the insurgents in the Wolf's Cave in chapter 14 is the identity of the "lion": some among them fear that their action may "arouse the pacified lion" (the Franks), but *Leon* Chamaretos replies that they take themselves for rabbits or deer while in fact they are "lions", and lions would rather fight and die as free men, like their Lacedaemonian ancestors, than live in slavery.⁶⁹ When in the last chapter Voutsaras announces that "it's time for the 'lions' to come out of the caves and chase the ravening wolves" and wonders where the head (chairman) of the gathering is, Geoffrey appears and assumes the duties, but next *Leon* Chamaretos shows up. It would appear that there are two "lions" in the story but with entirely different ideologies.

The lion-like ideology of *Leon* Chamaretos is given an emblematic literary expression during the tournament. Leon, strong but heavy and clumsy like Richard *the Lionheart*, fights Gautier, his rival for the hand of Anna, who moves with agility and grace. The raging Leon throws himself violently against Gautier seeking victory or death, like the lion in a famous Homeric simile – the only simile in the *Iliad* that portrays a lion at bay but with a heart as "brave" as that of the "lion-hearted" king of England:

"Like a lion which when it senses that it is fighting a superior opponent throws itself with rage to meet death rather than suffer the shame of defeat, thus the Black Knight retreated two steps, and next he rushed furiously against his opponent's spear, which was shattered on his breast with a loud crash".

(*The Lord of Morea*, p. 62)

"And on the other side the son of Peleus rushed against him like a lion, a ravening lion that men are eager to slay, a whole people that has gathered together; and he at the first caring nothing of them goes his way, but when one of the youths swift in battle has struck him with a spear-cast, then he gathers himself with his mouth wide open, and foam appears about his teeth, and his mighty spirit groans in his heart, and with his tail he lashes his ribs and his flanks on both sides, and rouses himself to fight, and with glaring eyes he rushes straight on in his fury, whether he slay some man or himself be slain in the foremost throng; so was Achilles driven by his fury and his gallant heart to go out to face great-hearted Aeneas".

(Homer, *Iliad* 20.164-175, trans. by A. T. Murray / William Wyatt)

The impulse that in Homer drives the lion to rush fiercely against the hunters' weapons, seeking death rather than the shame of defeat, is the same impulse as that behind Leon's "Lacedaemonian" ideology. In the tournament Gautier's spear is shattered against his breast, so he seizes his opponent with his strong arms and throws him to the ground unconscious. Leon's concluding fight is not, however, against physical violence but against the "chains of generosity and gratitude" which Geoffrey sought to impose on the Greek nation and which, as Leon bitterly notes, "are harder to break than iron and adamant". Leon had, in the words of the narrator, already "broken his sword against the iron armor of the Franks",⁷⁰ but the dagger he now drives against his own breast will not break.

When victory is impossible, death is the only alternative and the only path to freedom. Just before he dies, Chamaretos opens his eyes and sees Anna's tearful eyes above. He confesses to have often seen in his dreams Freedom coming down to him in her shape and breathes out his last words, and life, with epic lines inspired by the most famous suicide in ancient epic tradition, the liberation of the struggling soul of Dido as she dies in Virgil's *Aeneid*: "Your tears are Iris to me, thanks to whom my soul is liberated and flies winged to heaven".⁷¹

The Heroine of the Greek Revolution

Stephanos Xenos' *The Heroine of the Greek Revolution* was published in 1861 in London, where the author had been living since 1847 engaging in business.⁷² In 19th century Greece it enjoyed great popularity; for its readers it also played the role of a History of the Greek War of Independence because of its rich historical documentation, especially from foreign sources.⁷³ The novel is about Andronike and Thrasyboulos, a couple that pledge mutual love before the War of Independence breaks out; the beginning of the war finds them in different locations, they engage separately in the armed struggle, fight in all the major battles and get acquainted with all the major heroes; they meet again during the siege of Missolonghi, where Thrasyboulos is wounded and dies. Andronike will die later in a Russian convent after Greece has won its independence.

