



HELLENIC REPUBLIC  
National and Kapodistrian  
University of Athens

*180 Years*  
School  
of Philosophy

## Department of History and Archaeology

International Conference

*‘Ελλην’, ‘Ρωμηός’, ‘Γραικός’:  
Collective Identifications and Identities*



### Abstracts of Papers

Athens, 19-21 January 2017  
Venue: Amphitheater ‘Ioannis Drakopoulos’  
Central Building of the University of Athens  
30 Panepistimiou Ave.

**T**HE DRASTIC POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC CHANGES, as well as the surfacing of new social and cultural phenomena that have taken place in the last decades have brought about a vivid reflection on issues of identity. These issues were found in the epicenter of the scholarly interest and of the Public History, thus provoking a strong discussion and a particularly interesting production of academic works. The pertinent research on primary sources has enriched our knowledge; has sharpened our historical vision, and has led to new critical perspectives, which have broadened our way of thinking on the historical process of concepts that have been used as collective identifications both in the international and in the Greek academic literature.

Taking all this into account, the Department of History and Archaeology of the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens is organizing, on 19-21 January 2017, an international conference under the title "Έλλην', 'Ρωμηός', 'Γραικός': Collective Identifications and Identities. The sessions of the conference will focus on the content and the meanings of terms that in various different times of history came to identify the collectivity of Greeks. By hosting cases from diverse historical experiences and socio-political environments, in a period of time that extends from the ancient world to the nineteenth century and the establishment of the Greek nation-state, the conference aims at highlighting the complex processes of the construction of collective identities (such as 'Έλλην', 'Ρωμηός', 'Γραικός', etc.), and at examining further the use of these identities within their historical context and in the pertinent academic literature. The working languages of the conference will be Greek and English.

**Academic/Organizing Committee:**

*Olga Katsiardi-Hering (President),  
Anastasia Papadia-Lala, Irene Chrestou, Maria Efthymiou,  
Katerina Nikolaou, Sophia Aneziri, Katerina Konstantinidou,  
Vaso Seirinidou, Vangelis Karamanolakis, Spyridon G. Ploumidis*

## **Eleni Angelomati-Tsougaraki**

Professor Emerita, Ionian University

*'We Greeks, since we lost the kingdom, we lost everything.'* How Greeks under foreign rule self-identified: The textual testimony

Since it is impossible to determine through oral testimonies how early-modern Greeks self-identified, it becomes necessary to search for testimonies in the written record. In it, a long series of different types of testimony is preserved. Naturally, the largest part of these are learned texts by both clerics and lay-scholars. Nevertheless, sometimes, we come across texts by minimally-literate people, whose voice brings us much closer to the popular expression and formulation of their self-identity. In this context, the individual and collective terms of identity *Ἕλληνες Ρωμαῖοι / Ρωμιοί (Greek Romans/Romioi), Γραικοί (Greeks)* as national appellations will be commented upon, but also *ἑλληνικός (hellenic)* or *ρωμαϊκός (roman)* as epithets, often accompanied by other qualifiers, such as *χριστιανοί (christians)*, *παλαιοί (old)* and *νέοι (new)*, as well as the repeatedly used *ἑλληνικὸν γένος (hellenic genus)* and more rarely used *ἑλληνικὸν ἔθνος (hellenic nation)*.

The examination of these terms will be attempted through a categorization, where possible, of the texts in which the testimonies appear. By necessity, the testimonies will be presented through typical examples and in chronological order, so that both the duration in time of the usage and the changes in usage can be followed.

## **Konstantinos Burselis**

Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

*Alexander and the enlarged concept of Hellenism*

The aim of this paper is to examine what Strabo (I.4.9) reports about the way Eratosthenes understood Alexander's policy toward the local 'barbarians'. Alexander's point of view is very different from that of Aristotle, his teacher, and it is what will be fully adopted and emphasized during the imperial period by Plutarch.

## **Evangelos Chrysos**

Professor Emeritus, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

*'Greeks' and 'Latins' in the confrontation of Pope Nicholas I with Patriarch Photios*

During the controversy between Patriarch Photius and Pope Nicholas I on the issue of ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the newly converted Bulgarians, the conflict was partly focused on the difference between the general cultural dimensions of the East and the West.

Constantinople taunted Rome with being an ‘aged city’ [urbs inveterata], and described the Latin language as ‘barbaric’ and ‘Scythian’. The insults were exploited by the Pope to stir up the Latin-speaking West against the ‘Greeks’ in an unprecedented way, because they had the impudence to criticize certain doctrinal positions and religious practices of the Latins. Prominent theologians were called upon to write treatises contra Graecos. The conscious replacement of the established ethnic name Romanus with the less appropriate Gr(a)ecus in those texts, and even in papal correspondence, had as its aim the denial of the ‘Roman’ status of the Empire of Constantinople as the legitimizing basis of the physical continuity of the Roman state.

Thus the race for Bulgaria became a bone of contention, and led to the artificial booming of theological and ecclesiastical differences. This conflict was another blow to the cultural unity of the medieval world. The two parts, East and West, of the united Graeco-Roman Europe were alienated from each other, and became divided into a ‘Latin’ and a ‘Greek’ world.

### **Lidia Cotovanu**

PhD École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Post-Doctoral Fellow, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

*The multiple representations of the ‘Romans’/‘Greci’ in the Danubian Principalities: The testimony of Matthew of Myra (beginning of the 17th century)*

From the second half of the 16th century already, the local elite of Wallachia contends that ‘Constantinopolitan Greeks’ (*greci țarigrădeni*) are in control of the Prince’s throne and destroy the country. While the ruling class faces, from an ideological and a collective point of view, the ‘Romans’ / ‘Greeks’ as agents of the Constantinopolitan domination over Wallachia –something that does not prevent them from maintaining family ties with them–, those who belong to the lower social strata views them as merciless masters. Between the years 1610-1618, the local candidates to the throne and their supporters – including expatriates from Epirus, Thessaly and Macedonia, bearers of multiple collective particularities– repeatedly exploit the *anti-Greek feelings* of the crowd in order to rouse the ‘country’ against the rulers appointed by the Sublime Porte and their ‘Constantinopolitan Greek’ servants. Massacres of ‘Roman’ nobles, merchants and monks go hand in hand with Court conspiracies.

The metropolitan of Myra Matthew in his *History of Wallachia* records exactly these confuse multiple representations of the *Romans / Greeks*. The priest and scholar foresees the risk that the anti-Greek attitude prevailing in Wallachia will spread from *the political disputes* and *the social antipathy* to the refusal of *the Roman cultural heritage itself*, with all what the term includes: religion, law, institutions, language, ancient letters, etc. Matthew of Myra warns the ‘Romans’, who are pursuing their immediate interests in the Principalities, but also the ‘Wallachians’, explaining to the latter that *romaiosyni* does not only mean *political, institutional*

*and economic domination*, and is not limited to *the Roman language* either, but carries with it *the culture, right faith and tradition* of which they are also part (despite its Slav-Romanian form). The metropolitan of Myra then completes the definition of *romaiosyni* and is concerned with the fluidity of its multiple limits. In the preservation of Orthodoxy –cut to pieces from a political, customary and linguistic point of view– *romaiosyni* would find earthly salvation.

### **Nadia Danova**

Professor, Institute of Balkan Studies, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

*Greek itineraries as an instrument and a mirror of the formation of national identities*

I will present briefly and put into macrohistoric context three rather unusual sources for Balkan social history. I envisage three Greek itineraries, produced for the needs of itinerant traders, which contain data that would contribute to our understanding of the formation of Balkan national identities towards the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th centuries. These itineraries furnish us with direct information on the micro historical level, but when looked at macrohistorically they become really interesting. The first is an MS written in the period 1769-1773, now in the library of the Elenka and Cyril Avramovi Chitaliste - Reading House, Svishtov, Bulgaria. It follows the route Trieste-Braşov via Graz and Vienna. The other two itineraries are printed publications of 1824 and 1829. The three together mirror the formation of national identities and national programs in the Balkans at the time. The author of the earliest source (the MS of 1773) illuminates the transition from *genos* to *ethnos* when using the term *romaika* to designate the Greek language, and *romaios* for the Greek elite in Braşov. Such terms direct us to the times preceding the formation of modern national identities in the Balkans, for they belong to the supranational imperial project. As to the later sources (1824 and 1829), they cast light on the evolution of the Greek intelligentsia’s thinking, which more correctly may be termed ‘Greece’ as a function of the development of the Greek Revolution of 1821-1827.

