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This dissertation research combines archival data and historical methods and analyzes how schooling and education in Greece between 1834 and 1913 sought to shape a Greek national identity. The goal of this project is to present a historical analysis, that has thus far been absent from scholarship on the subject, and to convey how the adoption of a common national history in Greece, with roots to ancient Greece, assisted in the shaping of a Greek national identity. The timeframe this project examines is significant because it covers an important portion of Modern Greek history. The beginning of the modern state of Greece and the opening of the first Greek schools occurred in 1834, while 1913 represents the end of the Balkan Wars and the expansion of Greek schools and a Greek identity into newly claimed parts of Greece. The years between 1834 and 1913 were a time of major social, political, and cultural changes in the state of Greece that helped to facilitate the formation of a Modern Greek national identity.

Greek government legislation, textbooks, teacher’s manuals, curriculum guidelines, opinions, and other writings from and about this time period, provide the historical, social and cultural contexts analyzed in this dissertation. By focusing on these archival materials, this project contributes to the history of education, cultural and educational policy studies, comparative and international education, national identity formation, Modern Greek history and more broadly, European history.
CHAPTER ONE
OUR PAST, OUR FUTURE

We confront one another armored in identities whose likeness we ignore or disown and whose differences we distort or invent to emphasize our own superior worth.

--David Lowenthal

Overview

This dissertation research combines archival data and historical methods and analyzes how schooling and education in Greece between 1834 and 1913 sought to shape a Greek national identity. The goal of this project is to present a historical analysis, that has thus far been absent from scholarship on the subject, and to convey how the adoption of a common national history in Greece, with roots to ancient Greece, assisted in shaping a Greek national identity. The timeframe this project examines is significant because it covers an important portion of Modern Greek history. The beginning of the modern state of Greece and the opening of the first Greek schools occurred in 1834, while 1913 represents the end of the Balkan Wars and the expansion of Greek schools and a Greek identity into newly claimed parts of Greece. The years between 1834 and 1913 were a time of major social, political and cultural changes in the state of Greece that helped to facilitate the formation of a Modern Greek national identity.

Greek government legislation, textbooks, teacher’s manuals, curriculum guidelines, opinions and other writings from and about this time period, provide the
historical, social and cultural contexts analyzed in this dissertation. By focusing on these archival materials, this project contributes to the history of education, cultural and educational policy studies, comparative and international education, national identity formation, Modern Greek history and more broadly, European history. Thus this dissertation speaks to several audiences, historians on Modern Greece, students of nationalism and nation state formation, and scholars from various disciplines interested in national identity formation through education.

Statement of Problem

The early 21st century has been marked by a resurgence of nationalism in many parts of the world, suggesting that the formation of national identities is in need of serious re-examination. Among other examples, the increasing number of disputes over ownership of cultural property suggests that modern nations are actively competing for the exclusive rights to a historical past. For many nations, a particular vision of history has become an essential part of a nation’s identity; that history is taught to its future generations so as to assure the nation’s preservation over time.

A case in point is Greece’s current insistence that the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) change its official constitutional name, “The Republic of Macedonia” to one that divorces itself from a significant cultural and historic connection to the ancient Macedonian past.¹ The two competing notions of the FYROM historical

¹Today the “Macedonian Issue,” or as it is called in Greece To Makedoniko, plagues the Greek state and for many, threatens Greek identity. Greece objects to the name “Macedonia” by the Republic of Macedonia, preferring instead that it use a name that does not lay claim to ancient Greek history and sovereign Greek territory. The polemics behind this issue have caused a political rift between the two states and have raised questions as to whether the ancient Macedonians were Greek. The Greek nationalist perspective on the issue is fairly straightforward: since the people of the Republic of Macedonia speak a
past challenge the global recognition of a sovereign nation-state, and raise questions as to whether the ancient history of Macedonia belongs within the larger historical and cultural framework of Greek history, or whether such a history belongs to a culturally distinct and globally distinguishable modern Macedonian ethnic group.² For the country of Greece, ownership of history means maintaining its strong sense of a Greek national identity. For the state of Macedonia it means uniting its people around a commonly shared national history and identity.

In the last two decades, studies on nationalism in Eastern Europe and the Balkans have centered on scholarship that concerns itself with the rise of new nation-states. Many scholars have raised the question of whether these recently inducted states, such as Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Serbia, Slovenia, Montenegro, Kosovo, and the Republic of Macedonia are legitimate sovereign nation-states whose people have a distinctively unique national, cultural, and historical heritage.³

---

² Slavic language and not Greek, and therefore they cannot possibly be Greek. This ties them to the Slavic invasions of the Balkans that occurred almost 900 years after the rise of ancient Macedonia. The opposition to a Macedonian identity rests on resolving three main points 1) the existence of a distinct Macedonian nation, 2) a Macedonian language, and 3) a Macedonian minority group in Greece. The Macedonians on the other hand, claim that they only want to affirm their existence as a sovereign nation with a unique history, language, and culture, separate from Greece. Using its political leverage in NATO Greece blocked the Republic of Macedonia’s admission into the organization in 2008. Greece has also threatened to block Republic of Macedonia from being admitted in other high profile organizations in which Greece holds influence. Loring M. Danforth, “Claims to Macedonian Identity: The Macedonian Question and the Breakup of Yugoslavia,” *Anthropology Today* 9, no. 4 (1993): 3-10 and Victor Roudometof, “Nationalism and Identity Politics in the Balkans: Greece and the Macedonian Question,” *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 14.2 (1996): 253-201.


³ Bosnia-Hertegovina, Montenegro, Kosovo and the Republic of Macedonia are more of a concern to scholars with respect to their legitimacy as nation-states. George Schopflin, *Nations, Identity, Power: The New Politics of Europe.* (C. Hurst, 2000).
One could argue that at one time all these states shared a common Yugoslav identity, with similar cultural, historical, and linguistic practices. Serbs, Croats, Bosnians, Montenegrins, Kosovars, and Macedonians all lived in peace with one another, united around a common notion of “Yugoslavism.” More recently, these groups seem to view Yugoslavia as a distant and extinct modern national civilization whose mention appears only in 20th century world history books and in media reports of Balkan political and social unrest.

A Yugoslav nation, however, appeared on cultural and political maps for most of the 20th century and was a major player in European politics. At the turn of the 20th century it brought political instability and uncertainty to Europe because its people aspired to unite under one south Slavic identity that was bound by common blood and brotherhood. During the Second World War, a Yugoslav nation resisted the Nazis and their will to control the continent of Europe. By the mid to late 20th century, Yugoslavia’s non-alignment politics helped it gain the respect and financial support from both the United States and Soviet Union. Today, however, there is no Yugoslavia. Croats, Serbs, Slavo-Macedonians, and Bosnians no longer speak Serbo-Croatian, choosing instead to speak their own national languages—Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, and even Macedonian. Each group has its own national history and unique cultural practices and feels that it comprises a distinct nation. Yugoslavia is just one example of how diverse peoples may come together to form a nation and how that nation may easily come apart if that nation no longer feels that it shares a common cultural and historic past.

Ibid.
In a similar contemporary example, the issue of a Palestinian nation-state is often debated in terms of whether a Palestinian nation truly exists. A declaration by the Palestinian people that a Palestinian nation is historically and culturally distinct from other Arab communities in the region (often linking a Palestinian nation to the ancient civilizations of the Phoenicians and Philistines), suggests that the present day Palestinian people have ostensibly inhabited the areas currently controlled by Israelis and Arabs for as long as a Jewish and Arab nations have existed. In this case, the recognition of Palestine’s right to exist as a nation with legitimate claims to statehood and national self-determination is predicated solely on the existence of a people and the chronological extent of their national past. Its claim to territorial rights could be summarized as, “We have been here longer than you!”

In both the Balkans and Near East, then national recognition is claimed through a connection to the historical past that in turn helps to legitimate modern identities. Encroachment on this historical past may cause political and military conflict between nations and often stems from the question “How far back do your people go?”

**Imagining the Nation**

Benedict Anderson’s seminal concept of “imagined communities” fits within this project’s broader normative framework of national identity formation and the nation-state of Modern Greece. According to Anderson, national unity is based on common blood

---


and a shared past, even though people know very well that they are not related. A common historical experience thus helps to reinforce Greek social and national bonds when bloodlines are questioned. Anderson also found that nationalism offered citizens a means of converting their own deaths into a shared immortality when the nation and the state are immortalized. In many parts of the world the teaching of a national history specifically immortalizes national figures by presenting those figures as the ancestors or fathers of the nation. This is also true in Greece, where schools resurrect and recreate the past and present it as belonging to the nation. Schools also help reinforce a sense of common community by teaching a uniform version of the national past.

The idea of the nation is complex. Who decides who may be part of a nation is perhaps the most complex question of them all. It would, after all, be inaccurate to say that people choose their national identity. To the contrary, national identity is usually constructed and transmitted to people by external sources, often through government-regulated institutions like public schools. Through the school people are taught about

---


8 Anderson’s discussion of the importance of common blood proved insightful during my last few trips to Greece when I noticed that some Greeks were interested in the use of DNA testing in determining ethnic origin and cultural purity. In several instances I was asked if whether the Greeks of today were a pure race—in other words, that very little, if any, ethnic intermixing had occurred between Greeks and resident Slavic, Albanian and Turkish groups. In fact, DNA tests have shown only what genetic scientists had previously suspected; nations that border or live near one another share similar genetic patterns. Notably, Greek nationalists deemed the results of these tests as inconclusive thus leaving the door open for differences and the marginalization of minority groups. On the pseudo-scientific yet still interesting topic of DNA similarities between the Modern and ancient Greeks see Dienekes Pontikos, “Racial Type of the Ancient Hellenes,” in his personal anthropological blog page. *Anthropological Research* (September 2009). For further reading on the topic of the anthropological origins of the Modern Greeks see Aris Poulianos, “The Origins of Greeks” (PhD diss., Moscow Institute of Anthropology, 1988) (in Russian) (Reprinted in Athens. In Greek).

9 Ibid.
their national past and their national identity. They learn to feel that they are part of a broader community that shares a unique character and heritage, and when the entire nation is conceived as a single vast family, people begin to feel a belonging to a community of timeless homogeneity and widespread bonds based on kinship and a common historical experience. This ultimately unites the nation and helps its people feel that they are part of a single community that may share a common language, history, and religion.10

10Interestingly, according to the Greek state today, ethnic minority groups do not exist in Greece—they have been made invisible because, they would otherwise disrupt historic continuity and cultural homogeneity in a state, which prides itself in its cultural and ethnic purity. In fact, most minority groups living in Greece are presented by the state as Greek in order to avoid “polluting” common bloodlines or raising divisive questions regarding a shared national past. For many Greeks today, “Slavic-Macedonians” cannot possibly be the descendants of Alexander the Great and the Ancient Macedonian civilization because they are not Greek but Slavs, and the language they speak proves this. However, if ethnic or blood purity is what is in question here, how do we know that this group of non-Greek speaking Macedonians were not at one time or another Greek speakers? While Slavic Macedonian groups outside the state of Greece are not deemed Greek, minority Slavic groups that live within Greece are seen as belonging to the state and community even when they themselves feel like outsiders. The Pomachs, a Slavic speaking Muslim minority group in Eastern Greek Thrace is an example of an ethnic group in Greece that is considered by the Greek state as originally Greek, but had been converted to Islam during Ottoman times. E. Adamou and G. Drettas, “Le patrimoine plurilingue de la Grèce – Le nom des langages II,” Bibliotheque des Cahiers de l’Institut de Linguistique de Louvain (Leuven, Belgium, 2008): 107-132. Michail Domma, “From Locality to European Identity: Shifting Identities Among the Pomak Minority in Greece,” Ethnologia Balkanica (2003): 140-157 and Ulf Brunnbauer, “Diverging (Hi-) Stories: The Contested Identity of the Bulgarian Pomaks,” Ethnologia Balkanica (1999): 35-50. Another example is the Greco-Turkish minority in Thrace, which is identified by the Greek state as Greek-Muslims even though this group sees itself as being Turkish. This official state identification is seen as somehow bolstering the historical and ethnic purity of the state of Greece, because to say that these people are Turks would make them completely foreign and thus polluting. However, as Greek Muslims they are still descendants of the ancient Greeks and still part of the Greek historical past. Their Islamic religion does pose a problem in a country that is almost entirely Orthodox Christian. Although it challenges Greek national identity and unity, this religious difference is easily justified in given the realities of forceful conversion under Ottoman duress—a situation that is made undeniably evident in the Greek history classroom. Although the Greek state has not recognized ethnic minority groups they have recognized religious groups such as the Muslims of Thrace. On this topic see specifically pages 167-192 in Lena Divani, Ellada kai Mionotites. Greece and Minorities (Nepheli. Athens. In Greek, 1996) and Benincasa et al., “The Greek State, the Muslim Minorities of Western Thrace and Education: Shifts Under Way?” in Educational Strategies Among Muslims in the Context of Globalization, eds., Holger Daun and Geoffrey Walford (Koninklijke Brill, 2004).
In 1832 Greece was recognized as an independent state. In the years that followed, before mass media, mass communication, and mass transportation were available, an understanding of what it meant to be Greek was taught in the Greek schools to the first generation of Greek citizens. Before this time, it is unclear how the average person who lived in what had been the Greek territories of the Ottoman Empire viewed himself or herself, or for that matter how others may have viewed them. Rural peasant communities in the Peloponnese may have found a stronger allegiance and greater connection to their local towns and extended families than to a broader Hellenic or Greek national identity. Urban dwellers in Thessaloniki, Smyrna, and Constantinople may have perceived themselves as being more cosmopolitan, more European, or generally part of a larger community. Non-native Greek speaking ethnic groups such as the Arvanites, Vlachs, and Slavs, as well as the Turkish-speaking Karamanlides of Anatolia, may have identified themselves more with Orthodox Christianity rather than a specific ethnic or cultural identity. With the formation of an independent state of Greece, localized groups, minority ethnic groups, groups not speaking Greek and the more cosmopolitan Greek-speaking elite groups adopted a Greek national identity. Analogous processes had occurred elsewhere in Europe by this time and we can accurately say that in the case of Greece, education was the main driving force behind this phenomenon.

During the formal creation of modern nation states in Europe, which began as early as the 16th century, power brokers found that people who identified themselves across cultural, historical, and ethnic lines worked better together towards the function
and ultimate success of the state and its society.\textsuperscript{11} This certainly did not happen overnight. In France for example, by the 18\textsuperscript{th} century a standard French language was instituted, roads were built to link towns and cities, a professionally trained national French Army was created (with military uniforms fashioned to embody French national pride), and Parisian culture became the standard for French cultural identity.\textsuperscript{12} The issue for France at the time was not simply how to consolidate its power by expanding its territory, but how the state of France would convince its citizens that they were part of a larger French community and cultural identity.

Alsace and Loraine provides one of the best examples of this cultural transformation. France incorporated the region in the 18\textsuperscript{th} century during the reign of Louis XIV. Prior to this, the people of Alsace and Lorraine had only a limited connection to French culture and French identity. Demographically Loraine was about equal parts French and German speaking, while Alsace was almost exclusively German speaking. Yet a mere twenty years or so after Louis’ conquest of Alsace and Lorraine, Alsatians and Lorrainians would claim in both French and German that they were French. The Alsatians and Lorrainians did not magically learn to speak French, nor did they mysteriously learn to feel French. Instead, the French school system assisted in the


formation of a French national and cultural identity in the region. More than fifty years later when Otto Von Bismarck claimed Alsace and Lorraine for his new German state, Alsatians and Lorrainians saw Bismarck’s Prussian army as conquerors and not liberators. More importantly, the Alsatians and Lorrainians felt that they were French.

It is this project’s main contention that it is after the formation of a Greek national school system (1834) that an idealized Modern Greek identity is constructed that specifically seeks to pin down an exclusive and original Greek historical past. During most of Ottoman rule in Greece (1453-1821), most Greek speakers had yet to develop a national consciousness based on a historical past. In fact, the field history in most of Europe for much of the modern world (15th-early 19th centuries) was abstract. Past events were often associated with the present, actual events were often presented as fiction, fictional events were sometimes presented as real, and one’s understanding of how the past influenced his or her current world was often misunderstood. Alun Munslow says,

…historicism seems to have three related meanings: for most historians it is the primary historical act of perceiving historical periods in their own terms rather than any imposed by the historian; second and relatedly, it means accepting that every historical period had its own standards through which it determined what was trustworthy knowledge and warranted truth; third, that there are inclusive, demonstrable and determining patterns in the process of historical change.