Despite opinions to the contrary, neither the subject, which is the account of a long war with numerous episodes rather than an event within it, nor the heroically exaggerated actions of the protagonists, nor the romantic conclusion qualify for association with Scott's novels.⁷⁴ This two-volume, one-thousand-page long novel teems with historical, mythological and archaeological references to Greek and Roman antiquity. The reader is given the impression that he / she is

reading one of the many travelers' accounts where modern and ancient Greece merge.⁷⁵ Chapter 21 of volume 1, however, gives an idea of the writer's view of Byzantine Hellenism.⁷⁶

The first meeting of the couple is indicative of the novel's obsessive engagement with ancient Hellenism and the programmatic role assigned to ancient epic. When Thrasyboulos first sees Andronike, she is tending her sheep in the mountains of Arcadia, where the people still worship Artemis and Pan; she looks like a reincarnation of an ancient deity or mountain nymph in terms of beauty and courage – the text plays on “Andronike” (Ανδρονίκη) and “courage” (ανδρεία); her sheep and dogs bear ancient names. Especially relevant to our discussion is the following conversation:

“–Shepherd girl, wait ... do you know how to read?” –“Forgive my laughing ... can you understand this book?” She retorted. And she took a little book out of her garment and showed it to him.– “These are the rhapsodies of the Iliad!! How is it possible that you, a shepherdess, understand this book?” He cried out retreating in amazement”.

(*The Heroine of the Greek Revolution*, vol. 1, pp. 73-74)

Scott's typical hero, as introduced in *Waverley*, has a good classical education that may play a role in his relationships and in the development of the plot. But Andronike's erudition (she knows Homer and Pindar by heart, history and mythology) looks and is –to use Harry Shaw's term– “fictionally improbable” by comparison with that of Scott's heroines, who acquire it in an entirely different environment; and so are her military feats by comparison, for instance, with Scott's Helen Campbell in *Rob Roy* (any comparison with the Queen Elizabeth of *Kenilworth*, as has been suggested, is simply ridiculous). Despite the poor literary quality of the passage, the brandishing of the volume of the *Iliad* is multiply significant: it underscores the role of Homer, who, in the words of Adamantios Korais, was the common educator of the Greek nation, and his heritage to modern Greece;⁷⁷ it highlights the generic links between epic and novel of which I spoke earlier; and, finally, it alludes to martial valor and the heroes of Homer's *Iliad* –which was the leading ancient war epic– as models for the fighters in the Greek War of Independence to whom they are frequently compared in the narrative.

Loukis Laras

Dimitrios Vikelas spent twenty years in London (1852-1872) engaging in commercial activity.⁷⁸ *Loukis Laras*, the novel he published in 1879, initiated the dialogue between Greeks living in Greece and Greeks living abroad. The hero of the novel, the son of a merchant, flees from Smyrna at the outbreak of the War of Independence, and sails to the island of Chios, where he witnesses the massacre of 1822, and from there to the island of Tinos, where he starts a trading business. Unlike the heroes of Stephanos Xenos, he does not take an active part in the events and does not fight. He flees from place to place in order to survive and his aspiration is a trading business in peaceful times; he eventually reaches London, where he settles down and fulfills his dream. This is originally a true story told in the 1870's by a Chian Merchant settled in London (in the novel itself the voices of old and young Loukis interact throughout).⁷⁹

It has been suggested that Vikelas “is the first and only Greek writer to write a historical novel modeled after Scott’s novels, adhering with veneration to the principles set by the Scottish novelist”.⁸⁰ This argument is based on the author’s engagement in systematic research in order to prepare an accurate historical background for the novel, on the inclusion in the narrative of three historical personalities (though in minor roles), on the fact that the story is about a major historical event (the massacre of Chios) that affects the life of individuals, and finally, the fact that the protagonist is an ordinary hero like those of Scott. One could, however, object that neither the type of crisis nor the hero reflect the principles on which Scott builds his novels. Obviously the Greek War of Independence is different from the struggles that form the background to Scott’s novels,⁸¹ and hence, I would say, no action “to bring the extremes into contact with one another” can come into consideration. Such action is, in addition, made impossible by the conduct and character of the protagonist: unlike the average hero of Scott’s novels, Loukis Laras does nothing but flee from the enemy right from the beginning and never takes any initiative of the sort described above – leaving aside the fact that his obsession with trade is hardly a priority with the idealistic and romantic Waverley type of hero.

Gone the same way as the heroic approach to the War of Independence we encountered in Xenos’ *The Heroine*, is the glorious past of Greece. There are three references altogether to classical antiquity in this novel – *all* to Homer *but all* providing an unheroic perspective on the Homeric epics.⁸² Talking of the massacre on Chios the narrator says that “each family suffered an ‘Iliad’ of

calamities”; with regard to the difficulties of navigation in the Aegean he notes that “whoever is unable to wait fifteen days for the steamship to arrive ... is forced to expose himself to wanderings similar to those of Odysseus and his comrades”; and finally on another occasion he points out that the fiancé of his elder sister “found refuge on the island of Tinos after an ‘Odyssey’ of misfortunes”.⁸³

NOTES

1 Alexandros Papadiamantis’ *The Gypsy Girl* published in 1884 is the first novel in which Byzantium provides the setting (its action unfolds on the eve of the Fall of Constantinople) and eastern Orthodox culture is one of its three ideological poles (the other two are ancient Hellenism and western Catholic culture).