### **Tudor Dinu**

Associate Professor, University of Bucharest

*Greek clergymen, boyars, merchants and craftsmen in Bucharest during the Phanariot rule: Their ethnic denominations*

The Greek rulers from Phanar appointed by the Sublime Porte as hospodars of Wallachia in the years 1716-1821 have always arrived in Bucharest accompanied by a large number of councillors of the same ethnic background to whom they entrusted important positions in the

country's divan, one third of which during certain periods of time was made up of foreign elements.

According to the findings of our research, in the eighteenth century representatives of eighty-two Greek families, excluding the ruling ones, came to hold high-ranking positions in the divan. Aside from these, numerous clergymen settled in the Wallachian capital, who were part of the entourage of the six or seven Greek metropolitans of Hungaro-Wallachia, but had been also sent to ensure the most effective administration of the properties held by the monasteries dedicated to the Holy Places in Greece and the Orient. The presence of the Greek element was also noteworthy among the merchants who oversaw the supply of the acclaimed agricultural products of Wallachia to the Ottoman market, but also among the so-called Leipzig merchants who imported goods from Central European countries. And, paradoxically enough – a fact so far unknown – there were also craftsmen of Greek origin, who chose to leave their homeland in favour of the economically more dynamic Bucharest.

My paper, using a large corpus of documents of the period in which the names of Greek persons belonging to one of the four above-mentioned categories appear, aims to examine the ethnic denominations assigned to them, as well as the meaning and purpose of the usage of one or the other term (and, of course, of the absence thereof) in a different, sometimes even hostile, ethnic background.

## **Maria Efthymiou**

Associate Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

### *The meaning of ‘Greek’ in the Memoirs of Archbishop Germanos*

Peloponnesian Archbishop Germanos composed his Memoirs during the War of Greek Independence (1821 -1828) and he died before the end of this War. For that reason, his Memoirs are precious on what concerns the deciphering of religious, ethnic and local perceptions and ideologies of the Greeks of his time. Because, in contrast to other memoirs which have been composed by fighters of the Greek Revolution decades after the end of the War, in the 1840s and 1850s, Germanos writes without being under the influence of the new ideological formations that the liberated Greek society adopted after the end of the War of Independence.

### **Effi Gazi**

Associate Professor, University of Peloponnese

*His Hellenism and the Greeks: The nations according to Ion Dragoumis*

My paper examines the multifaceted nature and the distinct characteristics of Ion Dragoumis’ thinking around the Greek nation. Starting from his *My Hellenism and the Greeks* (written in 1903, published in 1927) and also subsequent works, the paper discusses how Dragoumis understood and what roles and perspectives he attributed both to Hellenism and to the Greeks. Within this context, the paper illustrates the internal dualism of Dragoumis’ nationalism. I will argue that this dualism had various cultural and political implications at the time of Dragoumis, while it subsequently facilitated broad and conflicting uses of his work.

### **Paris Gounaridis**

Professor Emeritus, University of Thessaly

*The ‘perpetual continuity of Hellenism’ through the eyes of a Byzantine (and/or of a Byzantinist)*

The communication examines the expression of ‘philhellenism’ by Eustathius bishop of Thessaloniki. He was one of the literati, i.e. the cultural intermediates between the classical Greek heritage and the Byzantine society. Prelate and Scholar, he was actively concerned with his own times, and explained various aspects of ancient Greek literature to his contemporaries. While fully respecting the overbearing institutional framework –of imperial fidelity to the Roman ideal and to ecclesiastical orthodoxy– he incorporates elements of ancient Greek culture into the Byzantine milieu.

### **Anastassia Hamatsou**

PhD History of Political Science, Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences, Associate Researcher, University of Cyprus

*‘But according to the rest of our Greek brothers we shall strive for freedom’. From millet to Greek ethnic community in Cyprus (late Ottoman-and early British rule)*

The nineteenth century was particularly determinant for the history of Cyprus since the island is experiencing the last phase of Ottoman rule and is beginning to be a part of modernity by the fact that the British Empire has taken over its management. In the late period of Ottoman rule, endogenous and exogenous factors led to a series of structural and institutional changes in the administration of the island (Tanzimat), which led to economic and social changes that had as a consequence the emergence of a Greek Orthodox bourgeoisie in Cyprus. The latter will challenge

the status quo, both within the community itself, which is traditionally represented by the Autocephalous Church of Cyprus, as well as its relation to the Ottoman administration. Critical role in this played the development of the national movements in Europe and the creation of the Greek state. The existence of a Greek nation-state has shown a new reference point both for Cyprus, as well as other Hellenic parts that have not join the state. The balancing process between the two most central parts of Hellenism, Constantinople and Athens will lead to internal changes and contribute to the evolution from the community of Cypriot Rum millet to the national community, a process that will last until the early British rule.

### **Ioannis K. Hassiotis**

Professor Emeritus, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

*In search of internal and external evidence of Greek national identifications in the pre-Revolutionary era*

In their ‘internal’ relations, peoples are not commonly referring to themselves with national identifications. Nevertheless, numerous testimonies, with more or less explicit references to national individuality, are disposable; they concern at least those peoples whose collective sense of their distinct nationhood is recorded in primary sources of early modern history. Among them is also included an historical *par excellence* (for various reasons) ethnic community, the Greeks. However, in order to reconsider the potential political significance of these sources, it is necessary to approach them (i) in their historical and ideological context, and (ii) in comparison with the use of similar testimonies relating to other peoples in pre-Enlightenment Europe. Given that the material (Greek or foreign), which concerns the Greek Orthodox element of the first three centuries of Ottoman domination, is scattered, occasional or simply unrecorded adequately, an *ad hoc* planning of a *corpus* of it seems indispensable. Such a collective work will facilitate the new generations of historians to approach the modern Greek national phenomenon in a more solid and well-documented way and, importantly, unaffected by the ideological stereotypes of traditional nationalist historiography, but also by some predetermined modern and post-modern interpretative models, promoted particularly by scholars unfamiliar with these primary sources.

**Evanthis Hatzivassiliou**

Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

*Identities, Historicity, and the problem of the arrogance of the Present*

The paper will focus on two intellectual preconditions of the study of the past. The first involves the need to avoid mirroring the present to the past, a particularly painful trap for a professional historian. In this respect, the historian must respect the Other, even if this Other is a Greek of another era; at any rate, the historian cannot set the criteria of identity exclusively in terms of the experience of the Greek nation-state created in the nineteenth century. This would amount to a sui generis intellectual imperialism of our era towards the past. The second topic involves the discussion about continuities and breaks in history. Although recently the focus seems to be on the breaks, historical methodology mostly stresses continuities, from the ‘stream of history’ of E.H. Carr to the ‘longue durée’ of Marc Bloch and Fernand Braudel.

**Anthony Kaldellis**

Professor, Ohio State University

*The Byzantine view of ancient romanization*

The nature, the mechanics, and even the very existence of ‘Romanization’ in antiquity are currently topics of fierce debate, both empirical and theoretical. Is Romanization to be measured archaeologically, through the adoption by provincials of a Roman-styled material culture, or as a function of identity, as more and more provincials became Roman citizens, assumed an ethnic Roman identity, and they identified with the empire’s normative political order? Debates over these issues by ancient historians, however, ignore the existence of Byzantium, a society that was the direct and natural offshoot of the eastern Roman empire, whose population identified overwhelmingly itself as Roman. What did the Byzantines themselves think had happened in antiquity that led to the effective ‘extinction’ of the tribes, nations, and peoples of the eastern Mediterranean and the emergence of a global Roman society? This paper will examine the scarce but illuminating Byzantine discussions of ancient Romanization, as scholars and thinkers looked back to the transition from non-Roman to Roman in the territories that would later form the homeland of the Byzantine Romans, known as Romanía. In an intellectual context in which ethnic groups were assumed to be more or less fixed, how was this transition conceptualized and recognized?