The core of the historicist movement, which begins to take root in Europe in the 18th century, consisted of the notion that man can only be understood in historical terms

---


and that ideographic methods in historical study were essentially different from the
nomothetic methods used in the natural sciences.\textsuperscript{15} By the 19th century in Europe,
historians began to connect past events to the present, where the past was seen as shaping
the present and where history was not merely a result of limited time-frames. At this
point one could use the past to understand the present and the past was related to one’s
national consciousness. Moreover, the historical movement of time in historicism also
suggested change and continuity towards progress in almost every aspect of everyday
life. In other words, man was better off in the present than he was in the past. Man lived
longer, he generally possessed a greater variety and accessibility to resources, and he or
she could travel farther and longer distances and had more time for leisure. However, at
the same time the past could not be accurately understood when it was examined in terms
of one’s own contemporary world.\textsuperscript{16} The ancient Greeks may have been pagans,
however, their accomplishments could still be valued even though their religious beliefs
and customs came into conflict with modern European Christianity. In the case of
Greece, the ancient Greek past had given rise to Europe and European civilization to the
point that Europe would attribute its cultural foundation to ancient Greece. Historicism,
as a historical approach, opened a portal where the past and present were intimately
intertwined and helped explain how one’s own national identity and consciousness was
connected to the past.

\textsuperscript{15}Karl Popper, \textit{The Poverty of Historicism}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} edition (Routledge, 2002).

After the Greek Revolution education was the main driving force in shaping and inculcating a Greek national identity through a connection to the ancient Greek past. Notably, Europeans were willing to recognize the connections between modern and ancient Greece because those links defended the notion of an ancient European civilization that was as old as most of the other known ancient civilizations at the time. In this way, Greece provided a notional birthplace for a common European cultural heritage. For Greece, it provided a cultural bridge that linked Greece to Western Europe. Despite its popularity in Europe and Greece, however, this idea did not accurately describe the relationship between Modern Greece and ancient Greece.

Further Roles for the State and the School

Undoubtedly, Greeks find national pride in their ancient past. When the Greek Ministry of Culture and Tourism decided in the 1980s that all Greek citizens had to pay an entrance fee to all Greek museums and ancient archeological sites in Greece it was not uncommon for a Greek to voice his concern for the new policy by reverting to the idea of a shared community and shared national past by openly declaring outside a museum’s entrance, “How could they charge us to see what is already ours, what was built by our ancestors?” Even during my recent visit to the new Acropolis Museum in Athens, where portions of the Parthenon friezes are proudly showcased, a Greek tour guide was quick to point out to a group of American tourists how these detailed masterpieces were “sculpted by the ancient Greeks, who happen to be the same as the Greeks today.”

---

17In the late 1990’s the Greek government, through pressures from the European Union, decided to remove religious affiliation from national identification cards (Tautotita). The Greek Church who sees itself as the protector of a Greek identity and tradition protested the government mandated act, arguing that Greeks should be proud of their Greek Orthodox identity and not have to disguise it. The then ruling Greek
Attempts today to repatriate the Parthenon marbles from London’s British museum to the new Athens museum have raised questions on cultural patrimony and ownership of a past. For the Greeks the Parthenon frieze is a part of their past and their identity. For the British the Parthenon frieze (or Elgin Marbles) are symbols of their own culture and history, a culture and history that was shaped during the course of the last two hundred years by giving rise to democracy and neo-classicism in Britain.\textsuperscript{18}

How do the Modern Greeks find pride in the past and why do people generally feel a sense of belonging to a broader community of citizens who share each other’s sympathies and emotional bonds to that shared past? This project contends that a Modern Greek identity was shaped mainly through the Greek school and the crafting of a Greek national history—both of which intended to link the Modern Greek individual to the culture and history of ancient Greece. We have to remember that state bureaucracies are immensely powerful institutions that often possess enormous resources and influence. Formal schooling in Greece is by and large controlled and organized by the Greek government through the Greek Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs (\textit{Ypourgio Paideas kai Thriseumaton}). In education, more broadly, the government often commands the means to determine which books should be used in the school curriculum, which parts of history should be included, which parts of history should be left out, how

this history should be taught and by whom it should be taught. Through the medium of the school, states construct national identities based on the nation’s historical record. These constructs are essentially appeals for legitimacy. In the case of Greece, these constructs are grounded on the Greek historical past and firmly imbedded in a Greek cultural and national identity.

**Defining Resurrection**

The process that had brought about an independent Greece was often called in Greece, *epanastasis* (revolution/resurrection), *paligenisis* (rebirth) and *anastasis* (resurrection). This project’s title uses the word resurrection, because a resurrection of the past took place in Greek schools between 1834 and 1913. In fact, *anastasis* embodied religious as well as a nationalist meaning in Greece that relates to this project’s theme. From a purely Orthodox Christian context *anastasis* refers to the resurrection of the Christ. From a secular nationalist point of view *anastasis* symbolized a reawakening of ancient Greece in the form of Modern Greece. In both instances, Greek Orthodox Christian tradition and ancient Greek historical past are linked. Most notably, General Markriyannis described the Greek Revolution as divine intervention where the “…Lord shalt raise the dead Greeks, the descendants of those famous men, who gave mankind the

---


fair raiment of virtue.”²¹ It is the “rising up,” if you will, of a Greek nation after centuries of Ottoman occupation that Makriyiannis is describing. What is important however is that this “rising up” helps shape a Modern Greek identity and a feeling in Greece that the Modern Greeks were the direct descendants of the ancient Greeks and that the Greeks of the present were the same Greeks of the past.

Research Questions

This inquiry is conducted through research in three specific areas:

1) Interpretive analysis of early Greek history textbooks used in elementary and middle schools between 1834 and 1913.

2) Analysis of writings such as opinions, commentaries, lectures, correspondence and literature from early Greek writers and educational leaders (particularly Adamandios Koraes, Rigas Velestinlis, Dionysius Solomos and Constantine Paparrigopoulos) on the topic of education within a historical, social, and cultural context.

3) Analysis of curriculum guidelines, teacher manuals, and educational legislation on Greek educational policy.

The research rejects the notion that a Greek identity in the modern sense (post-national-state formation and within the framework of Benedict Anderson’s “imagined communities”) had been maintained by a Greek society since ancient times. It asserts instead that a Greek identity with ancient links is introduced after Greek independence, mainly in the Greek schools and through the teaching of a Greek national history.

It must be noted that no society remains culturally unadulterated with the passage of time. As generation succeeds generation all types of cultural, social, and political changes occur that perpetually shape and reshape a particular culture and society. I say

this because assertions regarding national and cultural purity often cause divisions and ethnic political strife, although no one can truly prove that he or she is a pure descendant of any ancient civilization. We must admit that there are cultural and ethnic distinctions between the modern and ancient Greeks just as there are between modern Italian and ancient Roman society, modern Egyptian and ancient Egyptian society, modern Iranian and ancient Persian society, modern Chinese and ancient Chinese society, modern Ghanaian and ancient Ghanaian society, modern Indian and ancient Indian society, or modern Mexican and ancient Aztec society. The Greeks today are nonetheless still obsessed by their ancestral origins and their ethnic purity. For many, the more ancient you claim to be the more pure and more Greek you are.

Organization and Methodology

So far, as I am aware, there is not a single historical and theoretical study on the emergence of a Modern Greek identity in the Greek school. My study is organized chronologically and gives particular attention to three important ways in which the Greek state attempted to advance its national project in schools. The first is the Greek language and debates in Greece of which language should be used: the Katharevousa (purified Greek) or Demotic (common Greek). Advocates of the Katharevousa felt that this type of Greek should be taught in schools since it was contructed to emulate the Attic dialect of ancient Greek and in turn most resembled the ancient Greek. Second my study is concerned with the disciplines of history, geography, and literature as a mechanism to

---

22While having dinner with a friend one night in Athens in the summer of 2009, (who claims his Greek ancestry from Crete) he sarcastically defended his Greek purity by saying “We Cretans are pure Greeks unlike you hybrid Arvanites.” (Emis e Krites Eimaste Kathari Ellines Ochi san Esas e Migades, e Arvanites).
unite the Greek people. As Greece expands its territory new groups are included into the Greek state. The teaching of a common past as well as an understanding of Greek geography and literature in schools helps unite the people of Greece. Lastly, my study is concerned with how educational policy (particularly policies relating to the teaching of history in schools) was geared to national identity formation. What type of history would be taught in schools? How would it be taught? And who would teach it?

Specifically, this project addresses the following research questions:

1) How did early Greek history textbooks connect the Modern Greek to the ancient world of Greece?

2) In what ways did prominent educational discourse regarding a Greek identity reflect notions of a common historical and cultural link between Modern Greece and ancient Greece?

3) What was the process by which and what factors led the Greek school to magnify a notion of one continuous, unbroken historical past from ancient past to Modern Greek present?

Scholars have characterized Greece after independence from the Ottoman Empire as a time of major social, economic, and political change. They have also professed that the Greek school system reflected this abrupt change. The first Greek schools advocated notions of citizenship, but more importantly the first Greek schools helped create a Modern Greek identity. The early Greek schools built their curricula around textbooks that advocated the notion that the Modern Greeks were the direct descendants of the ancient Greeks. Few scholars have studied these early textbooks in detail. As a result, a major part of this project focuses primarily on the early Greek textbooks (1834-1913) used in the elementary and middle schools. The goal of this research is to help shed light
on just how the ancient Greek past was taught to Greek students and how the ancient Greek past was connected to a Modern Greek nation and a Modern Greek identity.\(^{23}\)

Chapter Two of this project, entitled “Historical and Theoretical Background,” gives some historical background on what occurred in Greece between the fall of the Byzantine Empire (1453) and Greek Independence (1821). This period of approximately 400 years is typically presented in Greek textbooks as a static era of “Greece Under Slavery” or “Years of Slavery” (\(Η \ Σκλαβομενι \ Ελλαδα, \ Χρονια \ της \ Σκλαβιας\)) wherein Greece is portrayed as the victim of the Ottoman Empire. As the idea of identity is central to this project’s overall thesis, a discussion on theories of identity is given significant attention as well.

Also in Chapter Two, I present the argument that there was Greek-speaking, Greek Christians living in Ottoman Greece, who believed that their culture dated as far back as the ancient Greeks. A discussion on Gemistos Plethon gives a voice to those few Greek-speakers that believed that they were the direct descendants of the ancient Greeks. One will also find that several of these Neo-Hellenes go as far as renouncing their own Christian beliefs and adopting what they believed were the religious and cultural practices of the ancient Greeks.\(^{24}\)

\(^{23}\)Since this project is historical in nature it is hoped that the reader will appreciate the historical tone and the historical content offered by this project. Modern Greece is rich in history and culture. The historical information offered in this project is intended to give some historical context about the time and place, as well as the social, political and economic movements that help shape the past.

\(^{24}\)The Greek Orthodox Church was for the most part strongly against a Greek identity based on the cultural precepts of ancient Greek civilization because these precepts conflicted with Christian cultural and religious practices.
However, I go on to argue that for the majority of the Greek speaking population from about Byzantine times to pre-independence Greece (13th - early 19th centuries), most Greek speakers did not necessarily see themselves as the direct descendants of the ancient Greeks. Therefore, a crucial part of Chapter Two shows how the Greeks viewed themselves during their occupation by the Ottoman Turks.  Certainly we do not know how every Greek speaking Christian saw himself or herself prior to the establishment of the Greek school system, but significant evidence from both Greek speakers and foreign travelers in Greece helps shed some light on how the majority of the population likely saw themselves.

Chapter Two also discusses how the formation of a Greek identity and the reawakening of ancient Greece were important to several western European intellectuals prior to Greek independence. For these western Europeans, mostly European intellectuals, Greece was the source of western civilization, and as such western Europe owed its intellectual roots to Greece. Ancient Greek works were valued for giving western Europeans an intellectual guide in philosophy, literature, science, and politics. Greek independence became ever more important to western Europeans after the Enlightenment swept through Europe in the 18th century. At this point Europeans realized that Greece could no longer be under the yoke of a tyrannical and oppressive regime. Greece needed to be free, and brought back to its western tradition where it was thought to belong.

25This project contends that most Greeks, prior to the Greek Revolution, did not necessarily see themselves as the descendants of the ancient Greeks. It is only after a nationalized Greek school system that we begin to see the Greek speaking population begin to see themselves as having a historical and cultural connection to the ancient Greeks.
To a certain extent an idealized Greek identity already existed in Western Europe, most notably among a group of Western European intellectuals who called themselves *Philhellenes*. Evidence from western Romantic art and literature shows how some western Europeans viewed the Modern Greeks. An analysis of works from George Byron, Eugene Delacroix, and Revault suggests that Europeans wanted to see a free state of Greece and the spirit of the ancient Greeks revived in the form of the modern Greeks. Surely, a free Greece benefited the western European world as an “imagined community.” Greece was an ideal nation for Europe to (re)create, for it was a country that claimed to be the ancestor of Europe while at the same time being the continent’s newest and most “oriental” nation. Thus, Greece had to look to its ancient past if it would be considered the birthplace of western civilization.

Chapter Three begins with a discussion of Greek education during Ottoman times. At that time, most Greek schools were located in manufacturing and trading centers across Ottoman Greece. Some local villages and provincial towns also had schools that were operated by the Church and local priests. For the most part this type of education was informal and religious in nature.  

26 Neither educational venue was anything close to a nationalized Greek school system.

However, later Greek educational thinkers certainly considered how Greek education could be used to nationalize a Greek identity. The case of Prosymni gives an account of how some minority groups in Greece were Hellenized through the vehicle of

---

26 Certainly there were some Greek schools that were not religious in nature and solely for the training of priests. We find some of these schools outside of Greece in such places as Bucharest and parts of Italy as well as in Ioannina and some of the Greek speaking islands of the Ionian coast. Mostly a Greek elite or Greek aristocracy attended these schools. However, the majority of the Greek speaking public attended these religious schools that were set up in their local communities by the local priest and church.
the Greek school system. In other words, how Greek minority groups who did not necessarily see themselves as Greeks, were assimilated and learned to view themselves as Greeks.

Later in Chapter Three, a comparison of Adamandios Koraes and Rigas Velestinlis’ visions for a Greek educational system provides some historical insight on the philosophical foundations of a Greek educational system. Both Velestinlis and Koraes are influential figures in early Greek education, thus few historians fail to mention both of them when the topic of early Greek education comes up.

A serious matter to Koraes was which language was to be used in schools: the purified Greek (Katharevousa) or the vernacular Greek (Demotic). The purified Greek Katharevousa was the Modern Greek that resembled most the ancient Greek and the Demotic was the vernacular Modern Greek. Most Greek speakers at the time spoke the Demotic, but to Koraes the Katharevousa would better link the Modern Greek to his/her ancient Greek past.

The national Greek school system eventually adopted Koraes’ and Velestinlis’ vision of a curriculum that taught its students about their ancient Greek past. Both Koraes and Velestinlis are thus the great prophets of national independence and are also often described as the “Teachers of the Genos” (Daskaloi Tou Genous).

Later in the same chapter I introduce the concept of “Patriognosis” as a national educational model for the Greek state. Patriognosis emerged as a desired model of Greek education. Some educational thinkers advocated implementing a more practical educational model such as one that would assist in the developments and stability of the
Greek economy. Others felt that Greek education should seek to encourage a democratic and politically stable form of government. Patriognosis on the other hand, centered on the historical achievements of Greece, reinforced through the teaching of Greek geography, language, history, and the connection of each to ancient Greece. Patriognosis sought to develop a common Greek identity and a loyalty to the state of Greece. The word Patriognosis translates to Gnosis: Knowledge and Patrida: Nation or fatherland e.g. Knowledge of the Nation/Fatherland. One could call this an ethnocentric way of learning, since Greece and all there is to know about Greece it placed at the core of the Greek curriculum. Today, Greeks often refer to themselves as Patriotes or hailing from the same local community. In nationalistic discourse, and in the Greek school, the term is broadened to be more inclusive, where it includes all Greeks. Thus the term is transformed to suggest that all Greek citizens are part of the same community. The notion of patriognosis was enforced in the Greek school curriculum for much of the 19th and early 20th century.

Chapter Four begins by considering the general characteristics and organization of Greek schools. The chapter follows with a discussion on the rise of a national history in Greece. Greek history was initially imported from abroad. These early histories were translated into Greek and extolled national and individual achievements from ancient Greece as well as the glory of the ancient Greek past. Few of these textbooks included histories of modern Greece and were almost exclusively focused on ancient Greece. Later on Constantine Paparrigopoulos’s publication History of the Greek Nation departed from these foreign textbooks by connecting ancient Greece to Modern Greece.
Paparrigopoulos’s work would be the first Greek history written by a Modern Greek historian to introduce the historical classification of *First Hellenism, Macedonian Hellenism, Christian Hellenism, Medieval Hellenism and Modern Hellenism*. Each of Paparrigopoulos’s historical classifications denoted a period that was part of a broader and continuous Greek history. Paparrigopoulos’s history on Greece would later set the standard for Greek history textbooks. Greek history would be taught as one continuous and unbroken thread from past to present. Moreover, Greek history and civilization would be presented as being superior to all other histories and civilizations, making them a source of pride for the Greek student.

Chapter Four also considers the general characteristics and organization of Greek schools. History, Geography, and Greek language were all important subjects in the Greek school curriculum for much of the 1834-1913 period. These three subjects were taught using an interdisciplinary approach, where they all came together in one overarching theme emphasizing loyalty to the state, common brotherhood and bloodlines and unity amongst the Greek people.