2 This may be the period of the War of Independence, of Ottoman occupation, Frankish domination of the Peloponnese (*The Lord of Morea* discussed below), or the Venetian domination of Crete (*The Cretan Weddings* by Spyridon Zambelios, 1871). The dramatic time of Achilles Leventis’ *Tasso* (1858) are the years of Turkish occupation, but the author, through embedded narrative, manages to bring in Venetian occupation of western Greece as well. Finally, the action of Emmanuel Roidis’ *Pope Joan* (1866) is located in medieval Europe though Joan pays a visit to Byzantine Athens as well.

3 This is the case with Roidis’ depiction of Byzantine Athens.

4 For the history of these publications, see Γ. Μακρής (G. Makris), “Χρονικόν του Μορέως: έρευνα και εκδοτικές δραστηριότητες μέχρι την έκδοση Schmidt (1904)”, in: Elizabeth Jeffreys & Michael Jeffreys (eds.), *Neograeca Medii Aevi V*, Oxford 2005, pp. 85-100.

5 Cf. the epigraph for chapter 13 in Ian Duncan (ed.), *Sir Walter Scott: Ivanhoe*, Oxford 1996, p. 152 (= *Ivanhoe*, all references are made to this edition). Indirectly, therefore, the topic “Homer and Walter Scott” concerns not only Greek historical novels but also Scott’s own novels, which sometimes reveal interesting intertextual relationships with Greek and Roman epic (Homer and Virgil) at the level of plot or character (Scott did not know ancient Greek and quotes Greek texts in translation). Unfortunately secondary literature on Scott’s novels and ancient epic is virtually nonexistent. This is true even of *Ivanhoe*, where the relation to Homer’s *Odyssey* (and to a lesser extent to the *Iliad*) is announced with epigraphs by Scott himself.

6 On the controversy over the classification of Greek novels of this period as “historical”, as well as over their relationship with the novels of Walter Scott, see Σοφία Ντενίσση (Sofia Denissi), *Το ελληνικό μυθιστόρημα και ο Sir Walter Scott (1830-1880)*, Athens 1994. As will be seen below, I do not share the conclusions of the book on the individual novels.

7 Georg Lukács, *The Historical Novel*, translated from the German by Hannah and Stanley Mitchell, Lincoln / London 1983, pp. 30 ff. See, however, Harry E.

Shaw, *The Forms of Historical Fiction: Sir Walter Scott and His Successors*, Ithaca / London 1983, pp. 150 ff. for the distinction between “disjunctive” and “conjunctive” novels. Basic reading on Scott’s novels are also Avrom Fleishman, *The English Historical Novel from Walter Scott to Virginia Woolf*, Baltimore 1971; and James Kerr, *Fiction against History: Scott as Story-teller*, Cambridge 1989, who sheds light on the contradiction inherent in Scott’s generic mixture of fiction and history, romance and realism.

8 See for instance Lukács, *op. cit.*, p. 49; Shaw, *op. cit.*, pp. 208-209.

9 About 35-40 years in the case of *The Heroine* and about 60 in the case of *Loukis Laras*.

10 Similes, a typical feature of ancient epic, are the commonest means and form a most distinctive feature of the style of Emmanuel Roidis’ *Pope Joan*; see Μιχαήλ Πασχάλης (Michael Paschalis), “Αρχαιογνωσία και μυθιστόρημα από τον Λέανδρο στο Λεμονοδάσος”, Proceedings of the International Conference *The Reception of Antiquity in the Byzantine and Modern Greek Novel* (Rethymnon 9-10 November 2001), Athens 2005, pp. 169-177. In Scott similes, especially long ones, are rare. The most obvious technique for introducing classical material are quotations: in his novels there is usually a character (a jurist, a teacher, an astrologist, an alchemist, an antiquary – even a mercenary army captain and an executioner) who utters Latin words and phrases copiously and sometimes in comic vein.

11 See Margaret Anne Doody, *The True Story of the Novel*, New Brunswick 1996, pp. 192-202.

12 He was born in Constantinople in 1809 and was educated first in Odessa and

then in Munich, in the military academy. He came to Greece in 1829, serving first as an army officer and then in the civil service. In 1844 he became Professor of Archaeology at the University of Athens and in 1856 Minister for Foreign Affairs. He died in 1892. Despite the burden of his duties, he was a prolific writer of all sorts of poetry and prose in the most varied areas. His best-known work is *The Lord of Morea*.