## **Vangelis Karamanolakis**

Assistant Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

*When does the history of the Greeks begin?*

Every national historiography is always *in motion*, aiming to integrate new historical periods in its narrative and to broaden the boundaries of the nation's roots, by placing its beginning to the earliest possible times and by prolonging the ‘national past’. To this end, the definition of the ‘past’, the contribution of each historical period to the formation of the ‘past’, the criteria by which the features of each period are chosen and integrated into the historiographical narrative, are not constant but ever-changing variables that are based on the political and social circumstances.

My paper aims to examine, through a series of Greek historians' works, the ways in which historical narrative saw and designated the populations that lived in the Hellenic realm during the prehistoric period. Starting from the one-volumed *History of the Greek Nation* (1853) to the first volume of the identically titled series by *Ekdotike Athinon* (1971), the paper will focus on these identifications, illuminating their connection to the findings of archaeology.

## **Olga Katsiardi-Hering**

Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

*Hellene, Greek, Romios: from a multiethnic to a national framework*

The terms under examination relate to the potential and/or the de facto formation of national identities, which, following the emergence of nationalism, led to the foundation of nation-states, but also to the search, or not, for national or ethnic identities in eras prior to the 19th century. This search also infused new meanings into terms which had conveyed a different content in the past—for example, the terms ‘γένος’ and ‘έθνος’ [natio/nation] and the terms used to refer to different peoples in different periods and eras. Until today, the historiographical debate has generally focused more on the subject-peoples of multi-ethnic/multi-religious empires or on peoples that formed into nation-states in the 19th century, and less on those from imperial or state formations which could demonstrate a relationship between state and nation as early as in the early modern era. My presentation aims to identify and explore the ideological influences which may be circumscribed by the terms ‘Hellene, Greek, Romios’ through the discourse on the shifts brought about by the changes in imperial and other systems (Roman, Venetian, French, English, Russian etc.) in the areas inhabited by the peoples labelled in this way by the authorities. The changes in the meanings ascribed to these terms in a Diaspora context will also be taken into account, given that the Greek/Romioi/Hellenes moved between multi-ethnic, multi-religious empires. Thus, the way in which they were identified by Others and in which

they identified themselves changed in a definite manner; immigration fuelled identity problems and helped in the shaping of consciousness. The nation-state brought together and re-signified all the trends of the past. An attempt will also be made to identify projections onto the past—valid or otherwise—of interpretations and views which gave rise to contemporary schools of thought regarding the explanation of identities.

### **Tonia Kioussopoulou**

Professor, University of Crete

*‘Ῥωμαίοι’ and ‘Ἕλληνες’ in the Despotate of the Morea*

The intellectuals who were living in Mystras during the 15th century use the terms ‘Ῥωμαίος’ and ‘Ἕλλην’ in order to designate the collective identity of the Peloponnesians. My paper aims to examine the meaning of these terms in the context of the policies, pursued by the despots of the Morea, and the social tensions in the regions that were under their sovereignty.

### **Johannes Koder**

Professor Emeritus, Universität Wien

*Romaisti – Remarks on the linguistic Romanness in Byzantium*

Language and space are of high importance amongst the many approaches to understand collective identity. This applies also for the landscapes around the Eastern Mediterranean basin in Late Antiquity and in the Middle Ages, where not only Greek and Latin, but also –in different regions and at different times– a dozen of other languages (Slavic languages, Albanian, Vlach, Armenian, Georgian, Aramaic Syriac, Coptic, many Arabic and Turkish dialects, etc.) were spoken. This multilingualism had consequences for an in depth understanding of the long-term development of the ethnic and cultural structures in Byzantium and the identity of its population.

Since the late 6th century Greek became, as one result of the territorial reduction of Byzantium, the dominant language in the remaining parts of the empire. The Byzantines described Greek traditionally by terms with two roots, *\*hellen* and *\*graiik*. Occasionally they used this possibility to differentiate between the ‘classical’ idiom in highbrow texts of the educated social layers and the varieties of colloquial Greek spoken by the broad masses.

On the other hand, the Byzantines (and after the Ottoman conquest in the 15th century the Greeks respectively) named and defined themselves as *Romaioi*, ‘Romans’, not only because it was the traditional common conviction of belonging to the Roman Empire, the *Romania*, but also with the intention to express their claims to ecumenical rule. In western Europe they were called

*Graeci* (also as rejection of Roman imperial claims), whereas in the languages to the east of Byzantium the term *Romaioi* was adopted and shaped into *Rûmî*.

### **Elias Kolovos**

Assistant Professor, University of Crete

*Ottoman names for the peoples of the Greek lands in the Seyahatname of Evliya Çelebi*

My paper will discuss how the terms *Yunan* and *(U)rûm* are being used in volume VIII of the *Seyahatname* of Evliya Çelebi, written in the second half of the 17th century, in connection with the names the famous Ottoman traveller used for the peoples living in the Greek lands in general. The terms used in the *Seyahatname* will be also examined within the context of their uses more generally in the Ottoman literature.

### **Paraskevas Konortas**

Associate Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

*The ‘Ρωμαϊκόν έθνος’ in the first half of the 19th and the early 20th centuries*

The aim of my paper is to analyze the meaning of the terms *Ρωμαίος* and *έθνος*, as they exist in texts produced by the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Constantinople during the second half of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, in relation to Hellenic synonyms and Ottoman parallel terms. My analysis will also take into account the important political and ideological developments in the Ottoman Empire as well as in the Hellenic Kingdom during the period under consideration.

The Patriarchate, a fundamental institution of the Orthodox Church and at the same time an institution of the Ottoman administration, tried to adapt itself to the Tanzimat era as well as to the propagation of nationalisms in the Ottoman Empire. As a result of this effort, the Patriarchate adopts the term *έθνος* in order to designate the confessional community of the Empire, while at the same time the same term has a totally different meaning in the Greek national state. Furthermore, the Great Church continued to designate its own flock by the traditional term *Ρωμαίος/οι*, identical in meaning with the Ottoman term *Rum*, while the term *Έλλην/ες* was reserved only to the citizens of the Greek national state. Through the above mentioned terminology, the Patriarchate, remaining faithful to the Ottoman legal framework and to Ottomanism, tried to conserve the multiethnic character of its flock and to avoid its fragmentation to separate national groups. At the same time, the Ottoman leadership tried to conserve the integrity of the Empire and to avoid its fragmentation to national states.

Both parallel efforts were abortive. The Greco-Bulgarian and Greco-Ottoman conflicts as well as the strengthening of Panturkist ideals amongst the members of the Ottoman leadership contributed to the early collapse of this project at the end of the first decade of the 20th century.

### **Angeliki Konstantakopoulou**

Associate Professor, University of Ioannina

*Balkan ‘Τραικομανία’: From the γραικικόν γένος to nations*

During the late 18th - middle 19th century social and political subversions, the Balkan national denominations and their reformulating content are a well aiming outset for the investigation of the national phenomenon. Actually, the terms “Έλλην’, ‘Ρωμηός’, ‘Τραικός’, whereupon the conference focuses, mattered also for various Balkan *erudite* pioneers in the educational field or/ and in the field of commerce, the so-called ‘Τραικομάνοι’.

Issued from the historical matrix of the ‘γραικικόν γένος’ or the ‘rum millet’ after a long period of coexistence and osmosis of the Balkan peoples, they distanced themselves from their traditional milieu/mother tongue and even their groups’ designation and ardently involved themselves into modernity by getting accustomed with Greek language, bourgeois mentality and civilian way of life. When however they encountered the ongoing process of state establishment and allegiance to a national ‘consciousness’ (Bulgarian, Serb, etc.), they followed a second path to modernity: they re-estimated whatever they previously rejected, and were integrated into *their* nation state (envisioned or already established) –a process unusually complex and sometimes painful.

The ‘Τραικομανία’ paradigm illustrates that the familiarization with a Balkan national denominations is better understood, if investigated from a combinational aspect, i.e. in respect to the other(s), since its content conveys competitive *enjeux* and national programs.