Chapter Five and Chapter Six delve into the intricate process by which Greek textbooks were crafted and then studied by the Greek student. Two phases of the teaching of Greek history are described in detail in Chapter Five. The first phase covers the years 1834-1880. This is when Greek history was mostly an imported history from Western Europe that primarily focused on ancient Greek history. The second phase covers the years 1880-1913. This is when Greek historians wrote the history of Greece and where ancient, Byzantine and Modern Greek history were linked as one national
history. The chapter also discusses the impact that Greek history textbooks have had on the formation of a Greek national identity.

History textbooks are among the most important mechanisms in shaping a national identity and historical awareness. In Greece, even very young pupils are inundated with images of the nation as well as the nation’s place in history. In this chapter, several examples are offered from around the world: how the past is taught may vary from nation to nation, but all seek to unite their people around a shared historical past. Textbooks are often windows to understanding the world from a particular society’s viewpoint, as well as how the society sees itself, and how it wants to be seen by others. Through the textbook the student may become politically and culturally indoctrinated and form in his or her consciousness a sense of a national identity. The way history is written and the way it is taught in schools thus play significant roles in the shaping of a national identity. State involvement in the teaching of history is also considered in Chapter Five.

Chapter Six on the other hand, delves into the textbooks produced between 1880-1913. A selection of textbooks is analyzed in detail, with each coming from a different period of time. The textbooks analyzed are from 1836, 1873, 1904, 1906 and two textbooks from 1913. Chapter Six explores: 1) how the Greek past is tied to the Modern Greek identity, 2) which individuals, groups or historical events seem to be consistent in the Greek textbooks, and 3) how changes in the social, political, and economic structure of society impacted they way textbooks were written.

Christina Koulouris compiled work, *Istoria kai Georgraphia sta Hellinika Scholia (1834-1914). History and Geography in Greek Schools (1834-1914)* provided some of
the primary source information for this project. In addition, the National Archives in Athens (Ethniki Bibliothiki) as well as the Palamide Public Library in Nafplion, the University of Crete in Rethymno, and the Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research in Germany, all house Greek history textbooks from 1834-1913 for elementary and middle years. Several sources of information from these libraries were used for the completion of this project, specifically in Chapters Five and Six. The Georg Eckert Institute was kind enough to send me copies of their collection of Greek history textbooks.

I made four trips were made to Greece between 2008 and 2010 for the gathering of information and completion of this project. This was something that was more of a treat than a burden since it only helped me grow intellectually and personally. Sometimes as historians we become so heavily involved in our research that we inadvertently transplant ourselves in the past. When researching and reading about my topic at times I felt that I had temporarily escaped the realities of my modern world and like a time traveler visited those magnificent places and times I was examining. At the midst of developing a historical point of view on my subject, this became ever more evident, when it was discovered in my research that with the creation of the Modern Greek state and an invoking of a distant classical past as in schools, a commonly shared source of identity, stood out in Greece.
Notes on Translation and Transliteration

The reader may notice the use of several foreign sources. It is always a difficult task to accurately translate sources since meanings sometimes differ from one language to another. The author has made every effort to translate these sources as accurately as possible. One may also notice that within the footnotes and bibliography Greek sources are transliterated and then again translated into English. I thought this would be the easiest way for one to phonetically read the sources, especially for those that were not familiar with the Modern Greek. On the other hand, in the “Primary Source” section of the bibliography and within the “Appendix of Textbooks,” Greek sources are cited in their original form and then translated into English. Within the text of the paper one will also find that quotes from textbooks are in their original form and then translated into English. In some instance certain quotes in Greek have been offered only in the translated English. Cited French, German, and Romanian sources are left in their original form and have not been translated into English.
CHAPTER TWO

HISTORICAL AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The nation like an individual, is the culmination of a long past of endeavors, sacrifices and devotions. Of all cults, that of the ancestors is the most legitimate, for the ancestors have made us what we are. A heroic past, great men, glory, this is the social capital upon which one bases a national idea. To have common glories in the past and to have a common will in the present; to have performed great deeds together, to wish to perform still more—these are the essential conditions for being a people….The Spartan song “We are what you were; we will be what you are”—is, in its simplicity, the abridged hymn of every patrie.

--Ernest Renan

Overview

This chapter discusses the historical and theoretical evidence of this project. The chapter is organized in six parts and begins by defining the nation and national identity. The chapter than considers the origins of a modern Greek identity and discusses how some Byzantine Greeks believed that the ancient Greek past was linked to a modern Greek identity. The chapter then describes how a Greek identity and the reawakening of ancient Greece were important to several western European intellectuals who called themselves Philhellenes. For the Philhellenes Greece was the source of western civilization, and as such western Europe owed much of its intellectual roots to Greece. The chapter concludes by looking at how “others”—notably western Europeans viewed the modern Greeks. Much of the evidence of how western Europeans viewed the modern

---

Greeks comes in the form of art and literature from the time just prior to Greek Independence. The reader will find that Greece struggled in finding a national identity. Along the way Greece was confronted with its “oriental” traditions and western cultural legacies, its Orthodox Christian religious beliefs and modern secular aspirations, its traditional customs and its ambition to modernize. In the end the school played a pivotal role in shaping a modern Greek identity.

Defining the Nation and National Identity

The nation and national identity are concepts that were quite different in Greece at the time of the Greek Revolution than those espoused in ancient Greece. The latter was organized around small city-states where borders and territories were not well defined. As a result, ancient Greeks identified themselves according to the city or town in which they lived rather than to a universally understood Greek nation and identity. The ancient Greeks were, of course, well aware that the people living in these city-states shared cultural similarities, such as religion, language, and common traditions. Nonetheless, competition between and wars among the city-states emphasized their differences.

According to several historians, the modern concepts of the nation-state and national identity emerged in Europe as early as the 16th century and are for the most part recent constructions. However, the idea of belonging to a community of people that share similar cultural attributes—a nation—has existed for some time. The earliest nations consisted of groups of people living in small towns and villages. As a local

---

population grew to become a city, so did its nation or people. Borders were reified and national living spaces and national boundaries became better defined on political maps. People and governments also found that people generally lived in greater peace with one another—within the prescribed confines of their nation-states—than those who lived outside the borders of their respective national state and amongst those who were not part of their nation.

In the 19th century, Europe experienced a period of intense nationalism that promoted the formation of nation-states. Arguably, this was the case for Italy (1870) and Germany (1871), each of which sought to consolidate its political power under a single authority. They did so by expanding their economic and cultural reach and unifying their people, who mostly lived at the time in small independent kingdoms and principalities, around a notion of a commonly shared history, culture, and ancestry. This created a shared commitment to, and emotional connection with a larger national community.

In contrast, states like France, Spain, and England had early consolidated their people and territory around large kingdoms. Those kingdoms gradually became modern nation-states, as absolute monarchs lost their divine and absolute authority and people began to define themselves in terms of belonging to a nation rather than as the subjects of a supreme ruler. Meanwhile, multiethnic empires such as, Russia, the Ottoman Empire, and Austria-Hungary, struggled to maintain their territories. By the 19th century the multitude of ethnic groups that comprised these empires sought to break from the yoke of their authority and form their own independent states. In his classic piece “What is a Nation?” Ernest Renan purports that,
The Modern nation is therefore a historical result brought about by a series of convergent facts. Sometimes unity has been affected by a dynasty, as was the case in France; sometimes it has been brought about by the direct will of provinces, as was the case with Holland, Switzerland, and Belgium; sometimes it has been the work of a general consciousness, belatedly victorious over the caprices of feudalism, as was the case in Italy and Germany.  

Contemporary scholars such as Benedict Anderson, Etienne Balibar, Michael Hertzfeld, Eric Hobsbawm, Charles Tilly, Terrence Ranger, David Lowenthal, and Anthony Smith agree that national identity is linked to the collective cultural identity and shared memories of an ethnic community. Nations are formed around communities that share a common religion, language, and set of customs, and are strengthened by the creation of a national history that focuses on the accomplishments of the community’s heroes, inventors, scientists, artists, writers, and philosophers. Such effects can be realized and propagated through a nationalized school system and the mass publication of books. Displaying national symbols such as flags, traditional clothing, monuments, images of the nation’s past, and the celebration of national and religious holidays can also reinforce them. Such messages implicitly suggests to the members of the nation that they are part of a community of people who put in place the institutions—schools, churches, family life, and others that help the nation as a whole succeed over time. In other words,

---


everyone in the community plays a role, whether directly or indirectly, in the nation’s success.

In short, the people of a nation are bound together by a common understanding of one another and a common understanding of their history and culture. In the case of Modern Greece, this was manifested through well-known historical figures, events and accomplishments including Socrates, Homer, The Battle of Marathon, the early Olympic Games, Alexander the Great, democracy, philosophy, and the Acropolis---to name a few.\(^5\) A nation can also bring together its members by reminding them of past difficulties, struggles, and miseries; unity is formed around a common historical experience even when that experience involves being oppressed and persecuted. In Greece, (as in much of the Balkans) the most important example of this type of unification involves the nation’s persecution at the hands of the Ottoman Turks.

Benedict Anderson’s seminal work *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* contends that nations and nationalism are products of modernity that have been created as a means to political and economic ends.\(^6\) Of particular importance to Anderson’s theory is the role of mass produced books and their dissemination to the public. According to Anderson, a newly emerging nation imagines itself antique and invents mythological stories about the formation of the nation and/or attaches its history to antiquity.\(^7\) National museums, with their finely maintained and preserved historical relics, are sometimes extravagantly showcased to the nation and

---

\(^5\) Costas Carras, *3,000 Years of Greek Identity: Myth or Reality* (Domus Books, 1983).

\(^6\) Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*.

\(^7\) Ibid.
Books are written about the history of the nation and it is taught to children in
school. All of this is intended to foster a feeling of belonging to help create a sense of
national unity and to promote loyalty to the nation. David Lowenthal echoes Anderson’s
arguments by contending that

The past remains integral to us all, individually and collectively. We must
concede the ancients their place….but their past is not simply back there,
in a separate and foreign country, it is assimilated in ourselves and
resurrected in a ever-changing present.9

Lowenthal also suggests that national histories bring an audience into direct relation with
the past even if these histories are distorted or invented to showcase a nations’ superior
worth over other nations.10

Similarly, works by Anthony Smith assert that nationalism draws on the pre-
existing history of a “group” where the group attempts to fashion this history into a sense
of common identity and shared history.11 Smith argues that nationalisms are based on
historically flawed interpretations of past events that tend to overtly mythologize small,
inaccurate parts of history.12 Greek nationalism, for example, makes prodigious use of

---

9 In the case of Greece, the museum is even brought to the people, when the people may not be
interested in seeing those relics. When a new subway system was built in Athens at the turn of the 21st
century, archeological relics unearthed during the construction of the underground project were later
displayed in the subway’s platform for commuters to enjoy.

9 Lowenthal, The Past as a Foreign Country, 129.


11 Smith, National Identity: Ethno Nationalism in Comparative Perspective.

12 Ibid.
the fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Turks in 1453. The loss of Constantinople has been mythologized and over embellished in Greek historical accounts, and has become an important part of a Greek identity. School children in Greece are taught as early as primary school, the exact year, month and day of Constantinople’s fall to the Ottoman Turks (Tuesday, May 29, 1453). The event is taught in such a way that it represents the end of a once culturally vibrant Greek civilization and the beginning of a long period of suppression and persecution by the Ottoman Turks. Ottoman rule is further presented as an assault on Greek religion—it was expected that Greeks would replace Orthodox Christianity with Islam—but the conquered Greek people were strong enough to ward off any forceful religious conversion. Ancient Greek figures and the leaders of the Greek Revolution are also idealized and presented as national models and are portrayed in Greek history books as patriots and heroes, as defenders of the nation, devout followers of the Greek Orthodox Church and the ideal models of “Greekness” and “Hellenism.”

Andrew Baruch Wachtel’s work *Making a Nation, Breaking a Nation: Literature and Cultural Politics in Yugoslavia* provides another example in which resistance to the Ottoman Empire proved important in nation building. He examines the concept of “Yugoslavism” as an intellectual construction that was first conceived by Croatian

---

13Maria Todorova, *Balkan Identities: Nation and Memory* (New York University Press, 2004). Serbian nationalism, for example, makes similar use of the Serbian defeat by the Turks at the battle of Kosovo in 1389. Many Serbian nationalists understand an independent Kosovo to be an attempt to destroy Serbian national identity, since it is believed that Serbian nationalism and a Serbian identity was born out of Kosovo. K. Crawford, “Serbian History Textbooks and the Construction of National Identity,” *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research* 3 (2002): 1-10.

14Today many museums in Greece display relics from ancient Greece and the Greek Revolution to help reinforce the idea of a continuous history and survival of the Greek nation despite centuries of foreign conquest and oppression.
nationalists during the *Illyrian Movement* of 1830. According to Wachtel, a movement for a unified southern Slavic nation-state occupying the northwestern Balkan territories of the late Ottoman Empire rose and fell in cycles to the strength of the movement depended on the public mood of a given time. By 1918, the world found on its maps a united Yugoslavia composed of various south Slavic ethnic and religious groups. However, the new nation struggled with how to keep itself intact as a state and nation—when people were not quite certain what to call themselves. Over time, Yugoslav monuments, symbols, and holidays were created to foster a common Yugoslavian identity. Literature, music, and art were also introduced and people eventually set aside their ethnic identities in favor of a broader southern Slavic identity. Yet, less than a century later, in the 1990’s, there was no longer a feeling of cohesion within the Yugoslav community; bonds that had once united the Yugoslav nation had slowly broken as established ties and social cohesion faded away. Groups began to identify themselves with their distant national pasts and religious orientations rather than as members of a Yugoslav nation.

Works by Eric Hobsbawm and Terrence Ranger argue that nation-states sometimes invent traditions or twist the truth about their history to secure their


16 Rudy Koshar’s work on German artifacts and German Memory (1870-1990) looked at the creation of the German state in the 1870’s and the deliberate effort by the newly founded state to unify its people by developing a common sense of history through a focus on particular artifacts and iconoclastic objects, such as the Cologne Cathedral, The Marienburg, the Walhalla, the Victory Column, the Hermannsdenkamal, the Kaiser Wilhelm monument, and the proliferation of Otto Von Bismarck statues throughout the country. Rudy Koshar, *From Monuments to Traces: Artifacts of German Memory, 1870-1990* (University of California Press, 2000).
legitimacy. Specifically, Hobsbawm and Ranger consider how the British monarchy invented national traditions to justify the existence and importance of the British Empire. In a speech to students from Central European University, Hobsbawm gives a personal example from a trip he took to Pakistan. Hobsbawm remarks that on this specific trip he saw banners posted on the streets of Karachi declaring, “Pakistan: 3000 Years of History!” Hobsbawm points out that the word Pakistan and the state of Pakistan were not even conceived until 1947 and that the nation-state of Pakistan was simply a modern national and political invention (as are most nation-states). Etienne Balibar echoes Hobsbawm and Ranger’s perspective on the invention of nations and national identities when espousing,

The myth of origins and national continuity, which we can easily see being set in place in the contemporary history of the “young” nations (such as India and Algeria) which emerged with the end of colonialism, but which we have a tendency to forget has also been fabricated over recent centuries in the case of the “old” nations, is therefore an effective ideological form, in which the imaginary singularity of national formations is constructed daily, by moving back from the present into the past.

In the case of Greece, Michael Hertzfeld’s anthropological study on the making of Modern Greece shows how after centuries of Ottoman rule, Greek scholars and

---

17 Hobsbawm and Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition.*

18 Ibid.


intellectuals constructed a cultural continuity through folklore studies so as to defend a Greek national identity that was linked to ancient Greece.\textsuperscript{21}

Hertzfeld presents the argument that a mostly uneducated rural Greece was in danger of having its cultural patrimony confiscated by a western intelligentsia. In other words, rural Greeks (which consisted most of the population of modern Greece) would be divorced from the achievements of the ancient Greeks and such achievements and their preservation over time would be attributed to those individuals educated in the west.\textsuperscript{22} Other scholars of Modern Greece would respond with a plethora of examples on how one could still find traces of the ancient Greek world in Modern Greece, specifically through examination of folk culture and folk life. Greek scholars examined the rural rituals of weddings, funerals, and songs to find evidence for this connection. The discovery of such historical linkages proved successful in countering any belief that the Modern Greeks were not the descendants of the ancient Greeks, even if the folk culture often seemed generally more pagan than Greek. However, questions remained. What connection did the Modern Greek have to the ancient Greeks? Further, how could the ancient Greeks become part of the Modern Greek nation and Greek national identity?