13 *Άπαντα τα Φιλολογικά*, vol. 8, Athens 1876, pp. 1-263.

14 On Roidis and classical antiquity, see Paschalis, *art. cit.*

15 *Ivanhoe*, *cit.*, pp. 102-103.

16 Απόστολος Σαχίνης (Apostolos Sachinis) (ed.), *Αλεξάνδρου Πίζου Παγκαβή, Ο Αυθέντης του Μωρέως*, Athens 1989, pp. 56-57 (= *The Lord of Morea*, all references are made to this edition).

17 Elsewhere we are told that “the barbarians are unable to understand the language of Greece’s immortal ruins” or that “the famous cities of the past are now ruins inhabited by wolves and foxes” (*The Lord of Morea*, *cit.*, pp. 125, 134).

18 *The Lord of Morea*, *cit.*, pp. 71-72, 216-217.

19 Mario Vitti, *Ιδεολογική λειτουργία της ελληνικής ηθογραφίας*, Athens 1991, pp. 22-25. For reactions to this view and other approaches see Sachinis’ Introduction to *The Lord of Morea*, *cit.*, pp. 17-20; Henri Tonnet, “L’image romantique du passé de la nation grecque dans l’œuvre d’Alexandre Rangavis *Le Prince de Morée*”, *L’imaginaire de la nation (1792-1992), Actes de colloque Européen de Bordeaux* (1989), Bordeaux 1991, pp. 323-330; Denissi, *op. cit.*, 224-226; Τάκης Καγιαλής (Takis Kayalis), “Πατριδογνωσία, ξενοτροπία και ιστορία”, in: Νάσος Βαγενάς (Nassos

Vaghenas) (ed.), *Από τον Λέανδρο στον Λουκή Λάρα: Μελέτες για την πεζογραφία της περιόδου 1830-1880*, Herakleion 1999, pp. 119-148; Αγγέλα Καστρινάκη (Anghela Kastirinaki), “Ο Ραγκαβής και ο ‘Αυθέντης’: ένας επωφελής γάμος στην Ελλάδα του 1850”, *Ta Istorika* 17 (2000), pp. 271-288.

20 I borrow this phrase from Paschalis M. Kitromilides, “On the Intellectual Content of Greek Nationalism: Paparrigopoulos, Byzantium and the Great Idea”, in: David Ricks & Paul Magdalino (eds), *Byzantium and the Modern Greek Identity*, Aldershot / Brookfield 1998, pp. 25-33, 27. Passages inserted in later editions of the novel do not affect the overall picture I am presenting. See Θεοδώρα Μυλωνά & Μιχάλης Πιερής (Theodora Mylona & Michalis Pieris), “Αλ. Ρ. Ραγκαβής – Walter Scott: επιδράσεις του ‘Ιανηοέ’ στον ‘Αυθέντη του Μορέως’”, *Nea Estia* 110 (1981), pp. 60-76; Kastirinaki, *art. cit.*.

21 William de Champlitte was Lord (Prince) of Morea from 1204 to 1209 (cf. *The Lord of Morea, cit.*, p. 59, note 3); Geoffrey (Geoffroy) I de Villehardouin ruled from 1210 to 1218 and his son Geoffrey (Geoffroy) II de Villehardouin from 1218 to 1246.

22 See *Το Χρονικόν του Μορέως. Το ελληνικόν κείμενον κατά τον κώδικα της Κοπεγχάγης μετά συμπληρώσεων και παραλλαγών εκ του Παρισινού*, εισαγωγή, υποσημειώσεις και σχόλια Π. Καλονάρου (Petros Kalonaros), Athens 1940, vv. 1847 ff., 2098-2434 (= *The Chronicle of Morea*, all references are made to this edition).

23 See Mylona & Pieris, *art. cit.*, pp. 1-6.

24 Mylona & Pieris, *art. cit.*, pp. 9-11.

25 Denissi, *op. cit.*, pp. 216 ff.; her analysis follows Mylona & Pieris, *art. cit.*

26 *The Lord of Morea, cit.*, pp. 34-37, 51, 177, 195, 198-199.

27 *The Chronicle of Morea, cit.*, vv. 2472 ff.; there Agnes appears as daughter of Robert, the Latin emperor (the story is also briefly told in vv. 1185-1198). It is Rangavis himself who refers the reader to *The Chronicle* with a note on p. 229. On the actual events and dates see the note on p. 105 of Kalonaros' edition.