### **Dimitrios M. Kontogeorgis**

Hellenic Open University and Ionian University

*Greek citizens and ‘graiкои’ raiades (reaya): National names and political questions in the Greek paroikia of Ottoman Dobrogea (1856-1878)*

The second quarter of the 19th century constituted for Ottoman Dobrogea a period of ferment and important changes. The region’s economic configuration, its demographic and social characteristics and its ‘ecclesiastical’ and national map changed often in a radical way and, almost always, painfully.

My paper aims to analyze a relatively understudied aspect of the ideological-political mutations and re-adjustments in this province, particularly the special and complex relationship between the Greeks (Hellenes), citizens of independent Greece, and those members of the Orthodox millet who identified themselves as ‘Graikoi’. The role of the Greek consular authorities, which were founded in Dobrogea at the beginning of the 1850s and became more active after the end of the Crimean War in 1856, in the political organization of the Greek paroikoi, and the formation of Greek communities there will also be examined. The stance of the Greek consuls vis-à-vis the Archbishop of Drystra, i.e. the supreme ecclesiastical authority in the region, the local elites of the Orthodox population, and the emerging Bulgarian national movement constitute another aspect of my study. Moreover, I will attempt to delineate, through a close reading of communities’ statutes, ecclesiastical documents and consular reports, the complex array of national names and identifications (Greeks, Hellenes, Orthodox, etc.) in the context of the Tanzimat and the regime change (*Metapoliteusis*) of 1862 in Greece.

The case study of the Ottoman Dobrogea can illuminate the re-adjustments of the Greek national idea, in a peripheral (concerning the Greek state) region, which was also of relatively marginal interest for the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople as well.

### **Kostas Kopanias**

Assistant Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

*Hiyawa, Achaians, Hypachaians: A case of Ethnogenesis in Cilicia during the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age?*

Within the framework of population movements in the Eastern Mediterranean during the late 13th and 12th centuries BC, several new settlements have been established in the area of *Adana(wa)* in Cilicia. The widespread use of Late Helladic IIIC pottery shows that some of those new inhabitants came from the Aegean. This archaeological evidence could perhaps be connected with the myth of *Mopsos*. A bilingual inscription in Karatepe in Cilicia mentions a king of the 9th or 7th century BC named *Awarikas*, whose family belonged to the House of *Muksas/Mopsos*. In the Phoenician version of the text his kingdom is called *Danuniyim* (a term which could be connected either with Adana or with the Danaans) and in its Luwian version *Hiyawa*, a term which could refer to the Hittite name of the Mycenaean kingdom. This term also reminds us of the *Hypachains*, who according to Herodotus lived in Cilicia.

## **Phokion Kotzageorgis**

Assistant Professor, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

*Searching for the ‘Greeks’ in Ottoman administrative sources*

Identifying the Greek subjects in the Ottoman Empire is a very difficult task. The absence of a coherent geographical area for the Greeks, which would have common cultural characteristics (language, religion, and a common historical past) was a reality throughout the Ottoman period until the establishment of the Greek nation-state. The difficulty of self-identification of Greekness was in line with the difficulty of other-definition. This difficulty, which the contemporary scholar is confronted with when he/she tries to detect the Greek identity, it was an everyday reality for the people of that era. So, we should not be surprised by the variety of meanings that such terms held in historical sources.

The Ottoman view on this issue is reflected both in narrative works of distinguished or common Ottoman authors, and in administrative sources. The latter, in theory, they (might) express the view of the Ottoman state for the Greek population. It is known that the Ottoman State, at least in its administrative terminology, separated, in principle, its subjects into Muslims and non-Muslims, a distinction crucial for tax purposes and legal reasons. It is also known that in any period of its long history the Ottoman state had non-Muslim subjects defined with just one single ethnic group. Otherwise, the Ottoman state was aware of the specific differences within the various non-Muslim groups, and this is reflected in the widespread use of terms/names, such as *Yahudi* (Jew), *Ermeni* (Armenian), *Rum* (Greek).

Through the study of a representative sample of Ottoman administrative sources (imperial orders, court records, tax registers), my paper seeks, initially, to crystallize the terms/names used in order to designate Greek populations within the framework of the large group of non-Muslims. Then it aspires to identify or to propose any variations in Ottoman terminology used either for Greeks themselves, or for other non-Muslim subjects. The sample consists of documents deriving from a wide range of time between the 15th and the 18th century, in order to investigate any temporal incisions in the process of the definition of the Greeks *per se*.

## **Ioannis Koubourlis**

Assistant Professor, University of Crete

*National identity, national character and national narrative: The interpretation of the history of the Greek nation from the Enlightenment to Historismus*

The transition from the Enlightenment to *Historismus*, symbolically from the *national narrative* associated with Koraes to that associated with Zambelios and Paparrigopoulos, could be interpreted as a process of *depoliticisation* of the meaning of being ‘Greek’. More specifically a

*decontamination* of any evaluative contexts took place, which in the end allowed for the inclusion of all historical phases of the Greek national past (without any hierarchy between them) in a single and indivisible history spanning 3.000 years.

From the time of Gibbon and Choiseul-Gouffier –not to mention earlier times, where the conflict between the Christian East and the West gave strictly religious connotations to any such debate– the terms *Hellene*, *Grekos* and *Romios* were accompanied by value judgments which largely determined their historiographical uses. We are in fact referring to a state of things inherited from both the European and the Modern Greek Enlightenments to the generation that took over the task of defending the Revolution of 1821 historiographically, thus producing a much needed model of the national narrative for the rebelled nation and the then under establishment national state.

The philhellenic historiography concerning 1821 gave us the first synthetic historical writings concerning the whole national past of the Greeks; in this way occasionally distinguishing the aforementioned concepts and then locating them in historical time. Nevertheless philhellenic historiography could not be separated from criticism as to whether modern Greeks deserve the name of their ancestors or whether they ought to be called somehow differently because it remained a largely *militant* historiography and thus evaluatively charged.

It is interesting though that an even more militant historiography, that of the Zambelios and Paparrigopoulos school of historiography, is the one that will attempt to depoliticize these concepts and drain them from their values and their content. The ultimate aim would be to appropriate all these concepts, even go as far as assimilate them, the very same way as we would do with all historical periods of the national past regardless of political connotations. Therefore, the ancient city-states would not be the only ones considered Greek, but also all the regimes, which succeeded them, be it monarchical or despotic, like the Macedonian and the Byzantine kingdoms, which also came to be considered Greek.

## **Andreas Lyberatos**

Assistant Professor, Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences

*Rums, Greeks and Gagauzes in 19th century Bulgaria: Classification, Re-Signification, Self-Understanding*

On the basis of various case studies from the region of Late Ottoman and autonomous Bulgaria (19th - early 20th century), I will sketch a theoretical and methodological approach to the question of ‘ethnonyms’ and their evolution during the transition from the pre-modern Ottoman era to the modern Balkan nation-states. Emphasis will be placed on collective representations, related, one way or another, to the Greek nation and nationalism.

## **Irak Malkin**

Professor, Tel Aviv University

### *Mediterranean networks and the emergence of Hellenic identities*

Greek civilization and identity crystallized not when Greeks were close together but when they came to be far apart. It emerged during the Archaic period when Greeks founded coastal city states and trading stations in ever widening horizons, from the Ukraine to Spain. No center directed their diffusion and the settlements (‘colonies’) originated from a multitude of mother cities. The ‘Greek center’ was virtual, at sea, created as a back-ripple effect of cultural convergence following the physical divergence of independent settlements. Overall, and regardless of distance, settlement practices became Greek in the making and Greek communities far more resembled each other than any of their particular neighbors, such as the Etruscans, Iberians, Scythians, or Libyans. The contrast between ‘center and periphery’ hardly mattered (all was *peri-*, ‘around’), nor was a bi-polar contrast with Barbarians of much significance. Rather, Greek civilization not only constituted a *de-centralized network*, it emerged, so I claim, owing to its network attributes. It was the ‘small World’ network-dynamics that rapidly foreshortened connectivity thus allowing the flows of civilizational content and self-aware notions of identity to overlap and proliferate.