Using Greece as an example, Hertzfeld takes theories of nationalism and national identity a step forward, by asserting


\textsuperscript{22}Ibid.
that the nation-state’s claims to affixed, eternal identity grounded in
universal truth are themselves, like the moves of social actors, strategic
adjustments to the demands of the historical moment.\textsuperscript{23}

Hertzfeld incorporates his concepts of “social poetics” and “cultural intimacy” to the
nation and national identity. According to Hertzfeld, even after modernity the “…nation-
state is ideologically committed to ontological self-perpetuation for all eternity.”\textsuperscript{24} Many
Americans today for example, protest tax increases to support programs that would
benefit them, because doing so preserves what is thought to be “traditional American
colonial and democratic virtues” such as individualism and the American belief in limited
government regulation and taxation. In the same respect, one may find in Greece a
devout Marxist-Leninist who during his lifetime staunchly attacked the Greek Orthodox
Church, opposed organized religion altogether, and declared himself an atheist, but who
is still buried in a traditional Greek Orthodox religious ceremony. In this strangely, but
interestingly contradictory case, both the Church and the deceased communist find
harmony. They both understand that religion, spirituality, and even mysticism is tied to a
Greek identity and that preserving a Greek identity, whether defined by the communist as
secular and pagan in nature or by the Church as purely Christian, is more important than
political and ideological rhetoric.

In contrast to most other national histories and identities, a Greek identity was
arguably imported into Greece prior to the formation of the modern state of Greece.
Constantine Tsoukalas contends, “A type of Greek identity has existed and did not need

\textsuperscript{23}\textit{Ibid.}, 5.

\textsuperscript{24}\textit{Ibid.}, 22.
to be invented or reinvented.” These proto-Greek nationalists, who were mostly Greek intellectuals, wealthy Greek business elites living in Europe and Constantinople, and a relatively large contingent of Western European writers and artists, helped formulate and import a Greek identity into Greece. This identity was primarily based on Modern Greek cultural, historical, and linguistic roots in ancient Greece with Orthodox Christian links to the Byzantine Empire.

The process that linked the modern Greeks to the ancient Greeks began as early as the last quarter of the 18th century when ancient Greek works became easily accessible to an elite group of Greek Christians in Europe. Benedict Anderson states,

Exalted by philhellenism at the centers of Western European civilization, they [Greek intellectuals] undertook the debarbarizing of the modern Greeks, i.e., their transformation into beings worthy of Pericles and Socrates.26

Eric Hobsbawm found that this process continued well into the early 19th century when,

The literate champions and organizers of Greek nationalism were inspired by the thought of ancient Hellenic glories, which also aroused the enthusiasm of educated, i.e. classically educated, philhellenes abroad.27

Such a belief however was limited to a marginal group of Greek-speaking intellectuals in Europe and the majority of Greeks in Ottoman Greece were not necessarily aware of this connection. Thus, it would not be until the 19th century when Greeks began to see themselves as the descendants of the ancient Greeks. Douglas


26Anderson, Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. 72.

27Hobsbawm, “A New Threat to History.”
Dankins’ ubiquitous history, *The Unification of Greece, 1770-1923*, argues that education in Modern Greece reintroduced the classical past and helped strengthen this connection. Dankin states,

As was only natural [the Modern Greeks] began to devote themselves to the study of ancient Greece and introduced classical studies into their educational system…..For [the Modern Greeks] the heroes of the ancient Greek world became the heroes of their nation, and they began to stress their classical ancestry.\(^{28}\)

Modern Greek culture had certainly not remained pure since classical times. The Greek language had changed, its people had become Christian, and the population had been culturally influenced by other societies and cultures over time. Nonetheless, by the 19\(^{th}\) century a free Greek state began to ostensibly identify itself and its people as the legitimate heirs of the ancient Greeks.

**Beginnings of a Modern Greek Identity: Historical Overview**

The idea of a Greek identity, in the modern sense, was nearly non-existent in most of the late Byzantine and early Ottoman Greek period. Andronikos Falangas finds one interesting example of proto Greek nationalism in the 16\(^{th}\) and 17\(^{th}\) centuries within the Habsburg Empire. Seeking to liberate the Balkans from Muslim Ottoman control, and expand his European control, Charles V (1500-1558 ACE), Holy Roman Emperor and King of Spain, assigned one of his military commanders a John Axagiolis to construct a poem in the vernacular Greek that depicted Charles as the rightful heir to the Byzantine throne. The poem clearly tries to encourage a sense of Greek nationalism by presenting Greek speakers in the Ottoman Empire as the valorous descendants of “glorious ancient

ancestors.” Charles’ political ambitions were not successful. The poem did however incite a revolt and convinced a marginal group of Greek speakers that they were the descendants of some great ancient civilization.29

More often, the Byzantines found it offensive to be called Greeks, because the term was associated with paganism, and instead preferred to be called Roman (Romioe).30 Claudia Rapp contends,

> For westerners to call the Byzantines Graikoi became an effective weapon in the arsenal of diplomatic exchange. It was taken as a grave offense, as it undermined the very essence of Byzantine political identity as the legitimate successor to Rome.31

However, at different points in the historical record one finds subtle traces of evidence that some were advocating a Greek identity that considered the legacy of ancient Greece and reviving the creation or revival of a contemporary Greek identity that was linked to ancient Greece.

Arnold Toynbee’s comprehensive work on Greek heritage, finds that during the 14th and 15th centuries several high-ranking Byzantine authorities who called themselves Neo-Hellenes promoted the creation of a Greek or Hellenic identity around the same
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30 Peter Charanis, “How Greek was the Byzantine Empire?” Bucknell Review (1963). In the Ottoman records from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century one could certainly find mention of Vlachs, Arvanites, Romios and Jews. There are not many references of Greek (Rum in Turkish) to the Greek-speaking inhabitants of the Empire. In essence, The Ottomans too referred to the Greek Christian speakers in their empire at Romios, which is merely the adapted of Roman. Andronikos Falangas, Mia Agnosti Elliniikí Martiriá gia tin Vlachía ton Archon tou Decapemptou Aiona. A Greek Description of Vlachia During the Early Fifteenth Century (Elliniki Istoriki Etairia. Thessaloniki. In Greek, 2002) and Andronikos Falangas, “Post-Byzantine Greek Merchants of the Fifteenth-Seventeenth Centuries,” Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora 33 (2007): 7-21.

time, the Ottomans were gradually encroaching on Byzantine lands.\textsuperscript{32} These \textit{Neo-Hellenes} wished to spare themselves from foreign domination and conquest. Their solution was to adopt the social, cultural, and philosophical ways of the ancient Greeks in order to unite the Greek-speaking population around a single national identity. Other groups of \textit{Neo-Hellenes} strongly believed in the traditions and religious and philosophical beliefs of the ancient Greeks. Indeed, \textit{Neo-Hellenic} movements appear sporadically in the historical record and were often inconsistent. None gained much political or public support during its time, but they do show serious (if limited) attempts to revive a Greek identity based on some of the cultural traditions of ancient Greece.

By the 15\textsuperscript{th} century, a Greek Orthodox \textit{Neo-Hellenic} monk and teacher by the name of Georgios Gemistos Plethon (circa 1355-1452) outspokenly promoted reviving the everyday use of the name \textit{Hellene} for those citizens who helped form the Greek-speaking communities of the Byzantine Empire. Plethon declared to the Patriarch of Constantinople, “We over whom you rule and hold sway are Hellenes by race as is demonstrated by our language and ancestral education.”\textsuperscript{33} In his famous work, \textit{Laws}, Plethon articulated his philosophy and vision of a \textit{Neo-Hellenic} identity based on the religious and cultural traditions of ancient Greek pagans. Leading by example, Plethon committed himself to Zeus, rather than a Christian God.\textsuperscript{34} He advocated bringing back


all the Greek gods for religious worship and spiritual inspiration. Plethon’s ideas did not have a drastic impact or change the way that Eastern Roman Greeks viewed themselves, but his ideas did threaten the Church’s authority.35

As is no surprise, Plethon’s vision was not well taken by the Greek Church. He had challenged the Church’s authority and advocated indirectly for the demise of the Church and its teachings.36 He also dismissed Christ as his savior (which made him a heretic in the eyes of the Church). But most serious of all, his teachings assumed that the ancient Greeks were at a higher spiritual and cultural level than his own Christian civilization. Plethon proclaimed that his former Church was corrupt and more concerned with maintaining its own power and authority than with the well being of its worshipers. Plethon also traced his Greek language back to that of the ancient Greeks. He felt that the Koine Greek language was the missing link between his contemporary Greek world and ancient Greece. Spoken for perhaps 1000 years, until the mid-6th century ACE it was clearly different from ancient Greek, but it had obvious linguist associations with that language. The Greek Orthodox Church used it most often both in formal communication as well as during religious services. In other words, Plethon understood that the language that he spoke was almost identical to that of his ancient Greek predecessors. Indeed, Plethon’s reference to God as Zeus may have been a greater indication of his linguistic orientation than his religious orientation. In ancient Greek “God” was called Zeus or Dias, head and supreme god. To the early Romans Zeus

36Woodhouse, George Gemistos Plethon: The Last of the Hellenes.
becomes the Latin Deus. Later, in many of the modern Latin-based or Romance languages it is revised to Dios; in the Koine and Modern Greek it becomes Theos.

Plethon was a well-regarded teacher during his own time and had several prominent students. Among others, he taught George Scholarius, who would become Gannadios II, the first Patriarch of Constantinople after the fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks. Gennadios would be Plethon’s strongest opponent and an ardent enemy of Plethon and his ideas. At one point Gennadios declared “Ουκ απ φοιην ποτε Ελλην ειναι” or “Never call me a Greek.” For Gennadios, his Orthodox Christianity constituted the most important dimension of his personal identity as well as those of his Church and his people’s identity. To call yourself a Greek would also declare that you were not a Christian.

Because of pressure from the Church and Gennadios, Plethon eventually left Constantinople to retire to the Peloponnese. He moved to the town of Mystras in Laconia, where he would later found a “mystery school” that advocated his Neo-Hellenic ideas. By the late 15th and early 16th centuries Plethon’s school had several followers, mostly Italians who were at the time becoming increasingly interested in the ancient Greek and Roman world. Ironically, Plethon’s school was modeled after the Christian monastic schools of the era—but Plethon’s students read works by notable Greek writers

---


39 Harris, “The Influence of Plethon’s Idea of Fate on the Historian Laonnikos Chlkokondyles.”
and philosophers rather than learning the teachings of the Old and New Testaments.
Plethon also taught his students to worship the Greek gods and pray to ancient Greek and Roman statues rather than teaching monotheism and the misgivings of idolatry.

Surprisingly, although Plethon’s teachings were anti-Christian, anti-clerical and anti-establishment, the Church did not close his school. There are two explanations for this. First, Plethon’s school was too small and too distant from the Church headquarters in Constantinople to pose any serious threat to the Church’s authority. Secondly and more importantly, Plethon’s school was located on lands controlled by Venice, wherein the Greek Church had no authority.

Despite Plethon’s agitation for a national identity, an overwhelming number of educated Byzantines and Greek-speaking inhabitants of the Byzantine region remained loyal to the Orthodox Christianity. The Greek Orthodox religious perspective focused around the world of God and the Bible, the struggle between faith and infidelity, and man’s struggle for salvation. Perhaps the Church saw Plethon as a washed up old monk who suffered from a permanent case of madness, whose ideas and teachings would never be taken seriously. Nonetheless, after Plethon’s death, his former pupil Patriarch Gennadios II burned many of Plethon’s works, most notably Summary, and permanently closed his school.40 As a result, Plethon’s movement to revive an ancient Greek identity dies out in Ottoman Greece.

40 Most of Georgios Gemistos Plethon’s surviving works could be found in J.P. Migne, Patrologia Graeca.
Some scholars point to Plethon to show that the existence of a Modern Greek identity with classical roots began as early as the late Byzantine period. But most scholars today would agree that Plethon’s notion of a Greek national identity was quite different from the notion that develops in Greece in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. He is better characterized as an enlightened humanist scholar who adored the teachings of the classical Greek world but found his Orthodox Christianity and humanist ideals to be conflicting bedfellows. Moreover, Plethon adamantly wanted others to look more closely to those teachings so they could be inspired as he had been. In this and other ways, he is similar to the scholars and artists of the Italian Renaissance, who envisaged a rebirth of the classical past even as those ideas came into conflict with the ideas of their predominantly Christian society. Plethon cared less about national identity than about the intellectual pleasures of the ancient past and bringing those ideas and way of life back to the forefront of the Greek Christian world.

Although Plethon’s resuscitation of a Greek or Hellenic identity with ancient roots failed during his lifetime, his ideas seemed sensible by the early 19th century, when both western European and Greek intellectuals also sought to develop a Modern Greek identity based on ancient Greece. However, in the years preceding the Greek Revolution the question that still remained was, “Who were the Greeks and what geographic space did they occupy?” The question was so important to Modern Greece’s national project that identity, language, history, and geography would eventually all be fused together.

From a geopolitical standpoint, ancient Greek lands were far smaller in size and much farther south than the geographically expansive Byzantine lands had been.\(^{42}\) This posed a serious problem for the devisers of the Great Idea or Grand Idea (Megali Idea 1844-1922), who envisioned a large and powerful Greek state that stretched from Romania to the southern tip of the Greek peninsula. This was a nationalist agenda that dominated Greek foreign policy for much of the 19\(^{th}\) and early 20\(^{th}\) centuries. The Megali Idea proposed that the Greek state should be extended to include all Greeks, not just the minority who lived in the Greek state—in short, this would be a Greek state that would dominate most of the Balkan region.\(^{43}\) After the Greek Revolution, an adolescent Greek state lobbied internationally for the re-unification, incorporation, annexation, or return of unredeemed Greek lands. Its claims were based on modern Greece’s historic and cultural links to the ancient Greek and Byzantine Empires. In order to legitimate such claims,


\(^{43}\) By 1922 Greek irredentism and the Great Idea were forced to an abrupt and unexpected end. Seeking to expand its territory, Greece entered a war with Turkey. Greece’s military campaign to annex Asia Minor, which was home to more than a million Greek speakers, was a disaster by almost all accounts. As a result, some 1.5 million Greeks from Asia Minor were expelled from Turkey and forced to relocate to Greece. At the same time, some 500,000 Turks living in Greece were forced to relocate to Turkey. At the time, this was the largest exchange of populations in the history of the modern world and the Greek state was in no way prepared to accommodate such a large incoming population. Some of these Asia Minor Greeks (Micrasiotes in Greek), who were also often referred to by nativist Greeks as Turko Sporades (Turkish Spawned) were hastily placed in towns and homes that once belonged to Greece’s exiled Turkish population. The majority however, ended up in make shift homes in major cities throughout Greece. The failed campaign in Asia Minor, or “Catastrophe” as it was called, was a major turning point in Greek foreign policy. For the Greek state Constantinople would no longer be within its territorial reach and political interest; Greece’s irredentist Great Idea was forced to a close. Set borders between Greece and Turkey were arranged through the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923. On the Greeks from Asia Minor see Renee Hirschon, *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe: The Social Life of Asia Minor Refugees in Piraeus* (Berghahn Books, 1998) and Giles Milton, *Paradise Lost: Smyrna, 1922* (Basic Books, 2008). On the exchange of populations between Greece and Turkey see, Dimitri Penzopoulos, *The Balkan Exchange of Minorities and its Impact on Greece* (C. Hurst & Co Publishers, 2002) and Renee Hirschon, *Crossing the Aegean: An Appraisal of the 1923 Compulsory Population Exchange Between Greece and Turkey* (Berghahn Books, 2003).
Greek history needed to be presented as one continuous and unbroken thread from Ancient to Byzantine to Modern Greece. By the late 19th and early 20th centuries, international support favored Greece’s modern territorial claims.

Most historians agree that the common Greek at the time of the Greek Revolution knew very little of ancient Greek and Byzantine history and civilization (to assume that all Greek speakers did, would be like assuming that all Austrians today could play any of Mozart’s classical overtures on the piano). Thus, the more difficult task for an independent Greece was to gain support from commoners who did not feel they were descendants of the ancient Greeks, and who had no particular sense of national history and identity. The Greek school system was chosen to serve as the main catalyst in shaping a Greek identity based on the ancient Greek past. Specifically, cultural and political leaders in Greece decided to rely upon the power of education as a nationalizing force. Both the school system and Greek history textbooks would be used in developing a strong notion of a Greek identity.

---


45 After independence most Greek citizens did not resist the Greek school and a Greek identity that advocated the notion that the Modern Greeks were descendant of the ancient Greeks. We do however find some resistance in some of the islands in the Aegean. On the island of Samos for example, there was an attempt on the island to develop an independent Samiote identity separate from that advocated by the Greek schools in Greece. Samos would be incorporated into the Greek state in the early 20th century.
Remembering and Understanding the Past

Several scholars on the topic of memory and the construction of national identity suggest that both are socially constructed for the purpose of serving the political and ideological interests of the nation-state. Maurine Halbwach describes “collective memory” as a group’s common understanding of the past, noting that it is usually produced in local communities first and later becomes part of a nation’s broader and collective understanding of the past. Collective memory thus helps shape a nation’s collective identity and helps unite the nation around that identity.