28 Geoffrey's qualities and Leon's inadequacies have been pointed out by several scholars, despite differences in interpretation (see for instance Kastirinaki, *art. cit.*, the most recent study of the novel's ideology).

29 Cf. Mylona & Pieris, *art. cit.*, p. 13.

30 *The Lord of Morea, cit.*, pp. 29, 50, 71-76, 169-173, 222-226 and *passim*. Careful reading of pp. 71-76 shows beyond any doubt that Leon has *no specific plan* in his mind, only the vague dream of “resurrecting the holy throne of Byzantium”.

31 *The Lord of Morea, cit.*, pp. 184-193.

32 *The Chronicle of Morea, cit.*, vv. 7970 ff. It is Rangavis himself that refers the reader to this passage of *The Chronicle* with a note on p. 233. There is much confusion, however, in *The Chronicle*, on which see the note on p. 322 of Kalonaros' edition.

33 John Henry Raleigh, “Ulysses and Scott's *Ivanhoe*”, *Studies in Romanticism* 22 (1983), pp. 569-586, 572.

34 See Michael Paschalis, «Τα Βουκολικά του Αλέξανδρου Ραγκαβή: η αναβίωση ενός είδους και οι περιπέτειες του τονικού βουκολικού εξαμέτρου», forthcoming in *Kondyloforos*.

35 *Ο Ιβανώης του Ουάλλτερ-Σκώττου εξελληνισθείς εκ του αγγλικού υπό Γεωργίου Δ. Λαμπίση*, Σμύρνη 1847. Mylona &

Pieris, *art. cit.*, p. 8, note 32, believe that Rangavis consulted this translation and not the English original.

36 At one point the pretexts of Raimondos, Geoffrey's agent, through which he delays the organization of an armed escort for Robert's return, are compared to Penelope's weaving and unweaving, by means of which she sought to delay marriage to one of the suitors ("In my country" he said "they tell the following story: there was a woman, very skilled in the craft of weaving, who had the weird obsession of undoing during the night what she wove during the day; in this way she kept herself busy all the time while her cloth did not get any larger. I suspect that our recruiting advances like the cloth of our Penelope", *The Lord of Morea, cit.*, p. 81). But when Nonnos (Petraleifas' agent who had orders to speed up Robert's arrival) informs Robert of the stratagem, Raimondos abandons the pretexts just as Penelope is forced to complete the weaving when a woman informs the suitors of her guile. An allusion to the *Odyssey* is also found during Robert's stay in Venice: the sumptuous hospitality with which the Doge of Venice manages to delay his departure are compared to the pleasures of Circe ("...they were forced to surrender themselves to the pleasures of Circe-like Venice...", *The Lord of Morea, cit.*, p. 97).

37 See especially vv. 2098 ff.

38 When Geoffrey is proclaimed Lord of Morea, the Greek noblemen are the first to cheer: the detail is added by Rangavis but reflects the spirit of the *Chronicle* and is in harmony with the conclusion of the novel where most of the insurgents acclaim him as Lord of Morea (*cit.*, p. 247). In an authorial intervention

Rangavis explains that "Villehardouin was generally loved by the Greeks, that is by those who were unwilling to resist and accepted foreign rule", because his rule was moderate and he respected the Orthodox religion, feudal privileges and the rights of the people (*The Lord of Morea, cit.*, p. 182; on his achievements see pp. 30, 44, and *passim*). For a different reading of these passages see Kastrinaki, *art. cit.*, pp. 274-275.

39 *The Lord of Morea, cit.*, pp. 32-33. Raimondos comes from France, where he had been sent to prevent the arrival of the rightful successor, disguised as a monk (like Ivanhoe); only one person knows who this character actually is (as it happens in Homer and *Ivanhoe*); and he retires to talk with Geoffrey (as Ivanhoe does in Scott with Rowena).

40 Cf. Tonnet, *art. cit.*, p. 330, who sees in Petraleifas' moves a combination of Odysseus' cunning with the subtlety of Byzantine diplomacy (same in Henri Tonnet, *Ιστορία του ελληνικού μυθιστορήματος*, Athens 1999, p. 122).

41 The ship is called "Leon" (= "lion"), obviously named after the symbol of Venice (*The Lord of Morea, cit.*, pp. 104 ff.). Robert was deliberately delayed by the Doge in Venice (on instructions received from Geoffrey) longer than anywhere else, and it is this delay above all that cost him the Lordship of Morea. It is possible that the ship "Leon" stands for Venice that hindered Robert's timely arrival at the Peloponnese and this may not be unrelated to the fact that Geoffrey, the other claimant to the Lordship, has an opponent on land called Leon Chamaretos; cf. section 3 below on "Leons" and lions.