## **Ikaros Mantouvalos**

Assistant Professor, Democritus University of Thrace

### *Perception of the collective self in a world of paroikoi: A matter of words?*

In the field of historical sociology, the search for the way in which the terms of a nationalist ideology (e.g. meanings, patterns and categories) were created and recreated is the *sine qua non* of a critical investigation of nationalism in historical time and place. Given the western European origin of the nationalist ideology, words such as *ἔθνος*, *nazione*, *natio* and *nation* were re-invested with a new meaning and re-baptized with new content after the late 18th century, in the context of the political adjustments and ideological priorities of the Enlightenment. Words, even when they are not new, can acquire new meanings within the chronological limits of modernism.

In the case of modern Greece, in the late 18th century the gaps left by the terms ‘Τραικός’, ‘Ἔνος’, ‘Ρωμῆός’, which referred to the composition of the nation, were covered to a large degree by the historical term ‘Ἕλληνας’. Studies of recent decades confirm the multiformity and multiplicity of identities, especially during a period, such as that of the Modern Greek Enlightenment (Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment), in which concepts and words began to be uttered

and shaped politically, but dipped in a complex web of historical significance. Regarding the world of the paroikoi (18th-early 19th century), the mapping of identities and the decoding of collective determinants (Γραικός, Ρωμιός, Ἕλληνας, Βλάχος, μη ουνίτες, ρωμαίοι, ἔθνος, nicht unierte Griechen, Greci, nazione greca, Griechen, Wallachen, Görögök, Olah etc.) came up against a dead end, generated by the polysemy of the written word (Greek language or foreign language, public or private) that was produced each time under different social and political conditions in host societies (Trieste, Livorno, Vienna, Pest, Miskolc, Braşov, Sibiu, etc.). The constitutions and regulations of collective bodies (communities, brotherhoods, companies), (ecclesiastical, state, community) administrative documents, letters, reports and texts by members of an intellectual political and social elite reveal different meanings and perceptions of terms that echo collective entities in multinational, non-Ottoman environments. The degree to which the disposition for self-knowledge is realized on the part of the paroikoi (and indeed which paroikoi?) and the language as evidence, certain or not, of the search for an identity, are just two of the issues considered in my paper.

### **Sophia Mergiali-Sachas**

Associate Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

*Collective and personalized identities of Byzantine intellectuals as a synonym of survival in the 14th century*

The term ‘Greek’, as a distinctive and permanent cultural ingredient of the Byzantine identity, made its initial course through the works of Byzantine intellectuals during the 11th, 12th and 13th centuries, aiming mainly at projecting the cultural superiority of the Byzantines *vis-à-vis* that of the Latins. From the beginning of the 14th century, with the loss of Asia Minor and the turn of the formerly robust Byzantine Empire into a minute and declining Hellenic state, the term ‘Greek’ defines unequivocally and reaffirms the new collective national-cultural identity of the Byzantine intellectuals, who seem to be delving into their Hellenic identity and adopting their identification with their glorious ancient Greek past as a means of shelter and comfort and a counterbalancing basis to the sufferings and instabilities of their times. To this kind of collective identity it would be significant to juxtapose the personalized identity taken during the second part of the 14th century by the leading intellectual and politician Demetrios Kydonis, who conscientiously adopted a religious identity that entailed the forsaking Orthodoxy and the adoption of Roman Catholicism as his confession.

## **Angel Nicolaou-Konnari**

Associate Professor, University of Cyprus

*‘Ὅλος ο τόπος ἦτον γεμάτος Ῥωμαίοι’ (‘All the country was full of Greeks’): Indices of self-perception and the perception of the Other and Identity/ies in Latin-ruled Cyprus (1191-1571)*

Language communication is a principal medium for the diffusion of cultural traits and provides an important clue for assessing the dynamics of the mechanisms of cultural transfer and interaction as well as of the complex processes of the formation of national/ethnic or collective/local identities. As language is the product of identifiable cultural and historical development and history an active agent in the social and ethnic construction of language, the linguistic consciousness of a group is formed within specific social and historical settings and it determines to a large extent its identity. The four centuries of the history of Cyprus under Frankish and Venetian rule (1191-1571) provide the chronological and socio-historical framework for both the development of the medieval Cypriot dialect, which bears most of the traits of the modern one, and the process of the formation of the Cypriot local and collective identity (degree of *Romanity* or participation in the Byzantine *oecumene*), a sensitive and complex issue that persists until today.

Taking as a starting point the words of a fifteenth-century Cypriot, Leontios Machairas, my paper aims to investigate the use of indices of collective (Hellene / Romaios / Graikos) and local (Kyprios / Kypriotes / Kypraios) identifications by the Greeks of Cyprus as well as those of alterity (i.e. self-perception in terms of the perception of the *Other*) that describe Greeks who do not come from Cyprus (Romanites / Kalamaras / toponymic adjectives) and Cypriots who are not Greeks (Frank / Latin / Syrian / Armenian / Kypriotis / local) in an effort to trace continuities/discontinuities in the perception of their identity. Although the different ethnic and social groups of the Cypriot population are not equally represented in the available written sources, this study is based on the working hypothesis that particular instances of language use or textuality incorporate cultural attitudes and social prejudices, and that the linguistic markings of group awareness and alterity define the history and origins of a group and incorporate many of the component elements of the identity of its members and of the *Others*.

## **Georgios Pallis**

Lecturer, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

*‘The ones who raised me up, the Orthodox genos of Romeoi’: Statements of identity in post-Byzantine inscriptions*

Epigraphy offers precious material for the study of the question of identity in the period after the fall of Constantinople. Following a long-established tradition, numerous inscriptions carved

on stone or painted on frescoes continued to memorialize personal or collective acts of donation, especially in church buildings. These publicly exposed texts hold, by means of their very nature, the character of a formal statement, and so the identities mentioned on them acquire the status of an official declaration. My paper will present several examples of post-Byzantine inscriptions with references of this kind, in order to highlight the diffusion, the form and the meaning of such statements. The most interesting case is found in the group of inscriptions that were carved in the Holy Sepulcher at Jerusalem in 1810 to commemorate the end of the large scale renovation of the building complex, which had been undertaken by the Greek Orthodox –‘the Orthodox genos of Romeoi’.

### **Anastasia Papadia-Lala**

Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

*The ‘Greci’ in the Greek-Venetian world (13th-18th centuries): The discourse of multiple authorities*

During the long period of Venetian rule over Greek lands (13th to 18th centuries), the most common definition of the indigenous populations, irrespective of their social status, was that of *Greci*. This was a term that encapsulated a number of significations and referred to a composite web of identities (pertaining both to religious and/or secular, based on geographic origin, common language, cultural backgrounds). My paper will examine the use of this term as a self-determinative/hetero-determinative in texts produced at various levels, both by central Venetian and local authorities (reports by Venetian officials, statutes of the communities, *embassies*, along with notary documents, etc.). Simultaneously, an attempt will be made to point to its semantic equivalence with specific collectivities evident within the Greek-Venetian world. The derivatives of the term *Greco*, as well as its associations with the terms *Hellene* and *Romeos*, sometimes used alternatively and sometimes not, will also be discussed. Last but not least, the use of the term *Greco* and its derivatives will be examined in connection with perceptions of belonging to a ‘Greek continuity’ and with the politico-ideological environment in the Venetian-Greek regions.

### **Theodora Papadopoulou**

PhD in Byzantine History, Ionian University

*The names Roman, Hellen and Graikos in the Middle Byzantine period*

My paper focuses on the terms *Roman*, *Hellen* and *Graikos* and attempts to explain their use as names. Their meaning is presented mainly through the scholarly literature of the Middle Byzantine period. The goal is to examine the question whether these names manifest a collective

identity. The same goal leads to the examination of the collective terms *nation (ethnos)*, *genos* and *fylon/fyle*. Furthermore, a brief reference to Latin sources of the same period is made, in order to compare and juxtapose the use and meaning of these names in question by the Western nations, with whom Byzantines developed close relations. It should be borne in mind that in the course of time these relations varied from collaboration and alliance to rivalry and conflict.