Similarly, J.R. Gillis suggests that memory tends to be influenced by people who have never met, or have no contact with one another, but still find similarities through a common national history. These individuals relate to one another as much by forgetting as by remembering their historical past, and the power of these remembrance practices very often helps construct a collective national identity. According to Gillis, the norm of collective memory is born from a strong sense of conflicting representations of the past, and the effort of each group to make its historical version the foundation upon which national identity is constructed. In addition, the nation-state can showcase and stress a type of collective memory which is shared by several members of a given national community, and whereupon the nation can be established. Relics of the past are often

46 Marina Hadiyanni, Contesting the Past, Constructing the Future: A Comparative Study of the Cyprus Conflict in Secondary History Education (Verlag, 2008).


49 Ibid.
displayed, national holidays are commemorated, and histories about the nation are written and carefully documented to consolidate the past as a universally understood national memory and collective national identity. Schools play the role of publicizing that national history, which inevitably becomes imbedded in the memory of the people. Gillis asserts that, “…memories and identities are not fixed things but representations or constructions of reality; subjective rather than objective phenomenon” and “…identities and memories are not things we think about, but things we think with [my emphasis]. As such they have no existence beyond our politics, our social relations, and our histories.” In other words, collective memory and national identity are socially constructed phenomena that, usually serve the interest of the nation-state and in the long run benefit the nation-state by uniting its people under a common experience, and understanding of a shared historical past.

Phillip Resnik has also examined national identity and the construction of memory. Resnik found that the teaching of the Holocaust in Israeli schools was controlled by the state, which intended to create citizens with an emotional attachment to Israel and to the nation it represents. Resnik implies that the state constructs national identity by creating collective memory, and that it does so to ensure its dominance over its subjects and their loyalty. In schools, the Holocaust is connected to Jewish history

---


53 Ibid.
from ancient times—emphasizing events such as Moses’s exodus from Egypt and the Roman Massacres at Masada through the more recent European *pogroms* that were intended to wipe out the Jewish populace. Israeli history, in other words, focuses on the struggle and survival of the Jewish people and their identity after centuries of persecutions. B. Schwartz similarly argues that collective memory is not a natural phenomenon, but is instead created through political manipulation. In other words, the nation’s production and reproduction of history and remembrances are designed to influence what is remembered, by whom, and for what purpose. The state controls what information about the nation’s past is broadcast and displayed so as to benefit the state.

**National Identity in Modern Greece**

In the case of Greece, by the time of the Greek Revolution most Greeks did not yet think in terms of national identity and most did not consider themselves as the heirs of the ancient Greek world. In fact, the landed primates were more interested in maintaining the political and social *status quo* and looked at revolution with skepticism, and only as means to consolidate their power. They identified more with their families.

---


55 Hadiyanni, *Contesting the Past, Constructing the Future: A Comparative Study of the Cyprus Conflict in Secondary History Education*.

56 The historical record reveals that their were some poems written in the vernacular Greek in the 16th century that make mention of ancient Greek figures, but do not call these figures Greeks. A song about Alexander the Great says “Ἄλεξανδρος ο βασιλεύς ολήν την οικουμένη με τους Ρωμαίους.” The poem refers to Alexander as the Emperor of the Romans and not the Greeks. Another poem on Achilles says, “Μα παντοτε πολύ πικρον ταχέων ο βασιλεύς με τι τρόπον να νικηθη ο νέος Αχιλλεας.” Again in this instance Achilles is referred to as an Emperor a term not used in ancient Greece, but in Rome. This type of confusion was quite common as has been illustrated in part of this chapter. The importance here however is that we know that most of the people at the time had a better sense of who the Romans were than who the ancient Greeks were. Andronikos Falangas, “Μορφές Ηπειρών Στις Πούμανικες Χρόνοι Κατά την Βαλκανικό Μεσαίανα,” “Personalities of Epirots in the Romanian Lands During the Later Balkan Middle Ages,” *Dodoni: Istoria kia Archeologia* (University of Ioannina. In Greek, 2004), 383-446.
and local towns than with a broader Greek nation. Wealthy Greek elites were also comfortable with the way things were. They had gained influence and status within the highest offices of the Ottoman political hierarchy and had benefited financially from trade throughout and beyond the empire. They were socially well regarded by their Muslim counterparts, and able to practice their Orthodox Christian faith with an extensive degree of freedom. In short, from an economic and nationalist perspective self-determination did not make sense for most Greeks, peasants or elites. Both groups had more to lose than to gain from a revolt.

On the other hand, Western Europe was home to vibrant scholarship about ancient Greece, which had been spread rapidly across the continent from the Renaissance onward. By the 1700’s ancient Greek works had helped shape the foundation of western European intellectual thought and enlightenment thought was often presented as originating in classical Greek and Roman texts. The Enlightenment had brought progress in science, art, and philosophy to the continent. The Enlightenment also advocated freedom from government and totalitarian oppression. Interestingly enough, some of these ideas would filter into Ottoman Greece when the Ottoman Empire began to gradually decline in power. At the same time, the West became interested in Ottoman Greece because enlightened thought had originated in Greece.

Alexis Politis’ study on Greek perceptions of the Byzantine Empire finds that an ancient Greek or Hellenic identity began to take root in the late 18th century. Politis

---

57 Alexis Politis, “From Christian Roman Emperors to the Glorious Greek Ancestors,” in David Ricks and Paul Magdalino, eds., Byzantium and the Modern Greek Identity (Kings College London, Centre for Hellenic Studies, 1998).
asserts that from the pulpit Greek priests often described their churchgoers as ‘descendants of the Hellenes’ and ‘worthy descendants of the Hellenes.’ However, at that point the common Greek speaker did not yet have a strong sense of who the Hellenes were and how they were connected to his or her own life. Such declarations from the pulpit may have sought to develop a national consciousness in the minds of the public, but most people at the time had not yet developed an understanding of a historical continuity from the ancient past to the present and how it was connected to their national identity.

Even so, such declarations indicate that the Church and some of its local leaders were cognizant that the ancient Greeks had come from the region they currently inhabited, that the ancient Greeks spoke a similar language to their own, and that the modern Greeks could likely be the direct descendants of the ancient Greeks. The Church had found that these historical links were good tools for boosting the morale of worshipers who felt insignificant in their lives and the world. Such worshipers comprised the majority—it has been estimated that in the 18th century over 95 percent of the Ottoman population were peasant farmers and peasants lived difficult lives of toil and hardship.59

58Ibid., 4-7.

59Timothy E. Gregory, “Contrasting Impressions of Land Use in early Modern Greece: The Eastern Corinthian and Kythera,” in Sirol Davies and Jack L. Davis, eds., Between Venice and Istanbul: Colonial Landscapes in Early Modern Greece (American School of Classical Studies, 2007). Although all land in the empire was the property of the Sultan, its actual use, management, and even ownership was granted to both Christian and Muslims. As a result, most local peasants lived an agrarian system quite similar to medieval feudalism. Not all parts of Ottoman territory were governed in a unanimous administrative manner. For example, some areas had more autonomy than others, such as the islands of Spetse and Hydra in the Aegean and Corfu in the Ionian Sea. In Smyrna and Constantinople most Greeks owned property, as these areas comprised the wealthier Greek speaking communities of the empire. These
Until the 19th century, the majority of Greek peasants saw themselves first as members of a kin group, then as members of a village or region, and lastly as part of a Christian Rum. Furthermore, most peasants did not have a strong sense of time and its importance to the historical past. Marking the passing of time implies progress, and that one’s current state was somehow built upon the cultural, social, and political foundations of the past. Yet in early 19th century Europe, history was still for the most part viewed as a series of unconnected events. In Greece it would not be until the late 19th century that an idealist conception of history was formulated. Such a formulation fostered recognition of the continuity of and relation among past events and epic narratives. The construction of a national history and national identity became historiography’s primary aim. As discussed in the following chapters, Greek history would become patriotic, heroic, and national narratives would valorize the heritage and culture of the Greek nation from its ancient past to its present.

Greeks were able to become wealthy through maritime trade. In 1774, the treaty of Kuchuk Kairnaj gave favorable privileges to Greek merchants. Wealthy Greek merchants such as Andreas Miaoulis and Laskarina Bouboulina built a large merchant fleet, but converted their fleet to a navy fleet against the Ottoman during the Greek Revolution. Yannoulopoulos, “Greek Society on the Eve of Independence,” in Richard Clogg, ed., Balkan Society in the Age of Greek Independence. Similarly, the Albanian semi-independent despot Ali Pasha controlled areas of what are today parts of southern Albania and Northern Greece. Pasha was able to create a small empire for himself and his family. He defended his mini-empire by signing an alliance with Napoleon I of France who found that an alliance with Ali Pasha served France’s interests in limiting British influence in the region. K.E. Fleming, The Muslim Bonaparte: Diplomacy and Orientalism in Ali Pasha’s Greece (Princeton University Press, 1999).


Even foreign travelers noted that few Greeks saw themselves as somehow standing upon the shoulders of their ancient ancestors. A British observer was surprised to find that many Ottoman Greeks cared more about the Roman Emperors such as Constantine the Great than the heroic figures of the ancient Greek world. He wrote, “Those who are most fond of referring to past times, dwell on the power and merits of those Princes, and begin their history with the great Constantine…”62 When the Greek Revolution was in full gear over a decade later, in 1824, another witness, M. Von Stackelberg, wrote,

The simple shepherd holds the Greeks to be the ancestors of the Franks, and considers them to have been foreigners and gifted craftsmen who were once lords and masters of the country.63

Similarly in 1891, a Greek nationalist was distressed to find that a Greek speaker from Asia Minor saw himself as being a Christian and not Greek. He asserted,

For if today you ask a Christian, even one speaking a corrupted Greek: “What are you?” “A Christian (Christianos),” he will unhesitatingly reply. “All right, but other people are Christians, the Armenians, the Franks, the Russians…” “I don’t know,” he will answer, “yes, these people believe in Christ but I am a Christian,” “Perhaps you are a Greek?” “No, I am not anything, I’ve told you that I’m a Christian, and once again I say to you that I am a Christian!”64

Although the contexts of these observations are at best vague, these accounts indicate that the common people of Greece did not at this time have a strong sense of historical connection and a broader Greek national identity. They likely saw their own

62J.C. Hobhouse, A Journey Through Albania and Other Provinces of Turkey in Europe and Asia: To Constantinople, During the Years 1809-1810 (M. Carey and Son Publishing, 1917), 588.

63Von M. Stackelberg, Der Appolotempel zu Bassae In Arcadien (Rome, 1826), 14.

64As quoted by Clogg, Balkan Society in the Age of Greek Independence, 67.
histories as something recent and quite distant from the ancient world. Dates were easily confused, allowing Constantine the Great and the Franks to have lived in the same place and around the same time as the peasants themselves. In other words, their understanding of history was associated with figures, symbols, and myths from a past that most resembled their own era and lived experiences.

Moreover, in most cases history was abstract and limited in scope as much perhaps as one’s Orthodox Christianity, just as churchgoers heard Sunday readings from the Bible, but had difficulty discerning the book’s Koine Greek from their colloquial Demotic Greek, so they heard about historical events, but had little or no framework for organizing such facts. Similar analogs occurred in other areas of life; Greek-speaking Christians often communicated in Greek and Turkish, celebrated Muslim holidays, and for many the Orthodox domed churches looked from the outside no different than the Turkish mosque next door. The Greeks happened to be Christian and still spoke a language similar to their Byzantine predecessors; it was therefore natural for them to feel more of a cultural and historical connection to their Christian heritage than to ancient Greece.

Scholars agree that three basic cultural factors, language, religion, and history, help unite a people around a common collective identity. During Ottoman times, the typical Greek was aware of differences between his culture and his Turkish counterpart’s culture. For example, he understood that Turks were Muslims and he was Christian. His primary language of communication was Greek while a Turk typically favored Turkish; some of his cultural practices also differed from his Turkish counterparts, including
differences in religious ritual and in familial and social organization. The degree to which these differences was unimportant, what mattered was that they helped reinforce a sense of “otherness, of “us” and “them” that overshadowed any underlying similarities.65

Greek and European intellectuals in the late 18th and early 19th centuries also saw Greek and Turkish cultures as quite different. They viewed the modern Greeks as the cultural heirs of the ancient Greeks. Because ancient Greece represented a pinnacle of cultural achievement, its descendant culture was perforce far superior to that of the Turks. Moreover, ancient Greece was by the 19th century embedded in European culture and acknowledged by most European intellectuals as the birthplace of western/European civilization. Like their western European counterparts, the Greeks were also Christians, but not free to practice their Christianity by their Muslim rulers. This was for the west enough reason to help the Greeks in their struggle for freedom. However, the greater task of Greek and European intellectuals was to convince the many members of the Greek population that they were the ancestral descendants of the ancient Greeks, despite the fact that the majority of the population did not see themselves this way. It was left to the
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65The “other” became more apparent in Greece in the 1990’s when waives of immigrants, mostly from Eastern Europe, settled in Greece. The largest number of them came from Albania. Today the Greek government estimates that 10% of its population is of Albanian descent. This phenomenon has sparked debate in Greece, especially with regard to the interplay between Greek education and Greek identity. Greece’s current status as a host country for immigrants is, more than anything else, bedeviled by uncertainty and confusion. This was made evident in 2003 when a student in Greece, who happened to be of Albanian descent, was picked by his local school to lead the national World War II parade. Many Greeks in his small rural community protested, contending that a Greek should lead the parade rather than a “foreigner.” For others the student was as much Greek as the other students as he had spent most of his life in Greece and had succeeded in the Greek school system. Martin Baldwin-Edwards, “Immigration Into Greece, 1990-2003: A Southern European Paradigm,” UNECE (European Population Forum, 2004). Brady Kiesling, “Burning Issues of the Day,” Athens News (6/24/2007): A04. Article code C13229A042 and Harry Van Versendaal, “Greeks Ask: What’s in a Flag?” H Kathemerini (English Edition, 2003).
Modern Greek school system to create these cultural connections in the minds of the Greek people.

Identity From the Outside In: Philhellenic Perceptions

The educated champions and coordinators of Greek nationalism in the early 19th century were inspired by the glories of ancient Greece. Ancient Greek and Roman works had helped give rise to the Renaissance in Italy, which later spread like a wildfire throughout the rest of western Europe during the late 14th to 17th centuries. Early Renaissance artists and their works, as Raphael’s *School of Athens*, Boccacio’s *The Deccameron*, and Dante’s *Divine Comedy* often credited Greek thinkers as a source of their humanistic and artistic inspiration. Artists like Michelangelo and Leonardo da Vinci had Greece and Rome in mind when completing many of their great works.

Later, the Enlightenment or Age of Reason, and Scientific Revolution (1600-1700 ACE) also owed much of its progress in philosophy, literature, art, and science to the ancient Greeks and Romans. Although some scholars as Paschalis Kitromilides contend that their was a Greek Enlightenment (*Diafotismos*) that emerged outside of Greece in various parts of Europe, most Greek-speakers in Ottoman Greece did not know of the impact that ancient Greece had had on the western world. Later, Greek-speaking intellectuals living in western Europe provided Ottoman Greece with specific ideas for developing a national identity based on Greek history. Western European artists, writers, and intellectuals called Philhellenes were bringing somewhat similar notions into the
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66 Hobsbawm, “A New Threat to History.”

region. Both groups were interested in seeing Greece become a free nation-state that would revive an ancient Greek past in the present.\textsuperscript{68} Constantine Tsoukalas assets,

\ldots\textit{the main narrative foundations of the self-perceptions and images of Greeks were first laid out in Western Europe as components of a broader representation of the sources of European civilization.}\textsuperscript{69}

Philhellenic representations of Greece in art and literature would help shape the Modern Greek identity and affirm the notion that the Modern Greeks were the descendants of the ancient Greeks. Although such representations were entirely a western European concoction, their creators were in almost unanimous agreement about their perceptions of the Modern Greeks. These outsider representations would help define the Greek nation as Greeks began to share with one another an understanding of who they were. As Orhan Pamuk notes, “Once imprinted in our minds, other people’s reports of what we’ve done end up mattering more than what we ourselves remember.”\textsuperscript{70}

The Philhellenes and their movement during the late 18\textsuperscript{th} to early 19\textsuperscript{th} centuries played important roles in shaping a Greek identity. The Philhellenes at first fashioned themselves as students of ancient Greece. Later however, the Philhellenes transitioned into a political movement that used its artistic, literary, and political voice to push the western world to support an independent Greece. By the early 19\textsuperscript{th} century the movement

\textsuperscript{68}Philhellenism was a 19\textsuperscript{th} century phenomenon that happened mostly in Europe. The philhellenes came from the British Isles, France, Switzerland, Denmark, Poland and the Italian and German states as well as the United States. At first they were resistant to accept that the Modern Greeks were the descendants of the ancient Greek, but later changed their minds as the movement philhellenism gained political support in Europe and the United States. William St. Clair, \textit{That Greece Might Still Be Free: The Philhellenes in the War of Independence} (Open Book Publishers, 2008).