42 *The Lord of Morea, cit.*, pp. 107-116.

43 Αλεξάνδρου Πίζου Παγκαβή Απομνη-

μονεύματα, vol. 1, Athens 1894 (reprinted 1999), pp. 200-223. The account of his coming to Greece was published sixty-five years after the events occurred. No original notes taken during the journey survive (assuming there were any), just the manuscript of the *Memoirs*.

44 See *Αλέξανδρος Ρίζος Παγκαβής, Διηγήματα*, Φιλολογική επιμέλεια Δημήτρης Τζιόβας (Dimitris Tziovas), Athens, 1999, vol. 2, pp. 132-164.

45 “Eventually one evening we sighted from a distance towards the east some blackish, solid clouds and with unspoken bliss we heard that these were at last the much desired Ionian islands –then belonging to England but being Greek from every other aspect– the islands of the Phaeacians and of Odysseus”. Cf. Homer, *Odyssey* 5.279-5.281, trans. by R. D. Dawe: “...and on the eighteenth day the shadowy mountains of the Phaeacians’ land appeared, at the point nearest to him. It looked like a shield in the misty sea”.

46 “And we saw the islands and slept a comforted sleep, and Greek dreams from the ivory gate came to us throughout the night; but in the morning we found out that getting near them was not without difficulties...”. Cf. Homer, *Odyssey* 19.560-19.567, trans. by R. D. Dawe: “Stranger, dreams, you know, are intractable and their message jumbled; not everything comes to happen for men. There are two sets of gates of strengthless dreams: one lot are made with horns, the others with ivory. Those which come through the sawn ivory ones, they are harmful, bringing tales which are not to be fulfilled. But those which come outside through the polished horns, they bring true fulfillment when one of mortal men sees them”.

47 “Dawn had just smiled on us when

I rushed to the deck eager to see Greek Zakynthos, famous for its beauty. I turned my bewitched eyes around ... but could not understand what was that caused the city of Zakynthos to be hidden from view”. Cf. Homer, *Odyssey* 2.1: “When she that is born early appeared, rose-fingered Dawn”; also Homer, *Odyssey* 13.194-13.196, trans. by R. D. Dawe: “That is why everything kept appearing to look different to their master – the continuous paths, the harbors where all may anchor, the sheer rocks and the flourishing trees”.

48 “When we had satisfied our desire for drink and food...”. Cf. Homer, *Odyssey* 14. 454: “when they had satisfied their desire for drink and food”.

49 Raleigh, *art. cit.*, p. 572.

50 *The Lord of Morea, cit.*, pp. 215, 227.

51 *The Lord of Morea, cit.*, p. 213.

52 *The Lord of Morea, cit.*, pp. 165, 191.

53 *The Lord of Morea, cit.*, p. 227.

54 *The Lord of Morea, cit.*, pp. 213, 226-227.

55 *The Lord of Morea, cit.*, pp. 220-222.

56 *The Lord of Morea, cit.*, pp. 234, 243.

57 It was Geoffrey who, in an effort to protect Chamaretos when he was given the list by Petraleifas, tore off the corner of the paper that bore his name.

58 Tonnet, *art. cit.*, p. 328 correctly sees here an allusion to Philopoemen who was called “the last of the Greeks” (Plutarch, *Philopoemen* 1.7).

59 *The Lord of Morea, cit.*, pp. 244-248.

60 For interpretations of the scanty evidence, see M. Κορδώσης (M. Kordossis), *Η κατάκτηση της Νότιας Ελλάδας από τους Φράγκους. Ιστορικά και τοπογραφικά προβλήματα*, Thessaloniki 1986; Haris Kalligas, *Byzantine Monemvasia: The Sources*, Monemvasia 1990; Αλέξης Γ. Κ. Σαββίδης (Alexis Savvidis), “Τα προβλή-

ματα σχετικά με τον Λέοντα Χαμάρετο”, *Byzantinai Meletai* 3 (1991), pp. 350-383.