### **Dimitris Pavlopoulos**

Associate Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

*The ‘Greekness’ in Modern Greek sculpture*

The problem of the ‘Greekness’ –the word in quotation marks– in Modern Greek Sculpture is considered to be complicated in the historiography of History of Modern Art in Greece. Due to the opinion of some scholars, we cannot discuss the meaning of the ‘Greekness’ only in the iconographical way of interpretation. Did sculptors in Greece consciously create Greek works? What is finally the real problem?

### **Nikolas Pissis**

Research Fellow, Freie Universität Berlin

*Distinctions and ambiguities: Collective identifications in the Orthodox world of the 17th century*

Claiming that the construction of social groups, and accordingly of the collective identifications that distinguish and define them, is connected to the dimension of otherness –i.e. to the importance of a distinct, not necessarily hostile environment– is not original. Collective identifications of the self and the other emerge, are being modified or re-defined when the position of a group is not (anymore) obvious, when the familiar categories become non-functional. The vivid research on the formation of collective identities in the Greek Diaspora, especially in the 18th century, usually sets out from this methodological starting point and highlights the condition and the context of Diaspora communities as opposed to those of the Ottoman homelands, in order to illuminate the complex character of pertinent processes.

In this paper the field of study is defined by two choices that determine the problems and questions involved. On the one hand, the temporal focus on the 17th century, i.e. on a pre-national context, but additionally before the transformations of the following century, which concern the extension of the Romaic/Greek/Hellenic identity in terms of a cultural capital or even a social/professional category. Furthermore, a period, in which confessionalization processes bring about efforts to redefine the notion of a compact Orthodox world. On the other hand, the geographical focus on environments of Orthodox confessional dominance, where

Orthodox ethnic groups co-existed, e.g. the Athos monasteries, the Danubian Principalities and Russia: environments, where religious/confessional distinctions between them do not function; instead, emerging tensions, ruptures and ethnic stereotypes are where the main interest really lies in. My paper aims to highlight the functional character of pre-national collective identifications and to help thus interpret explicit distinctions as well as ambiguities revealed in the sources concerning contents and meanings connoted in the terms *Romaios/Greek/Hellene*.

## **Spyridon G. Ploumidis**

Assistant Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

*The Great Idea and the foundations of the Greek national ideology in the 19th century*

The Constitutional Assembly of 1843-1844 entailed a great deal of soul-searching. First and foremost, the speech of Ioannis Kolettis (a veteran leader of the Revolution of 1821), which was delivered on 14 January 1844, has been identified as the dominant discourse of the Great Idea (*Megali Idea*). Historians have interpreted Kolettis' discourse as purely cultural: Greater Greece aimed at the 'regeneration' and the 'enlightenment' of the Near East. Yet, a closer look at this historical speech reveals that the exact meaning and the main aim of 'the great idea of our homeland' (as Kolettis phrased it) was the national liberation of fellow-Greeks and, 'more generally speaking', of all the Orthodox Christians that lived in the Near East. Kolettis argued further that the programme of the Great Idea was, more or less, the sequence of the Revolution of 1821, and drew on the ideas of Rigas Velestinlis (1757-1798), the most eminent political thinker and revolutionary hero of the Modern Greek Enlightenment, who suffered his death in the hands of the Turks.

In the event, Kolettis maintained that he and his fellow comrades has sworn on the liberation of all fellow-Greeks and fellow-Orthodox, yet 'certain unfortunate events' (alluding to the European diplomacy) constrained Greece within its 'delimited boundaries'. The veteran revolutionary leader illustrated the cleavage between the 'nation' and the 'Greek race' on the one hand, and 'Greece' (i.e. the Greek nation-state) on the other. At the time, this gap had been aggravated by the bitter clash between the native (*autochthones*) and the immigrant (*eterochthones*) members of the National Assembly. The resolution of the question of *eterochthones* by means of a constitutional law in March 1844 certainly contributed to national unity and the consolidation of Greek identity. Yet, Kolettis' discourse looked further beyond this internal division of Greek society: the 'General Agenda' of his 'Great Idea' transcended Greek borders, and highlighted the territorial cum cultural broadness of Hellenism. Greece of 1844 was, in his own words, lagging far behind 'Greece' of 1821 in 'this great idea of the homeland' and the latter's broad agenda. What is more, Kolettis' oration was not, by any means, an

exception or a novelty, but it squared fully with the orations of other parliamentary speakers, who equally emphasized the ‘small’ or ‘great’, ‘entire’ and ‘great’ aspects of Hellenism.

### **Marinos Sariyannis**

Principal Researcher, Institute for Mediterranean Studies/Foundation for Research and Technology - Hellas

*Images of ancient Greeks in Ottoman literary sources before the 19th century*

My paper will focus on the perception of the ancient Greek past by Ottoman Turkish literary sources before the Greek Revolution and the Tanzimat period. After a short survey of some folk traditions on various ancient or Byzantine monuments, the building of Constantinople and of Aghia Sophia, and so forth, my paper will examine in more detail the inception of ancient philosophers (Plato, Aristotle) or other personalities (Alexander the Great) by the Ottomans and their Islamic philosophic tradition. The major part of the paper will analyze some Ottoman accounts of ancient Greek history, from a mythical history of Hungary (mid-sixteenth century) to a series of general world histories dated from the mid-seventeenth up to the late-eighteenth centuries. These accounts reveal an original mixture of Islamic and European traditions on ancient Greece. Special emphasis will be placed on the ethnonyms used by these sources: the most common term for ancient Greeks was the Arabic *Yunan*; *Rum* usually designates ancient Rome, but also occasionally Greece.

### **Francesco Scalora**

PhD University of Palermo, Post-Doctoral Fellow, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

*Greek-Albanian colonies in Sicily, 15th -19th centuries: Identity and interpretation issues of the term ‘Graecus/Greco’ in the Statutes of Foundation (Capitoli di Fondazione) of the Greek-Albanian communities of Sicily*

My paper poses questions and formulates hypotheses with the purpose of analyzing the use of the term ‘Graecus/Greco’ in the Statutes of Foundation (*Capitoli di Fondazione*) of the Greek-Albanians communities of Sicily.

These communities were founded by Albanians, Arvanites (who had already been settled in Greek territory, about two hundred years before their migration to Sicily) and Greeks. Their settlement in Sicily chronologically is limited in the period from 1482 to 1534. Other waves of immigration are recorded around the second half of the 17th century.

This population, which, thanks to the decisions of the Council of Florence, was initially considered as Catholic by the authorities of Rome, later (in the late 16th century), due to the Catholic Reforms, lost its Orthodox dogma, preserving only the ‘Byzantine Rite’ in the religious ceremonies (i.e. the language and the rite of the Greek Orthodox Church).

The inhabitants of these communities were called (until the mid-19th century) ‘Greci’ (Greeks) –a term that indicates and their religious identity– or ‘Albanesi’ (Albanians), or, like today, ‘Arbëreshë’. The use of these terms synthesizes the double ethnic nature of this population. However, from the end of the 17th century and mostly from the beginning of the 18th century, a gradual process of De-Hellenization of these communities began, to the benefit of their Albanian component.

It is worth noting, moreover, that the Italian historiography (with only few exceptions) began to identify (from the beginning of the 20th century onwards) the population of these communities as ‘Albanesi’ (Albanians), considering that the term ‘*Graecus*’ identifies only a religious identity and not an ethnic one.

## **Alexandra Sfoini**

Associate Researcher, Institute of Historical Research, National Hellenic Research Foundation

*‘Authentic Greeks’ – ‘unworthy of the Greek name’: Identities of Greeks during the Revolution of 1821*

It is a matter of fact that the use of the name ‘Hellenes’ becomes generalized in official documents during the Revolution of 1821, although terms such as ‘Romaioi’ and ‘Graikoi’ are still in use particularly in private correspondence. However, what is the content of the name ‘Hellenes’? We suggest that we can discern, generally speaking, two meanings which correspond to two different identities, images and self-images of the revolutionary Greeks:

A. The Greeks as a collective body and a nation, as ‘authentic Greeks’, which means ideal descendants of their glorious ancestors, according to their rediscovery by the Enlightenment, and also good Christians, heroic fighters for the independence of Greece, citizens of the newly founded Greek state and worthy members of the European family.