\textsuperscript{69}Tsoukalas, “The Irony of Symbolic Reciprocities-The Greek Meaning of ‘Europe’ as a Historical Inversion of the European Meaning of Greece,” 27.

\textsuperscript{70}Orhan Pamuk, \textit{Istanbul: Memories and the City} (Vintage, 2006).
had garnered worldwide support, partly for humanitarian reasons, partly for political reasons, and partly for animating the ancient Greek world. Glenn Most contends that,

Philhellenism celebrated the Greeks as true individuals and saw in the freedom of the Greek polis a necessary condition for the development of the full human and cultural potential of the ancient Greeks.\(^{71}\)

Most of the Philhellenes came from England, the German states and France, but Belgium, Poland, Italy, and the United States also had a hefty number of Philhellenes. They came from various social and cultural backgrounds, some were writers and poets, others were soldiers and politicians, some were idealist and romantics while others were political realists and pragmatists. Although they had differences, all agreed that Greece needed to be free. Some of the Philhellenes as Lord Byron fought and died alongside the Greeks during the Revolution. They were all admirers of ancient Greece to the point that they wanted to revive that world. They also associated the modern Greeks with the ancient Greeks and believed that traces of the ancient Greeks existed in the modern Greeks. Thus, western European Philhellenism had an immediate and intimate interest in Greece for two reasons: first, because Europe traced its intellectual roots to Greece, and second, because Europeans were looking to the ancient Greeks for answers about their own world. As a community with a knowable past and an imagined future, Greece was woven into 19th century European discourse on nationalism, identity, and nation-state formation as soon as Europe began to trace its roots in Greece.\(^{72}\)


\(^{72}\)Tsoukalas, “The Irony of Symbolic Reciprocities-The Greek Meaning of ‘Europe’ as a Historical Inversion of the European Meaning of Greece.”
Stathis Gourgouris finds that although French, English, and German writers and artists played a pivotal role in identifying the Modern Greeks in a literary and artistic context, it was the German bildung tradition’s focus on education that liberated a post-colonial Ottoman Greek society from mythical superstition and forcefully pushed Greece towards secularization and modernization. The secularization and modernization of Greek society vis à vis a European educational tradition was thus a product of the broader European Philhellenic movement.

Generally speaking, westerners saw Greece as suffering from a cultural backwardness caused by the occupation of the Ottoman Empire. They also held that Greece and its people would have remained culturally advanced had the Turks not conquered them. That conquest, they felt, had kept Greece from participating in such pivotal and influential European cultural phenomena as the Renaissance and the Enlightenment. Not surprisingly, the Philhellenes saw themselves as protectors of both European civilization and classical Greek thinking, all the while portraying the Ottoman as both “other” and “inferior.” They believed that the liberation of Greece form its “oriental” oppressors would save the Modern Greeks and their ancestral roots, bringing
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74 Maria Todorova, *Imagining the Balkans* (Oxford University Press, 1997).

75 Greeks did participate in the Enlightenment although a state of Greece did not take part in the Enlightenment. The question that still remains is the beginning of this Greek Enlightenment. Dean Kostantaras has pushed it back as early as the 17th century. He finds that this Enlightenment in Greece, of which occurs in the then Ottoman occupied territories of Greece gave rise to the beginnings of a Greek national conscious spearheaded by educated Greek intellectuals. It is unclear however by Konstantaras what this national consciousness meant to the average Greek speakers and how effective these Greek intellectuals were in developing this notion of a Greek national identity. Dean J. Kostantaras, *Infamy and Revolt: The Rise of the National Problem in Early Modern Greek Thought* (Columbia University Press, 2006).
them back to the west, (where it was assumed) they belonged. Philhellenes also argued that freeing Greece would enrich European civilization, causing it to reach or exceed the glories of the ancient Greek past, and increase Europe’s global influence. Gourgouris argues that, “Philhellenism treats the origin of Modern Greeks both as symbolic capital and as symbolic contemporary political investment.”

Others such as Edward Said have contended that the Philhellenic movement was one half of a power struggle between the Occidental West and the Oriental East, and that Greece was merely the playing field on which this struggle took place. In terms of both geopolitical resources and Philhellenic sentiment he may be correct. At the time of the revolution, Greece was in fact far behind western Europe in cultural, political, and economic terms. Athens, once the center of the Aegean trading world and the western
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76 St. Clair, That Greece Might Still Be Free: The Philhellenes in the War of Independence.

77 In November of 1990 a symposium was organized in Paris entitled, “The Greeks, the Romans, and Ourselves.” The overall purpose of the symposium was to rethink European civilization’s ancestral roots from Greece to Rome. Around the same time, the European Union was considering formulating a common European identity. Ancient Greece would serve as the foundation of European civilization and culture. The EU proposition found overwhelming support by the European member states. Roger Droit, ed., “Les Grecs, les romans st nous: Antiquitè est-elle moderne?” (Paris: Le Monde, 1991).

78 Gourgouris, Dream Nation: Enlightenment, Colonization and the Institution of Modern Greece, 143.


80 In 1981 Greece was admitted into the highly exclusive and highly selective European Economic Community (EEC). Admission into the EEC caused issues of identity to resurface in Greece. Was Greece truly part of the west or was the Greek nation culturally and politically suspended between east and west? From a cultural point of view “Westernizers” wanted Greece to become more western, more European, and more cosmopolitan. In contrast, “Traditionalists” feared that “westernization” would mean relinquishing some traditional Greek values and undermining the Greek Orthodox Church. From an economic and political standpoint, however, European integration made sense for Greece and Europe. It would open markets in Europe provide Greece with political security. However, to retain its EEC membership, Greece had to make several concessions, such as the reorganization of its economy and many of its internal social and cultural policies. Michael Tsinisizelis, “Greece in the European Union: A Political/Institutional Balance Sheet,” unpublished paper (2005).
heart of politics, literature, the arts, and philosophy was by 1830 a relatively small provincial town of no more than 30,000 residents. At the time, residents of Athens could still see the ruins on top of the Acropolis, which included the Parthenon, (sculptures gone since 1801) the Erechthyon, with its stoically standing Caryatides as columns, and of course the Propylae at the entrance of the walled ancient city.\(^{81}\) Below the Acropolis one would find few traces of ancient Athenian common life. Most of the agora was still buried in the ground waiting for archaeologist to unearth it, but the Temple of Olympian Zeus (with one extra column standing), the Theatre of Dionysus Eleuthereos, and Hadrian’s Roman Wall still remained very much visible.\(^{82}\) For many outsiders this seemed to be all that was left of the ancient Greek past in Greece.

The city’s population had neglected its ancient landmarks for centuries. But by 1800, Athens had begun to attract western travelers interested in the classical world.
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\(^{81}\)Rudolph Muller, *View of the Acropolis from the Pnyx* (1863). Original found in Rome. Inv. No. 25193. Also in Maria-Fani Tsigakou, *Through Romantic Eyes: European Images of Nineteenth-Century Greece From the Benaki Museum* (Art Services International, 1991), 31. Prior to Greek independence, the Parthenon has undergone several transformations. During Byzantine times it had been converted into a church. Later, during Ottoman times it had been turned into a mosque. After Greek independence much of the Parthenon as the other structures on the acropolis had been neglected. However, outsiders were more interested in the Acropolis than the local Greek population. For some time in Greece restoration of the buildings on the Acropolis as much of the ancient ruins across Greece was prohibited by the state. Kostis Palamas, the late 9th century Greek poet advocated this because he felt that it was better for the imagination to do the restoration. Some scholars have called the process of keeping the Greek ruins in their natural state or un-restored state as *anapalaiosi*. From a political aspect, nevertheless, Greece had an advantage in its ancient ruins after statehood and used them wisely when developing a Greek national consciousness. In other words, Greece did not need to create national monuments. The monuments were already there. Most were buried in the ground and only needed to be brushed off. No serious investment was done by the Greek state in the building new national monuments. The only new structures built that also served as national monuments was the University of Athens that took on a neo-classical architecture, the Kings’ palaces and the national museums that were built to house relics from the ancient Greek past. Peter Mackridge, “Cultural Differences as National Identity in Modern Greece,” in Katerina Zacharia, ed., *Hellentisms: Culture, Identity, and Ethnicity From Antiquity to Modernity* (Ashgate, 2008).

Some were surprised to find the city in such a dilapidated condition and so “oriental”. In a letter written while in Greece, the American traveler Nicholas Biddle was disappointed to find few traces of the ancient Greek world, and a people that lacked any cultural resemblances to their ancient forebears:

The race so honored, so proud whose oracle dictated to nations groans under the rod of the Turkish despot. I look in vain for the crowd, which once ascended the mountain to bring the offerings and the hopes of very people.

Biddle was expressing a popular sentiment of the time, and one that certainly bolsters some of Said’s arguments regarding the use of Greece as a battleground between East and West.

Although the majority of westerners were little concerned about the affairs of Ottoman Greece, the political developments taking place there prompted many western artists and writers to focus their abilities on the inhabitants of Greece and connect the modern to the ancient. At times this was accomplished by depicting the local people in
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83 Comments by foreign travelers to Greece, mostly from the west, are fairly consistent in their immediate impressions on Greece. Greece is seen to be more eastern than western. “Oriental”, a term that suggests mystical, romantic, eastern, exotic, also suggests a lack of modernity and economic prosperity. This is still true today when Greece is referred to as a “cultural crossroads” or as Martin Bernal put it in a speech at Northwestern University in 1999, “When one enters Greece from the west it feels as if you entered the east, however when one comes into Greece from the east it feels as if you just entered the west.” No published source exists on Martin Bernal’s speech, but as my notes show, I had attended the speech in 1999 while a student at Northwestern. For more on foreign travelers in Greece prior to Greek independence, see Olga Augustinos, *French Odyssey: Greece in French Travel Literature From the Renaissance to the Romantic Era* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994). Robert Eisner, *Travelers to an Antique Land: The History and Literature of Travel to Greece* (University of Michigan Press, 1991).


still life that were realistic and natural. On other occasions, artists blended the conditions of the contemporary locals with those of ancient Greece. This is perhaps most evident in the works of the Romantics. For example, Revault’s 1822 drawing *Reveil de la Grèce* depicts a Modern Greek woman, dressed in classical apparel that is breaking the chains of slavery and standing victorious over her fallen Turkish master. Several symbols of ancient Greece are shown in Revault’s drawing including a statue of the goddess Athena, a Doric Greek column, scrolls inscribed with the names of ancient Greek philosophers and playwrights, and various ancient Greek geometric and scientific tools. Above the woman a nymph-like figure holds a sign that reads, “Libertè: Leves vos nobles fils des héroes” and in each of the four corners of Revault’s work are the inscriptions “Rèligion,” “Patrie,” “Gloire,” and “Prospèritè”. Revault’s work clearly portrays the Modern Greeks as the direct heirs of the ancient Greeks by blending contemporary themes with ancient figures and symbols and connecting modern themes with ancient themes. Revault was not the only western artist to do this.

Eugene Delacroix’s *Scenes de Massacres de Scio* (1824) and *La Grèce sur les Ruins de Missolonghi* (1826), for example, are both allegories of defeated Greece pleading for help from the west. Delacroix personalizes the pleas by focusing on the emotional context of the images. In both paintings his characters are facing disasters...
soon to be brought by an oncoming Turkish army. His Greek figures become symbols of
classical civilization and Christianity threatened by barbarism and “Islamization.”
Moreover, Delacroix’s Greek figures look physically western, but are romanticized by
wearing eastern attire.

Similarly, Delacroix’s painting, *La Grèce sur les ruins de Missolonghi*, is as much
a political statement as it is an incredible work of art. The Messolonghi maiden looks to
be pleading for help from her audience. At the same time she seems still very much
strong and courageous. Her classically inspired white dress exposes almost her entire
chest and breasts. Delacroix has drawn her so that her appearance is very similar to many
ancient Greek statues depicting goddesses. A dead body lies below the maiden, covered
in rubble while in the background a shadowy dark Turkish soldier holds a staff high in
the air, as if declaring victory. From a political point of view, Delacroix is demanding
that the west intervene and help the Greeks in their struggle for independence. From an
artistic point of view, Delacroix’s Greek maiden is a symbolic declaration that the
Modern Greeks are the true descendants of the ancient Greeks.

Similarly, Delacroix’s *Massacre de Scio* follows a similar artistic and political
theme that takes place on the island of Scio or Chios. In this case, a belligerent Turkish
army is seeking retribution for a massacre of Turkish civilians by Greek revolutionaries
in the Arcadia region of the Peloponnese. In Delacroix’s painting the Turkish army is
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*statues of Greek goddesses. For an extensive collection of Delacroix’s romantic works see Gilles Neret,*

*Rethinking World History: Essays on Europe, Islam and World History* (Cambridge University Press,
1993).
about to assert its revenge on a group of Greek civilians who have taken temporary refuge on top of a hill on the island. Most striking in the painting is the depiction of a Greek mother who lays on the ground dead, her young child still feeding on her breast for nourishment. Next to the dead mother a naked Greek woman is tied to a horse and is about to be taken as a slave by the Turkish soldier. Several other Greeks on the hill lay half naked and fearful, awaiting their fate by an incoming Turkish horde. Delacroix’s painting is truly graphic in its expression and nature. The Greeks in the painting are portrayed as scared, innocent, and in discontent. They also all have a classical Greek appeal to them; it recalls the appeal of the maiden of Messolonghi. Barthelemy Jobert argues that, Delacroix achieves this by positioning his Greek figures in unusually contorted positions so as to show the details of their godlike characteristics. The Turks, on the other hand, are depicted as dark and mysterious figures. They all wear turbans and are unemotional. With Massacre de Scio, Delacroix again sends the message that the Greeks of today are the Greeks of the past and that a massacre of the Greek people is a denigration of western principles and civilization.
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Figure 1

Eugene Delacroix, *Massacre At Scion (Chios)* (1824), Louvre
Figure 2

Eugene Delacroix, *Greece Expiring on the Ruins of Missolonghi* (1826), Musée Des Beaux-Arts, Bordeaux
Revault and Delacroix were not the only artists to depict the Modern Greeks as the *de facto* descendants of the ancient Greeks; this was a common theme within the genre of 19th century Romantic art and literature. George Byron, for example, fused the modern and ancient Greeks in an almost perfect contemporary literary illustration of the ancient and the oriental. Percy Bysshe Shelley would even declare,

> The apathy of the rulers of the civilised world to the astonishing circumstance of the descendants of that nation to which they owe their civilisation, rising as it were from the ashes of their ruin, is something perfectly inexplicable to a mere spectator…The modern Greek is the descendant of those glorious beings whom the imagination almost refuses to figure to itself as belonging to our kind, and he inherits much of their sensibility, their rapidity of conception, their enthusiasm, and their courage.

Clearly the Romantic’s representations of and statements about the Greeks became symbols within a Modern Greek ideology that advocated Greek ethnic survival after centuries of persecution and a Greek historical and cultural continuity from the ancient past to present. However, not all agreed that the modern Greeks were the direct descendants of the ancient Greeks. As will be discussed in Chapter Four, Jakob Philipp Fallmerayer (1790-1861) had suggested that there were few similarities between the Modern Greeks and the ancient Greeks. Fallmerayer’s *Greek Theory*, which had gained significant support in European intellectual circles, advocated that the ancient Greek population had been replaced by a massive Slavic migration. Thus, Greek intellectuals were forced to defend a Greek cultural continuity from past to present.

---

Constructing a Greek Identity

Although the Philhellenes and other “outside forces” helped shape a Modern Greek identity, the Greek school would become a national symbol for the clandestine survival of that identity. Moreover, the Greek school as a national institution reproduced a historical consciousness and a Greek national identity. After Greek independence the Greek state was committed to a nationalized school system. Compulsory education was passed surprisingly early when compared to other European nations (1834), even though few schools existed in Greece and the state lacked the money to build new schools and train new teachers.\textsuperscript{91} As shown in the following chapter, the school system had to start almost from scratch and unite the nation around a common national identity. As a result, Greek history came into Greek schools first from the west, through textbooks; Greek historiographers used translated histories of ancient Greece before and while developing their own national history. Later, Greek history would be portrayed as an unbroken historical continuum from past to present.

Greek identity was also predominately aligned with European notions of a Greek identity. This identity was heavily linked to the Greek Church and Christianity, as the Church took most of the credit for protecting and preserving a Greek identity after the formation of the Greek state. Notably, those communities in Greece that had not yet acquired a national identity and those communities that did not speak Greek adopted a Greek identity with almost no resistance.

Greece would struggle long and hard with its eastern traditions and western cultural legacies, its spiritual Christian religious beliefs and modern secular aspirations, its rural lifestyles and customs and its ambition to modernize and westernize. Yet immediately following independence, the ultimate burden fell on the Greek school system. Schools were bestowed with the task of inculcating a Greek identity to both a Greek speaking public and to a public whose members were not quite certain just what to call themselves.