61 “This young man was Leon Chamaretos ... Having rekindled the last spark of ancient valor amid the ashes of Sparta, Leon hoped to resist the torrent of the Franks and withstood their siege with great bravery for five days; but in the end Sparta suffered its final fall and Chamaretos’ sword was shattered against the iron armor of the knights” (*The Lord of Morea, cit.*, pp. 40-41, authorial comment). On Chamaretos’ vain defense of Sparta see also *The Lord of Morea, cit.*, pp. 31, 70, 74-75 (“I surrendered him the keys of Lacedaemon”), 76, 125. The five-day war that led to the surrender of the Lacedaemonians is an element derived from *The Chronicle of Morea, cit.*, v. 2055, where, however, there is no mention of Chamaretos.

62 “There was a time when the three hundred dead bodies of her [Sparta’s] sons were able to check the torrent of the whole of Asia” (*The Lord of Morea, cit.*, p. 70, spoken by Chamaretos to Anna); “There were days when the three hundred bodies of her [Sparta’s] sons checked the torrent of entire Asia ... Our ancestors either won or died” (*The Lord of Morea, cit.*, p. 133, Chamaretos’ speech to the insurgents).

63 “Our ancestors either were victorious or died” (*The Lord of Morea, cit.*, p. 71, Chamaretos speaking to Anna).

64 “...when mothers armed their sons, they wished and bade them rather to be brought back dead on their shields than to come back alive without them” (*The Lord of Morea, cit.*, p. 133, Chamaretos’ speech to the insurgents).

65 When a proper name is inserted in a narrative it may release the semantic potential its components possess or gene-

rate pseudo-etymological meaning; this is commonly done through semantic association with other words (= semantic clusters; see the introduction to Michael Paschalis, *Virgil’s Aeneid: Semantic Relations and Proper Names*, Oxford 1997). Greek χαμαί (“on the ground”; “to earth”) occurs as first component of several ancient and modern Greek words; in ancient Greek it is common with verbs meaning “fall”, especially πίπτω. As for ἀρετή, in ancient Greek it indicated, among other things, “valor” or “bravery”. Rangavis’ archaizing style is very sensitive to ancient Greek usage. When the author first introduces Chamaretos (pp. 40-41), he gives a short narrative that renders the semantic content of his name: he rekindled the last spark of “ancient valor” (της αρχαίας ἀρετής) but unfortunately Sparta “suffered its final fall” (έπεσε την τελευταίαν της πτώσιν). The semantic potential of “valor” and “falling” is unfolded in several passages and episodes.

66 “How can my thoughts not be dark, when a black veil of death has spread over my country?”. Chamaretos is replying to Anna’s comment that his mind is always “fed with dark ideas” (*The Lord of Morea, cit.*, pp. 124-125).

67 *The Lord of Morea, cit.*, pp. 130, 157. As pointed out by Kastriaki, *art. cit.*, p. 272, the words of Voutsaras pick up the opening lines of the famous patriotic *Thourios* (Battle Hymn) composed by Rigas Velenstinlis.

68 *The Lord of Morea, cit.*, pp. 192, 136, 215, 220.

69 *The Lord of Morea, cit.*, p. 133.

70 *The Lord of Morea, cit.*, p. 41.

71 Cf. Virgil, *Aeneid* 4.693-4.705.

72 Xenos was born in Smyrna in 1821 and died in Athens in 1894.

73 Denissi, *op. cit.*, pp. 230 ff.

74 For discussions of *The Heroine* as a novel modelled after Scott, see Denissi, *op. cit.*, pp. 230-252.

75 Travelers used to take note only of vestiges of Greek antiquity in the people, the buildings and the landscape of modern Greece. References to travelers occur occasionally in the novel: see *Στέφανος Θ. Ξένος, Η Ηρωίς της Ελληνικής Επανάστασεως, ήτοι σκηναί εν Ελλάδι από έτους 1821-1828*, Φιλολογική επιμέλεια Βικτωρία Χατζηγεωργίου-Χασιώτη, Athens, 1988, vol. 1, pp. 69, 72, 94, 379.

76 In a kind of Virgilian *katabasis* the Patriarch of Constantinople Gregorios V, who was brutally murdered by the Turks, appears to Thrasyboulos in a dream and takes him through a cave opening to see the shades of Christian saints and Byzantine emperors and the two gates of Hellenism: the golden gate of past glory and the gate of martyrdom. The account involves criticism of “corrupt” Byzantine emperors.

77 In chapter 48 of vol. 1 a dance of Chios is said to date back to Homer’s days and specifically to a famous description on the Shield of Achilles, *Iliad* 18.587-18.604.

78 Vikelas was born in Ermoupolis in 1835 and died in Athens in 1908.

79 For the author’s life, his work, the actual story told by the Chian merchant, and the text and readings of *Loukis Laras*, see Μαρτιάννα Δίτσα (Marianna Ditsa), *Δημήτριος Βικέλας, Λουκής Λάρας*, Athens 1991 (= *Loukis Laras*, references are made to this edition).