B. The Greeks as ‘Romioi’ (even though this term is actually not used) as ‘unworthy of the Greek name’, geographically or politically divided, having all the flaws bequeathed to them by their long-standing slavery.

My paper will examine the lexical and semantic field of the term ‘Hellenes’ during the Revolution of 1821 in various texts of this period: official documents, correspondence, pamphlets, books and the press.

### **Niketas Siniossoglou**

Associate Researcher, Institute of Historical Research, National Hellenic Research Foundation

*Philosophy and Modern Greek identity, 19th-20th centuries*

Modern Greek identity attracted the interest of philosophers Kostas Axelos and Panagiotis Kondylis, who wrote important essays on the topic. Still, the discussion has a long –albeit neglected– history that may be summarized as a clash between essentialist and anti-essentialist approaches to Greek identity. Essentialist approaches thought to have uncovered in Hellenism a metaphysical entity and a more or less immutable core traversing the flux of history. Still, it was the anti-essentialist approaches that prevailed: though historically accurate, they sidestepped the philosophical dimension of the problem by tacitly assuming that Hellenic identity is a fluid social construction, constantly mitigated by socio-economic shifts. My thesis is that both approaches are vulnerable from the viewpoint of the history of ideas, insofar as they fail to take into account the permanent tension between Greek philosophy and Orthodoxy. Consequently, to think today about Greek identity as a philosophical problem is to move at once beyond naïve essentialism, as well as beyond the assumptions of social and cultural history.

### **Dimitris Stamatopoulos**

Associate Professor, University of Macedonia

*On the monarchies of the Greeks and the Romans: Daniel's prophecies in the work of a teacher at the Greek School of Melnik in the early 19th century*

My paper will focus on how Greek and Roman history was perceived as sections of the ‘Introduction into Global History’ written in 1815 by Konstantinos Nikolaou, a teacher at the Greek School in Melnik, in the form of a questions and answers ‘for first-year students, especially those studying Greek’. Nikolaou’s introduction is constructed on the model of Daniel’s prophecies; in other words, it segments world history into four parts, with the only exception that the Babylonians’ place is taken therein by the Assyrians and that it is preceded by Jewish history (thus rendering Nikolaou’s form quintipartite) and followed by the history of the Turkish monarchs, which actually is considered as a continuation of the Roman monarchy. The studying of the ideological processes in Nikolaou’s historiographical approach provides interesting information about a world that was then on the brink of the 1821 Revolution as well as about a region especially close to the Ottoman capital, wherein Greek letters were flourishing, especially during the time of Metropolitan Anthimos of Melnik (1796-1820).

## **George Tolia**

Research Director, Institute of Historical Research, National Hellenic Research Foundation, and  
Directeur d'études, École pratique des hautes études,

*Territory, Ancestry and Humanistic Geography, 15th-18th centuries*

Together with historiography, Humanists made ample use of comparative antiquarian geography in order to specify the historical cultural bonds that identified the early modern nations.

Early modern geography was shaped under the wing of Greek geographers of the imperial Roman era, especially Ptolemy and Strabo, but also by minor geography handbooks of late antiquity. Understanding modern spatiality through the Roman imperial patterns was part of a vast programme of transcendences that aimed to reactivate a shared imperial legacy and to convert the varied ethno-cultural areas into spaces of power. Humanistic geography proposed a comprehensive and structured system of representation by which ethno-cultural collective bodies were associated to their historical national territories.

The aim of my paper is to trace the transcendence from the notion of ‘Greeks’ to that of ‘Greece’ and to assess its shaping and standardization within the continuum of humanist geographical traditions. The paper focuses mostly on (a) the successive layers of meaning added on the definitions of Greece, at time when humanism proceeded to a more complex perception of historical phenomena; and (b) the responses of Greek geographers to the pertinent discussions.

## **Yorgos Tzedopoulos**

PhD in Early Modern Greek History, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Research Associate, Modern Greek History Research Centre, Academy of Athens

*‘Christian’, ‘Muslim’, ‘Greek’, ‘Turk’: Some thoughts on the negotiation of collective identities in the 17th century on the example of Panagiotakis Nikousios’ *Dialexis* with Vani efendi.*

The *Dialexis* (disputation) of the grand dragoman Panagiotakis Nikousios with the preacher Vani efendi, dated 1662, falls within the traditional genre of Greek polemical literature against Islam. Its particular importance lies in that it sheds some light on procedures of identity elaboration and conflict between representatives of the Muslim and Orthodox elites of the Ottoman Empire within their historical context, that is, at a time of generalized crisis and emergence of messianic expectations. Whether authentic or apocryphal, as it has variably been claimed, the *Dialexis* had a considerable dissemination among the Greek-speaking Christians since the late 17th century, a fact largely due to its being written in a simple, accessible language.

My paper will analyze the conceptions and functions of collective identity in the *Dialexis* not as the simple ideological imprints of a politico-religious order, but as dynamic categories with

specific objectives. Departing from this analysis, I will proceed to the examination of a wider scope of texts and sources of the same period, in order to detect similar fields of dialogic and/or confrontational negotiation of collective identity, religious and ethnic, in other levels of social interaction among Christians and Muslims.

The 17th-century crisis of the Ottoman Empire was marked by the short-lived yet influential imposition of Islamic zealotism on Ottoman official policies, on the one hand, and by the emergence of a new European balance of power, on the other. I will argue that this period was pivotal for the development of the non-Muslims into ‘minorities’ and for the eventual emergence of ‘national’ collectivities. I will also attempt to highlight some aspects of this process that are related to the shaping and the consolidation of collective social identities.

## **Panos Valavanis**

Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens

*Ancient Greeks and Panhellenic conscience in the Panhellenic sanctuaries*

Although ancient Greeks constituted a unified nation, they were politically divided into many small city-states with steady commercial, financial and social relations. However, they were continuously at war with one another, either for the control of border lands or in their pursuit of Panhellenic rule.

Panhellenic sanctuaries (Olympia, Delphi, Isthmia and Nemea), places for contact and common action for Greeks, were also used as places of open antagonism and political conflict. This conflict first appeared at the end of the 8th century B.C., with the exhibition of the defeated enemies’ arms as trophies. Accordingly, a broader political and an ideological agenda lies behind the works of the great architecture and sculpture, which followed in later periods. These works were devoted to the gods as an expression of piety, but at the same time they constituted forms of public display. These images depicted great events in collective memory and functioned as a means of projecting messages of power and political influence of individuals, families and city-states.

In latest research works, the immediate place and visual contingency of the dedications is especially underlined; the aim was to underline the strongest possible conflict between opposing cities. In the big sanctuaries there was a continuous struggle between Panhellenic and local. This double nature seems contradictory because the peacemaking and the unifying role of sanctuaries has been over-emphasized in former research. Today, everything is interpreted through the antagonistic character of ancient Greeks, which was expressed in the same manner in war, and on the athletic and artistic level.

Therefore, despite their common cultural features, ancient Greeks were more Athenians, Spartans, Thebans or Corinthians and less Greeks. Their local political identity was so powerful

that it could never approach and captivate the limits of Panhellenic consciousness. Their cultural unity, i.e. their Greekness, was to a large extent expressed through the need for confrontation. Panhellenism in Ancient Greece was more of a conflicting nature than that of synthesis.

## **Elpida Vogli**

Assistant Professor, Democritus University of Thrace

*The Greeks and the Others: Citizenship and national identity during the War of Independence*

Shortly after the outbreak of hostilities in 1821, the definition of Greek identity was placed anew at the forefront of the Greek debates. Since then the basis of all possible definitions of ‘Greekness’ was provided by the theory which held that nations were collective entities, discerned by empirically ascertainable characteristics and had the supreme political right of self-government. This theory led to the identification of nation with state, which was safeguarded in the proclamation of Greek independence and transferred the sovereignty to the one and indivisible Greek nation –in other words, to all Greek citizens. As a consequence, the legislation concerning citizenship reflected not so much the effort to define and protect the rights of the emergent society of Greek citizens but rather the quest to define the identity of modern Greeks.