By resurrecting a vision of Byzantine and ancient Greek culture and history and projecting it onto the country’s students through the medium of the school, forces both within and outside of Greece helped to foster the creation of a Greek national identity. At the local level the school taught armies of fresh students about their shared traditions and customs, their common past and glories, and their commitment and dedication to one another and to their nation. The Greek nation would pride itself on its past. For many Modern Greeks, they were who their ancestors were, and once again became what their ancestors had been.
CHAPTER THREE
THE ROLES OF SCHOOLS IN CONSTRUCTING A GREEK IDENTITY

Greeks are those who have a Greek education.

--Isocrates

Overview

This chapter outlines the origin and development of formal education systems in Greece and in neighboring areas with large numbers of Greek-speaking residents. The chapter is organized into ten parts. It first considers the roles of the Orthodox Church and others in establishing educational institutions, emphasizing the purported purposes, administration, and funding of schools. The chapter then describes and analyzes the ideas of two educational reformers, Rigas Velestinlis (1757-1798) and Adamandios Koraes (1748-1833). Although each proffered a model in which an educational system-linking Modern to Ancient Greece would help foster a Modern Greek national state, their visions differed in important ways. The chapter closes with a description and analysis of the ways that formal education developed in the century after Greek Independence.

A Short History of Greek Education

The development of a formal education system in the Greek world began centuries ago. The so-called Patriarchal Academy, one of the first Greek institutions of higher learning was opened during the Byzantine era (c. 425 ACE).¹ During Ottoman

¹Scholars debate whether the Patriarchal Academy truly existed. Some claim that the term merely refers to the church of the Hagia Sophia. Others say that there was no school and that late Byzantine
times the school became known as the Great School (*Megale Schole*). In 1620, Kirillos II Loukaris initiated major reforms in the Great School including the use of a greater number of secular teachings and more books for the academy’s students. Many Orthodox priests were trained at the Great School and similar institutions preparatory to being stationed throughout the empire as religious leaders, community leaders, and teachers.\(^2\) They lived and worked amongst ordinary people, delivering religious services in the *Koine* Greek; community members looked to them as both spiritual and personal advisors.\(^3\) Priests were also responsible for fulfilling any requests that came from Constantinople; such as informing citizens of new regulations passed by the Church or the state.

**Teacher-Priests**

Although there is no precise count of the number of schools in the rural areas of Ottoman Greece,\(^4\) historians agree that most of the Greek-speaking communities had makeshift schools that were usually housed in a church or another public building.\(^5\) The description of didaskali (teachers) at the school actually refers to preachers. Constantine N. Constantinidis, *Higher Education in Byzantium in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries (1204-1310)* (Nicosia, 1982). Sophia Mergali, *L’enseignement et les lettrés pendant’époque des Paléologues (1261-1453)* (Etairia Philon tou Laou, 1996). Michael Angold, *Church and Society in the Byzantium Under the Comneni: 1081-1261* (Cambridge University Press, 1995).

\(^{2}\) Quite often the priests did not receive any formal training. Rather an ordained priest in the form of an apprenticeship often trained another person. This was often a priest son or close relative of the priest.

\(^{3}\) Constantine Cavaros, *Cultural and Educational Continuity of Greece from Antiquity to Present* (Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, 1995). Cavaros book is an analysis of Saul A Tovar’s 1993 lecture on the cultural and educational continuity of Greece from Byzantine to contemporary times.

\(^{4}\) For purposes of clarification, Ottoman Greece refers to the Ottoman dominated areas of the Greek peninsula.

\(^{5}\) For some time Greek Scholars believed that the Turkish authority prohibited the Greek schools from functioning freely during Ottoman rule. Greek history has since been revised to downplay the
French traveler Francois Pouqueville was in the region at the end of the 18th century and left a detailed description of his observations:

As soon as their [Greek students’] reason begins to developed, they are sent to the school of the papas, [priest] to learn to read; but when the method of teaching is examined, it is impossible to conceive how the children can even learn their letters. The master hears his scholars while sitting in an easy chair, in the attitude of a man afflicted with the vapors of opium; and holding a long cane, which with he strikes boys promiscuously. One of them begins to read, on which they all follow the lesson with high voice, and the most opposite tones; but the most singular circumstance is, that the [students] possess the art of deceiving their master by reading with effrontery in different books, while he supposes that they are reciting one general lesson.⁶

According to Pouqueville Orthodox priests were responsible for daily operations in the schools and served as their main teachers. The schools were predominantly populated by children, most between the ages of six and twelve years old, who generally attended classes at night because they worked on farms during the day.⁷ Books and other print materials were written in atticed Koine Greek, rather than the spoken vernacular Demotic. However, some texts were available to students—notably psalms (Psaltiri) and chronicles like Hronigrafos (attributed to Pseudo-Dorotheos of Monemvasia) were written in the Koine and the vernacular Greek.⁸ Because students were fluent in the vernacular rather than the Koine, the works written using the latter were difficult for them.
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to understand; in most cases the priests would have had to help translate the information to the pupils. Students practiced their reading, pronunciation, and spelling from these books and were often instructed to memorize and recite lines from them. Lessons emphasized religious education, history, arithmetic, and basic reading and writing.\textsuperscript{9} Lessons on history probably focused on Church and Byzantine history and were taught via narrative. The priests may also have blended accounts from ancient and Byzantine Greece with those found in the \textit{Bible}.\textsuperscript{10}

\textbf{School Regulation and Funding: The Problems of Rural Schools}

Although scholars of Greek history once concurred that the Sultan prohibited the operation of local Greek schools, this did not in fact occur until the beginning of the Greek Revolution in 1821.\textsuperscript{11} To the contrary, local schools were of very little concern to the Sultan in far-off Constantinople. They cost him little or nothing, as funding relied primarily on the wealth of a given locality, and helped spread literacy across the Empire.

A few independent organizations also supported schools. For instance, the Society of Friends of the Muses (part of the \textit{Philiki Eteria} or Society of Friends) was founded with the assistance of Ioannis Kapodistrias (also known as John Capodistrias)

\textsuperscript{9}Peter Drinis, “Pre-Independence Education: The Secret School,” \textit{Holy Trinity Hellenic Orthodox Church} 35, no. 5-6 (February/March 2005).

\textsuperscript{10}As discussed in the previous chapter this may be why immediately after the Revolution, many Greeks confused the chronology of history.

\textsuperscript{11}For sometime and in some instances still today it is suspected that the Sultan prohibited Greek education in the Greek speaking territories of the empire. As such, hidden or secret schools (\textit{krifo scholio}) operated in secrecy in many parts of Greece. The best know hidden school in Greece today is the Secret School in Dimitsana, Greece in the Peloponesse. The school was operated by the local monastery, Moni Philosophou. Fr. Germanos, who is said to have raised the Greek flag in defiance to Ottoman rule and Gregory V Patriarch of Constantinople are believed to have attended the school. Georgios P. Theocharis, \textit{Moni Philosophou, Krifo Scholio} (Athens. In Greek, 2000).
and was originally funded by Tsar Alexander I of Russia for the sole purpose of expanding Greek education. However, while the organization’s original mission was to open more Greek schools in Ottoman Greece, it ended up financing Greeks who wished to study abroad in Western Europe.\textsuperscript{12}

Documents from the 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} centuries indicate that Greek schools located in large towns such as Constantinople, Smyrna, and some of the trading centers on the islands in the Aegean and Ionian seas were fairly well funded because they received financial support from wealthy Greek elites as well as the Church.\textsuperscript{13} In contrast, the quality of education in rural areas was almost entirely dependent on the talents of the local priests, as rural folk generally had little income to spare to support their schools.\textsuperscript{14} By 21\textsuperscript{st} century standards most of the rural schools would not even be considered as such, as they lacked the administrative organizations and facilities now generally viewed as necessary.

No accurate figure exists on the percentage of students who actually attended school, but it is known that most parents did not intuit the importance of a basic education in improving their children’s social and economic status until well after the

\textsuperscript{12}C.W. Crawley, “John Capodistrias and The Greeks Before 1821,” \textit{Cambridge Historical Journal} XII, no. 2 (1957): 162-182. In most of Europe, outside of Greece, Ioannis Kapodistrias was referred to as John Copodistrias.


Revolution: they expected their children to become farmers and nothing more. As a result, many of the Greek students who were registered at a school may have never attended. Even in the 1860’s several decades after the Revolution, absenteeism was commonplace because neither families nor local governments were enforcing the national mandate of compulsory education.

Schools and Hellenization

In the 18th century rural schools began to be better funded in those areas where ethnic groups were competing amongst each other for cultural and linguistic dominance. For instance, some Greek priests working as teachers sought to Hellenize non-Greek speaking populations through schooling. With the support of the Church and the government, schools began to engage in rhetoric that supported the ideas of a Greek nation based on commonalities of brotherhood, bloodlines, religion, language, and history.

We first find examples of this in the later 18th century. In 1770 the Greek Orthodox monk Kosmas of Aetolia (1714-1779 ACE) helped curb mass conversions to Islam in the northern Greek territories (Thesaly, Epirus, and Macedonia) by founding schools in small villages where Greek was no longer the dominant language and where Islam had become the dominant religion. According to some scholars, Kosmas was successful because these groups converted to Christianity and adopted Greek as their

\[15\text{Kallia Kalliataki-Merticopoulou, “Literacy and Unredeemed Peasants: Late Nineteenth-Century Rural Crete Faces education,” in Philip Carabott, ed., Greek Society in the Making, 1863-1913: Realities, Symbols and Visions (King’s College London: Centre for Hellenic Studies, 1997).}\]
primary spoken language.\textsuperscript{16}

Almost a century later, another Greek Orthodox cleric, Metropolitan Dorotheos Scholarios of Demetrias, was concerned with the Vlach (also known as Macedo-Romanian or Aromanian an Eastern Romance language related to the Romanian language) dominating his region of Thessaly.\textsuperscript{17} Fearing that these northern regions could be lost to Slavic and Romanian territorial ambitions, Dorotheos opened a Greek school in 1866 in the predominately Vlach-speaking village of Vennitsa in the region of Thessaly.\textsuperscript{18} The school was free and local children and adults were encouraged to attend. Additional Greek schools gradually sprung up in the area and eventually the people of the region chose Greek over Vlach.

The spread of Greek schools and the assimilation of Vlach and other groups via the Greek school system continued until the early part of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. This was especially true in Macedonia during the late 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries—Macedonia was still part of the Ottoman Empire and yet was coveted not only by Greece, but also by

\textsuperscript{16}Phanis Michalopoulos,\textit{ Kosmas o Aitolos (Kosmas of Aetolia)} (University of Athens, 1940).


Bulgaria, Serbia, and Romania. Between 1897 and 1905 the Greek government was aggressive in their pursuits in opening Greek schools and spreading a Greek identity and language throughout the region. Eventually Greek schools out-competed their rivals in making their language and identity dominant in the region.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Schools in Unredeemed Region of Macedonia 1897-1904</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greek</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Corroborating evidence is provided by historian Anastasia Karakasidou, whose study on Greek Macedonia showed that in the town of Assiros (formerly Guvenza), schooling played an important role “…in forging a Greek national consciousness among the residents of Guvenza.”\(^{19}\) According to Karakasidou, the residents of Guvenza had begun to identify themselves as Slavic, but were influenced by the Greek school to take a Greek identity during the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

In Macedonia and elsewhere, rural Greek schools offered a venue for the

transmission of a more or less standardized national Greek identity. Formal education helped raise literacy rates, encouraged the use of Modern Greek over other languages, taught people a common history, and opened new channels for social and economic mobility. In so doing, the schools helped to strengthen ties between Greek-speaking communities living inside and outside Greece.

The Greek school curriculum was not solely positive, however. A sense of national unity relies as much on a sense of the “other”—those whom we are not—as it does on a sense of “ourselves.” The former sense, of the exotic and dangerous, was the subject of school-based national propaganda during the First and Second Balkan Wars (1912-1913) in which Greece fought against several of its Balkan neighbors. But it is only when propaganda was transmitted in the Greek schools that differences between Greece and its neighbors became more apparent. At the same time, the Greek school strengthened Greek national identity by magnifying common religious, linguistic, and historical ties among the Greek people and the school was able to mobilize its citizens against the nation’s enemies.

---

20The expansion of Greek borders into the present day Northern Greek frontier after the Balkan wars included within the new Greece a number of linguistically diverse groups. Many historians argue that these groups were allowed to move freely within the confines of the Ottoman Empire. Thessaloniki (Salonika), for example, a port city was the most cosmopolitan of the Turkish controlled cities in Southeastern Europe and attracted a number of ethnic groups due to the cities economic success. After the annexation of the city by the state of Greece, Greek leaders were surprised to find that many of local population in around the city’s periphery did not speak.
Contesting Identities: The Case of Prosymni

During the course of fieldwork for this project, I had the opportunity to interview several elders in a small Greek village. These interviews help illuminate the state of Greek education during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. At that time, children were encouraged by their teachers to speak Greek at home rather than Arvanite, the local population’s preferred language. One of the locals, a 99-year-old woman, commented, “Teachers told us to tell our family to speak to us only in Greek. It made no difference to us what language we spoke at home. To us we were all still Greeks.”

In short, at the turn of the last century the people of Prosymni experienced no inner conflict in speaking Arvanite while identifying themselves as Greeks. Just a century later, however, to call an Arvanite-speaker in Prosymni an Albanian would be found offensive by most of the locals of the town—despite the fact that the same individual might agree that the Arvanite language is of distant Albanian origin (to some extent the cause of the offense may be xenophobic reaction to Greece’s illegal Albanian immigrant population). Other locals have gone so far as to suggest that Arvanite is a

---

21 Some fieldwork for this project was done in the village of Prosymni in Greece in the fall of 2008 and summer of 2009. Although this study is not an ethnographic project, some research from Prosymni helps glean on the state of Greek education during the late 19th and early 20th century.

22 Arvanite has its linguistic roots in Albanian and is most similar to the Tosk Albanian dialect.

23 Eleni Zervas, Interview, August 12, 2008. Eleni happens to be my 99-year-old paternal grandmother.


form of ancient Greek that has merely been influenced by Albanian, and hold that they are more Greek than most of the other communities in Greece.

Members of both groups invoke the elusive tales regarding Prosymnì’s origins to help establish their “Greekness.” The town borders the ancient city of Mycenae and archaeological research indicates that the settlement originated several millennia ago. Its agricultural fields (kambos) are sparsely marked with Neolithic, Mycenaean, Classical, Hellenistic, Roman, Byzantine, and Ottoman ruins that lend themselves to rumors of mysterious origins. Some locals suggest that the town’s residents are the descendants of the Soulïotes, a war like Albanian-speaking, Christian Orthodox group that inhabited the region of Thresprotia in Western Epirus. The Soulïotes were early champions of a Greek identity and the Greek independence movement. After losing a battle in Epirus to the provincial Albanian ruler (Bey), Ali Pasha, some twenty years before the Greek Revolution, they settled down in the village as refugees. Others have even suggested that the residents are the descendants of an ancient Greek clan called the

---

Metanastasi miais Koinotitis. The Albanians of Greece 13th-15th Century: The Migration a Community (Athens: Goulandri-Chron Foundation, 1994). In Greek. The Arvanites were traders and merchants and as merchants constantly traveled throughout the Balkans thus were exposed to other ethnic and linguistic groups. The Arvanites for example had a long tradition of seafaring. Some Arvanite communities could still be found in parts of modern day Greece and Italy. Other Greek speaking elite groups were also known to interact with other ethnic and linguistic groups. Some of these Greek elite groups formed principalities of what is today modern day Romania. Certainly there was a sense of the outside world still it was mostly confined in the Balkans and parts of the Mediterranean. It is still true though that the majority of people in Ottoman Greece rarely traveled outside their local communities and maintained their economic sustenance in a sort of local self-sufficient economic system. Georgios Papageorgiou, Oikonomiki kai Koinoniki Michanisme ston Orio Choro: Zagori (Mesa 18-Arches 20 Aiona). Economic and Social Mechanism in the Outside World: Zagori (Mid-18th-Early 20th Centuries) (Ioannina, 1995). In Greek.

Berit Wells and Curtis Runnels, The Berbati-Limnes Archaeological Survey, 1988-1990 (P. Astoms, 1996). Also relics from archeological excavations from Berbati could be found at the Archeological Museum of Nauplion. The town seems to date back to Neolithic times about 8000 B.C.E.

Seloi, who were absorbed by the Mycenaean civilization around the time of the Trojan War.\footnote{Aristides Kollias, *Arvanites ke i Katagogi ton Ellinon. Arvanites and the Origins of Greeks* (Athens: I.M. Rallis, 1983). In Greek. It is unlikely that the people of Prosymi are the descendants of the Seloi since ancient records show that the Seloi inhabited the region of modern day Epirus and not Mycenae.}

Unfortunately for this study, archaeological and ethnographic evidence do not reveal why or when the locals learned to speak Arvanite. The language survives in Prosymi even now, spoken predominantly by a generation born in the early to middle 20th century. These people speak both Greek and, (as they call it) *Arvanitika*, and still prefer Arvanite when communicating with their generational peers. Despite the presence of Arvanite speakers, many of them suggest that the townspeople have always spoken Greek. However, it is unlikely that both languages were always spoken.