80 On Vikelas and Scott, see Denissi, *op. cit.*, 1994, pp. 256-293, with earlier literature.

81 As admitted by Denissi, *op. cit.*, p. 282.

82 It should be mentioned at this point that in 1866 Vikelas published a translation of book 6 of Homer’s *Odyssey*.

83 *Loukis Laras, cit.*, pp. 122, 139-140, 175. The passages of pp. 122 and 175 have proverbial overtones.

Π Ε Ρ Ι Λ Η Ψ Η

ΜΙΧΑΗΛ ΠΑΣΧΑΛΗΣ: Όμηρος και Ουόλτερ Σκοτ στον *Αυθέντη του Μορέως*, την *Ηρωίδα της Ελληνικής Επανάστασεως* και τον *Λουκή Λάρα*

Η απουσία του νόμιμου ηγεμόνα, η διεκδίκηση της εξουσίας του και η παρεμπόδιση της επιστροφής του ίδιου ή του διαδόχου του είναι θέματα κοινά στο *Χρονικό του Μορέως*, τον *Αυθέντη του Μορέως*, τον *Ιβανόη* και την *Οδύσσεια*. Εκδοχές της *Οδύσσειας* λειτουργούν ως διακεείμενα στον *Ιβανόη* και τον *Αυθέντη του Μορέως* αλλά και στο ταξίδι που κάνει ο Ραγκαβής κατά την άφιξή του στην Ελλάδα το 1829, όπως περιγράφεται στα *Απομνημονεύματά* του. Αντίθετα προς την επικρατούσα άποψη, ο Ραγκαβής πέτυχε να δημιουργήσει στον *Αυθέντη του Μορέως* μια σφιχτά οργανωμένη πλοκή με πρωταγωνιστή τον Βιλλαρδουίνο, ο οποίος φέρνει σε πέρας τρία σχέδια: την εξαπάτηση του Ροβέρτου και την κατάκτηση της Αυθεντίας· τον γάμο του γιου του με την Αγνή Κουρτεναίη, ανιψιά του Λατίνου αυτοκράτορα της Κωνσταντινούπολης, που εξυπηρετεί

μακροπρόθεσμες φιλοδοξίες του (στο *Χρονικό* ο γάμος γίνεται μετά τον θάνατο του Βιλλαρδουίνου)· και, τέλος, τον εντοπισμό και την παράδοση των Ελλήνων επαναστατών και την αναγνώρισή του από αυτούς ως Αυθέντη του Μορέως. Η «μεγάλη θήρα» στα βουνά της Ανδραβίδας, με την οποία ολοκληρώνεται ο *Αυθέντης του Μορέως*, αποτελεί το πολιτικό ανάλογο των αιματηρών επιχειρήσεων στον *Ιβανόη* και την *Οδύσσεια* και το κορυφαίο επίτευγμα του Βιλλαρδουίνου. Η τελική άρνηση του Έλληνα πρωταγωνιστή *Λέοντα* Χαμάρετου να συμφιλιωθεί με τη φράγκικη εξουσία προεξαγγέλλεται μέσα από τη στάση του στην κονταρομαχία και εκφράζεται μέσα από το όνομά του, όπου συγκλίνουν στοιχεία από τον Σπαρτιάτη *Λεωίδα*, τον «Μέλανα Ιππότη» Ριχάρδο τον *Λεοντόκαρδο* και τον ομηρικό *λέοντα*, που σπρώχνεται από την ορμή να σκοτώσει ή να πεθάνει, αντί να ντροπιαστεί. Η περιγραφή μιας κρίσης στον ιστορικό βίο και η υπέρβασή της καθιστά τον *Αυθέντη του Μορέως* το πρώτο και μοναδικό ιστορικό μυθιστόρημα που γράφεται με τους όρους του Ουόλτερ Σκοτ. Στο τέλος της εργασίας εξετάζονται, συγκριτικά και εν συντομία, η *Ηρωίδα της Ελληνικής Επανάστασεως* του Στέφανου Ξένου και ο *Λουκής Λάρας* του Δημητρίου Βικέλα, που έχουν συζητηθεί σε σχέση με τη μέθοδο του Σκοτ, και διερευνάται, επίσης συγκριτικά, ο τρόπος με τον οποίο οι συγγραφείς τους χειρίζονται την αρχαιογνωστική και ειδικότερα την ομηρική ύλη.