Greek citizenship, as an institution and moreover as the legal formalization of the criteria required for a Greek identity, was closely linked with the needs that arose during the ongoing war of Independence; more particularly, it was linked to the necessity to define the Greek identity of people who were fighting on the battlefields and through them the ‘Greekness’ of those who had been born and had always lived in Greek regions, and, ultimately, of the state they wanted to found. Under these extraordinary circumstances, every conceivable criterion of ‘Greekness’ was projected onto the relevant provisions of Greek law, in order to avoid exclusions of ‘Greeks by descent’ –since the ‘imaginary domain’ of the Greek nation did not coincide with the regions in revolt– and exclude the Muslim native inhabitants of the same regions, who were the enemies in the theatre of war at the time.

My paper examines Greek citizenship and identity during the War of Independence, and looks closer into the relationship between these two and discerns the ways they influenced each other. It also explores the way Greek policy on these issues was increasingly adapted to the diplomatic need for international recognition of the new state, as the revolutionary war came closer to its end. Moreover, it investigates how the emergent Greek society of citizens, which still held the main characteristics of a Christian community that had developed historically between the East and the West, was connected on the one hand to the Christian Diaspora, mostly spread out throughout the Ottoman Empire, and on the other hand to the large and thriving Greek communities in various European cities, which had resulted from the sporadic mass migrations in the past centuries.

## **Ioannis Zelepos**

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität Munich

*‘Ellinikon Genos’ and ‘Ellinismos’ in the religious discourse on the eve of the Greek Revolution (late 18th century to 1821)*

Since the 18th century the term ‘Ellin’ with its derivatives experienced semantic changes under which it evolved from a traditional hetero-designation with a predominantly religious meaning into a collective self-designation with an almost exclusively national meaning. This development was closely linked to the Modern Greek Enlightenment and is justifiably considered to be even a crucial manifestation of it. Regarding ‘the’ Church, i.e. the contemporary bearers of Ottoman-Orthodox discourse, former scholarly works put them virtually at the antipodes of this development, by emphasizing their usually fierce reactions against Enlightenment in the spirit of a pronounced religious traditionalism.

My paper will investigate usages and attributions of the terms ‘Ellinikon genos’ and ‘Ellinismos’ in such texts that originated from the circle of the Kollyvades. The related contradictions and ambiguities will be examined under the prism of perception of ideas beyond the rather simplistic hermeneutical scheme of ‘enlightenment’ vs. ‘counter-enlightenment’. Finally, influences of the religious discourse on the formation of Greek national terminology in the period of independence will be considered.



**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS  
(SPEAKERS AND CHAIRS)**

Sophia Aneziri, Assistant Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
sanez@arch.uoa.gr

Eleni Angelomati-Tsougaraki, Professor Emerita, Ionian University, eangel@ionio.gr

Konstantinos Buraselis, Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
kburasel@arch.uoa.gr

Irene Chrestou, Associate Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
ichres@arch.uoa.gr

Evangelos Chrysos, Professor Emeritus, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
evchrysos@gmail.com

Lidia Cotovanu, PhD École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Post-Doctoral Fellow,  
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, lcotovanu@yahoo.com

Nadia Danova, Professor, Institute of Balkan Studies, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences,  
nadiadnv@yahoo.com

Tudor Dinu, Associate Professor, University of Bucharest, tudordinu@hotmail.com

Maria Dourou-Eliopoulou, Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
mdourou@arch.uoa.gr

Maria Efthymiou, Associate Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
mefthim@arch.uoa.gr

Costas Gaganakis, Associate Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
cgagan@arch.uoa.gr

Katerina Gardikas, Associate Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
kgardika@arch.uoa.gr

Effi Gazi, Associate Professor, University of Peloponnese, egazi@hol.gr

Paris Gounaridis, Professor Emeritus, University of Thessaly, pgounar@uth.gr

Anastassia Hamatsou, PhD History of Political Science, Panteion University of Social and Political  
Sciences, Research Associate, University of Cyprus, aha@ucy.ac.cy

Ioannis K. Hassiotis, Professor Emeritus, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, ihass@hist.auth.gr

Evanthis Hatzivassiliou, Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
xevanthis@arch.uoa.gr

Anthony Kaldellis, Professor, Ohio State University, kaldellis.1@osu.edu

Vangelis Karamanolakis, Assistant Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
karamanolaki@arch.uoa.gr

Olga Katsiardi-Hering, Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
olkats@arch.uoa.gr

Tonia Kioussopoulou, Professor, University of Crete, kiousopoulou@uoc.gr

Johannes Koder, Professor Emeritus, Universität Wien, Johannes.Koder@oeaw.ac.at

Elias Kolovos, Assistant Professor, University of Crete, ekolovos1@gmail.com

Paraskevas Konortas, Associate Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
pakonort@gmail.com

Angeliki Konstantakopoulou, Associate Professor, University of Ioannina, aconstan@uoi.gr

Katerina Konstantinidou, Assistant Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
kkonstantin@arch.uoa.gr

Dimitrios M. Kontogeorgis, Hellenic Open University and Ionian University,  
kontogeorgisd@yahoo.com

Kostas Kopanias, Assistant Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
kkopanias@arch.uoa.gr

Phokion Kotzageorgis, Assistant Professor, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki,  
phokion@hist.auth.gr

Ioannis Koubourlis, Assistant Professor, University of Crete, koumpi@social.soc.uoc.gr

Dimitra Lampropoulou, Lecturer, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
dlamprop@arch.uoa.gr

Andreas Lyberatos, Assistant Professor, Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences,  
lyberatos@gmail.com

Irada Malkin, Professor, Tel Aviv University, malkin.irad@gmail.com

Ikaros Mantouvalos, Assistant Professor, Democritus University of Thrace, ikmadou@yahoo.gr

Sophia Mergiali-Sachas, Associate Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
smergiali@arch.uoa.gr

Angel Nicolaou-Konnari, Associate Professor, University of Cyprus, an.konnaris@cytanet.com.cy

Katerina Nikolaou, Associate Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
anikolaou@arch.uoa.gr

Georgios Pallis, Lecturer, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, gpallis@arch.uoa.gr

Anastasia Papadia-Lala, Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
apapadia@arch.uoa.gr

Theodora Papadopoulou, PhD in Byzantine History, Ionian University,  
doretta@papadopoulou@yahoo.gr

Maria Papatheanassiou, Assistant Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
mpapath@arch.uoa.gr

Dimitris Pavlopoulos, Associate Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
dempavl@arch.uoa.gr

Nikolas Pissis, Research Fellow, Freie Universität Berlin, npissis@hotmail.com

Spyridon G. Ploumidis, Assistant Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
sploumid@arch.uoa.gr

Marinos Sariyannis, Principal Researcher, Institute for Mediterranean Studies/Foundation for  
Research and Technology - Hellas, sariyannis@ims.forth.gr

Francesco Scalora, PhD University of Palermo, Post-Doctoral Fellow, National and Kapodistrian  
University of Athens, ventunesimo.fs@libero.it

Vasso Seirinidou, Assistant Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
vseirinid@arch.uoa.gr

Alexandra Sfoini, Associate Researcher, Institute of Historical Research, National Hellenic  
Research Foundation, alexsfin@eie.gr

Niketas Siniosoglou, Associate Researcher, Institute of Historical Research, National Hellenic  
Research Foundation, nsinios@eie.gr

Dimitris Stamatopoulos, Associate Professor, University of Macedonia, ds@uom.gr

George Tolia, Research Director, Institute of Historical Research, National Hellenic Research  
Foundation, and Directeur d'études, École pratique des hautes études, gtolia@eie.gr

Yorgos Tzedopoulos, PhD in Early Modern Greek History, National and Kapodistrian University  
of Athens, Research Associate, Modern Greek History Research Centre, Academy of  
Athens, tzedoy@gmail.com

Panos Valavanis, Professor, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, pval@arch.uoa.gr

Elpida Vogli, Assistant Professor, Democritus University of Thrace, harrist@hol.gr

Ioannis Zelepos, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität Munich, ioannis.zelepos@lmu.de



Front-page image:

Ed. Dodwell, *Views in Greece*, 1819

Courtesy of *Travelogues* Digital Archive – Aikerini Laskaridis Foundation