Instead, the *Prosimiotes (Berbatiotes)*, as they are called, probably learned Greek when systems of communications and commerce were extended to the neighboring trading towns of Argos and Nauplion. Greek had historically been the language of trade in the region. We know that the residents had schools of some form or another from Ottoman times onward, and that some years after Greek independence a national Greek school had appeared in the town.\footnote{Georgios Pichios, *Historia tou Berbatiou* (History of Berbati, 2000). In Greek (Unpublished). Pichios is described by the locals of Berbati as the town historian. Although trained as a lawyer and not as a historian much of the information from Pichios work helps confirm what other sources say on education in rural Greece in the mid to late 19th century.} Arvanite probably survived because Prosymi and the other neighboring Arvanite-speaking villages (Limnes, Manesis, and Dendra) in the area were not in the area of expansion sought by the Greek state in the late 19th and early 20th centuries (they had become part of the Greek kingdom after the Revolution).
Nevertheless, the Greek school system in Prosymni succeeded in convincing later generations to replace Arvanite completely and to communicate only in Greek.

**Velestinlis and Koraes: Two Visions of Greek Education**

In the early 19th century, the French traveler Francois Pouqueville urged that the best way for Greece to achieve independence was to foster an educational system that invoked continuity with classical Greece. Pouqueville declared,

> Abhorrence is not enough: it is necessary to sap his [the Ottomans] power, and general information is the only means of ruining that colossus of despotism, by discerning knowledge among the Greeks.\(^{30}\)

Pouqueville as his European contemporaries helped to shape the thinking of Rigas Velestinlis (1757-1798) and Adamandios Koraes (1748-1833), both of whom envisioned the creation of a Modern Greek state through an educational system that magnified Modern Greece’s cultural links to ancient Greece.\(^{31}\) Velestinlis and Koraes were Modern Greece’s first educational thinkers. They influenced the Greek educational system for much of the late 19th century and early 20th century, Velestinlis as an active revolutionary, and Koraes as an expatriate intellectual whose propaganda and visions of a free Greece with a modern educational system framed the future of the country (see Appendix A).

---


\(^{31}\)Velestinlis is also known as Rigas Feraios. We know that his surname comes from the name of his home village, Velestino in Thessaly. Velestinlis uses the name Feraios in several of his later writings. The name probably derives from the ancient Greek city of Pherae, which is near Velestino. Velestinlis may have adopted this name because it sounded more Greek. C. M. Woodhouse, *Rhigas Velestinlis: The Proto Martyr of the Greek Revolution* (Denise Harvey, 1995).
We know less about Velestinlis than Koraes; the former’s life and legacy became more myth than history. Velestinlis spent his childhood in Thessaly while Koraes spent his early life in Smyrna. Both men came from well-to-do merchant families and attended Greek schools in their Greek-speaking communities. Velestinlis found his political and educational inspiration while living in Bucharest, while Koraes found his while living in Paris during the tumultuous events of the French Revolution. They knew of each other but never met in person.

Rigas Velestinlis (1757-1798)

Velestinlis is remembered as the first martyr of the Greek Revolution even though the Revolution did not begin until some fifteen years after his death. His failed attempts to spark a revolt against the Ottomans in late 18th century Belgrade cost him his life and made him a Greek national hero.

Like Nikolay Danilevsky’s dream of a pan-Slavic state, Velestinlis dreamed of a large multi-ethnic Balkan state in which Christian Orthodoxy would unite the populace. He found it difficult to unite the Modern Greeks around classical Greece because “Greece suffer[ed] from two faults respect for and indifference to antiquity.” Velestinlis did, however, believe that Modern Greeks would eventually recognize their cultural connections to ancient Greece.

---

32 Ibid.


Velestinlis wanted Modern Greeks to rule the Balkan state he envisioned. He had two reasons for this: first, because they were already in prominent political and administrative positions within the Ottoman political hierarchy, and second, because a Greek merchant elite controlled much of the commercial trade in southeastern Europe. The state he envisioned would also be inclusive, with Orthodox Christians of various linguistic backgrounds living in harmony and unity and forming a powerful European state in the southeastern margins of the European continent.\textsuperscript{35}

Velestinlis gave priority to the psychological preparation of Greeks enslaved under Ottoman domination. He wanted to raise their moral spirits so that they would unite to form a Greek free state. He also tried to inspire people by reminding them of the great political and military legacy of the ancient Greek city-states.\textsuperscript{36}

Aside from his vision of a large Balkan state, Velestinlis believed that education, specifically of youth, would be the source of liberation for the Modern Greeks. In his series of articles on human rights Velestinlis asserted that,

\begin{quote}
Everybody, without any exception, has the duty to be literate. The country has to establish schools for all male and female children in villages, since the education brings the progress, which makes free nations shine. The old historians should be explained in the big towns. French and Italian languages should be taught while the Ancient Greek language must be indispensable.\textsuperscript{37}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{35}Elena Lazâr, ed., \textit{Românii Despere Rigas: Repere Istoriografice. Romanian on Rigas: Historical Accounts} (Bucharest: Omonia. In Romanian and Greek, 2007).


It is clear that Velestinlis believed in the importance of creating a national school system that would be open to all citizens. However, it is unclear which “old historians” students should read. Given his desire to link the past with his present, Velestinlis may have been referring to Herodotus and Thucydides, historians with whom he was familiar and whose invocation would advance the connection between the past and the present.

In a similar vein, Velestinlis suggested that “Ancient Greek” be taught in all the schools in addition to French and Italian. The inclusion of Ancient Greek would obviously advance his argument of continuity between ancient and Modern Greece, but why choose French and Italian as well? In the 18th and 19th centuries, French was the lingua franca of European politics and diplomacy. Knowledge of French would therefore help prepare a Greek citizenry to engage in international politics and diplomacy. Velestinlis may have included Italian to appeal to the Italian speakers on the islands of the Aegean and Northern Ionian Seas and the island of Malta, as he aspired to include these groups in his grand Balkan state. In addition to these reasons, the French and Italian languages were symbols of Westernization and modernization, something that he wished to see a Greece move towards.

Velestinlis thought that once the Greeks threw off the Ottoman yoke, they should create a system of government that funded schools. He determined that many of the schools run by the Church were outdated and inadequate and advocated instead the creation of a system based on French and Prussian educational models. He also found

---

38Ibid., “Constitution”.

that the Church operated schools were not integrated with one another.\textsuperscript{40} The schools not only varied in their daily instruction (if instruction took place daily), in addition, the topics taught were predominantly religious in focus and the teachers were often untrained or poorly educated. Despite these problems, when compared to the Turkish schools on the Greek mainland, Velestinlis found the Greek Church schools to be better organized, better funded, and better at preparing students.

While in Vienna in 1790, Velestinlis wrote a textbook in the Modern Greek titled *Anthology of Physics*.\textsuperscript{41} The text comprised twenty-four chapters, eighteen of which were concerned with astronomy, meteorology, and terrestrial science; the last six chapters were mostly on biology and zoology. It is not unclear for what audience Velestinlis intended his textbook. However, the book appears to be too difficult for lower and middle school students, which suggests that his intended audience comprised of well-educated Greeks.

Velestinlis more clearly promoted his vision of an independent Greece through the protraction and publication of his *Charta (Map of Greece, 1796)*. The map consisted of twelve plates that when put together formed one large map of Greece, including many of the Ottoman territories in the Balkans.\textsuperscript{42} The map included illustrations of the important events and locations of Ancient Greece, including Olympia, Sparta, Salamis, Delphi, Plataea, and Thermopylae. It also included lithographs of six coins, three from

\textsuperscript{40}Ibid.


ancient Greece and three from the Byzantine Empire. The Greek scholar Vangelis Calotychos suggested that,

The allusion to classical and mythological personages and events in Rhigas’s map claims an immemorial Greek tradition and the recollection of the Byzantine Empire by way of the genealogical tables and assorted coins at a time in Europe when Gibbon was vilifying Byzantium’s importance for European civilization.⁴³

In challenging the eminence of Gibbon’s *Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Velestinlis was clearly laying the groundwork for social and political change in Greece.

**Adamandios Koraes (1748-1833)**

Koraes was more active than Velestinlis in Greece’s struggle for independence and the creation of its modern school system. This may be due to his long life, which was spent working tirelessly to achieve his dream of a *bona fide* free Greece and Greek public school system. Koraes’s ideas became significant because he was able to convince a large body of European intellectuals that Modern Greeks were culturally linked to the ancient Greeks. He began his work in 1787 Koraes by self-publishing four hundred copies of his doctoral dissertation, which was on the medical accomplishments of Hippocrates. He distributed his thesis to close friends and associates in Paris as a way to help him gain academic recognition in European intellectual and academic circles, and also to show European elites that the ancient Greek spirit was still very much alive.

Koraes commented that

[One French doctor from Montpellier] ...read my thesis with pleasure and felt that he learned from the Greeks of today, though subjugated, they are still the Greeks of Ancient times...44

Koraes found that like the French doctor, other Europeans were also willing to accept Modern Greece’s historical and cultural ties to ancient Greece. In his lecture before the Societe des Observateurs de l’Homme in 1803, Koraes said,

The [Greek] nation continued in this deplorable state until after the middle of the last century. Yet it was difficult for the attentive observer to discern through the heavy darkness, which covered unhappy Greece that this state of affairs could not last. On the one hand, the very small number of schools where ancient Greek was taught, in spite of the discouraging imperfection of the teaching methods, in spite of the teachers ignorance and obstinacy and the small benefit which consequently derived from them, preserved the knowledge of it ancestral tongue like a sacred fire which would one day bring back to life. On the other hand a national vanity, ridiculous in its motives but salutary in its effects, rendered the Greeks as proud of their origin as would be somebody who was descendant, in direct line of Miltiades and Themistocles.45

In short, Koraes believed that Greeks would have been the intellectual equals of their progenitors if the Ottoman Turks had not oppressed Greek intellectual life and had the Church taken a more serious approach to Greek education. He even ties the ancient Greek past to the Enlightenment, pointing out that it was various ancient Greek authors who enabled Europeans to shed their religious superstitions in favor of truth.

44The original source is found in Mamoukas and Damlas (1881-1887); Collections of Letters Written from Paris at the Time of the French Revolution (in English by P. Ralli, 1898). Supra, n31: Vranoussis. The quote is also found in Georgiou Lada, Vivliographiki Ereuna Anaferomena eis ta Erga tou Adamandiou Korae. The Works of Adamandios Koraes A Biographical Sketch (Athens. In Greek, 1934), 40. As well as in Stephen George Chaconas, Adamandios Koraios: A Study in Greek Nationalism. Part of the Series, Studies in History, Economics and Public Law. Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University (Columbia University Press, 1942), 27.

Koraes’s lecture before the Societe des Observateurs de l’Homme is essentially a plea to Western intellectuals, asking them to assist the Modern Greeks in their quest to freedom. His Memoire sur l’état actuel de la civilization en Grèce (Memoir on the Present Civilization in Greece) was also a convincing piece of nationalist propaganda. One of its goals was to dispel any notions in the west that Modern Greeks were not the descendants of the ancient Greeks. Koraes accomplished this by presenting Greece as a nation that had fallen from grace several times, but which was always reborn.

Koraes clearly believed what he wrote, despite the propagandistic tone and style of his work: the true ancestors of the Modern Greeks were the ancient Greeks. For instance, he referred to the ancient Greeks as Hellenes and the Modern Greek as Graikoi because the term Graikoi was older than the word Hellenes. In contrast, Modern Greeks often identified themselves as Romioi. Koraes strongly disagreed with the use of this word; he felt the Modern Greeks should be ashamed of the term Romioi since it preserved the memory of Greek subjugation to the Romans. Similarly, to Koraes the Byzantine Empire was the aberrant continuation of an Eastern Roman Empire that was ruled by unappreciative Roman-Greeks and the Greek Church. Instead of adopting the ways of the classical Greeks, the Roman-Greek emperors took Greece farther away from the ways of the west into a world of superstition and mysticism.

---

47 Adamandios Koraes, Atakta I and II (Paris, 1828).
48 Ibid.
With regard to education, Koraes believed that the Greek educational system should become purely secular and controlled exclusively by the Greek state. He deemed education important for the preservation of liberty and the promotion of progress; he further believed that the promulgation of religious superstitions by the Greek Orthodox Church through the schools had left Greek society stuck in the Dark Ages. He said that a European educational model would work best for a free Greek state because it would bring Greece back to the west.\textsuperscript{49}

As regards to language, Koraes felt that lexicography was also an \textit{a priori} factor in developing a strong Greek consciousness. He believed that the Greek language had evolved not just because of corruption by foreign words, but also because it had no modern literary tradition. Therefore, people needed to agree on language—a language used not merely for the sake of conveying information or for communicating people’s common needs, but as a contribution to a Greek identity.\textsuperscript{50} Unlike Velenstinlis’s

\textsuperscript{49}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{50}The Greek language had gone through drastic changes after the expansion of the Ottoman Empire into Greek speaking territories. Under Ottoman rule, Greek took words and phrases from Latin, Albanian, Slavic, and Turkish. After the collapse of the Byzantine Empire in 1453, many Greek speakers left and relocated to other parts of Europe, bringing with them the vernacular Greek spoken before the fall. It is not clear what ways these early Greek refugees tried to preserve their Greek. The language that emerged after independence was Modern Greek or \textit{Nea Hellinika} (New Greek). Modern Greek is categorized in two distinct categories; the Katharevousa (purified) the Demotic (vernacular). Katharevousa is etymologically the nearest form of Modern Greek to resemble Ancient or Attic Greek. Historically, supporters of Katharevousa sought to purge the Greek language from foreign words and phrases. Demotic was the common Greek that was spoken Greek by most of the Greek speaking population in Greece. The debate over the use of Katharevousa and Demotic became highly political during the Greek educational reforms of the 1970’s. One Greek politician is quoted saying, “Without the study of ancient learning we would have been balkanized.” The agreement that was reached involved teaching all school lessons in the Demotic, but having mandatory courses in Ancient Greek in the upper grades. Wendy Moleas, \textit{The Development of the Greek Language, 2nd edition} (Duckworth Publishing, 2005), H. Kathimerini (Greek Edition) February 8, 1976 and Andreas A. Kazamias, “The Politics of Educational Reform in Greece: Law 309/1976,” \textit{Comparative Education Review} (1978).
advocacy for the teaching of Demotic Greek, Koraes’s solution was the “middle” way: a form of Greek cleansed from foreign words. Such a language would be inclusive of a wide range of Greek speakers, ranging from the Demotic speech of rural and isolated communities to the more formal speech of large cities.

In 1805, he began work on his Hellenic Library, a serried of books consisting of re-edited versions of ancient Greek works. His reason for creating such a series was twofold: for academic recognition and to help galvanize the Greek—speaking public to revolt. Each of the re-edited ancient Greek works included a preface, written by Koraes in the Modern Greek, with nationalist rhetorical undertones. The intended audience comprised the educated Greek elite living in Europe’s urban centers and the Greek speaking parts of the Ottoman Empire. Koraes intent was for those elites to become inspired enough to rise up against their Ottoman masters and convince the rural Christian population to join them in the struggle. Coincidently, this was the first major propaganda war in Modern Greek history. In the process of creating it, Koraes unified ideological themes such as a common history, common blood, and common religion.

Although his most important audience was elite, Koraes believed that his books should also be distributed to the general Greek speaking public even though the majority of them could not read and write. Koraes was convinced that, as had happened during the French Revolution the responsibility to initiate a revolt lay in the hands of the (in this case, Greece) bourgeoisie and elites, who should educate the peasant masses about their

---

ancient history and language; only then would Greeks find unity and revolt *en masse* against their Ottoman masters.

The *Hellenic Library* consisted of twenty volumes in all and arguably became the greatest accomplishment of early Modern Greek literature. By the early 19th century, copies were sent to the Peloponnese, several of the Greek islands, and some of the Greek speaking cities in Asia Minor. The distribution of the texts was one key to finding the financial support that Koraes needed, in this case from a few wealthy Greek merchants who were also interested in seeing a free Greece. However, the *Library* did not inspire much support form the *Phanariote*, the elite Greeks of the Ottoman Empire, who included Church dignitaries, Christian notables, and prominent Greek families. Koraes’s attempt at mass publication was not in the end the fuse that lit the revolutionary fire of the Greek nation.

However, as noted later in this project, Koraes set the historiographic stage for a post-Ottoman, independent Greece that would develop a national history, a common Greek consciousness and identity, and a school system that would transmit these to its citizens. As historian Olga Augustinos states, “The envisioned [Greek] revival was to take place in historical time, more precisely, at the juncture where the imagined past,

---


53 Koraes along with his financier, Michael Zosimas founded lay schools that were independent from Church control in Chios and Smyrna. He structured the learning in many of these schools around the pedagogical ideas of Pestalozzi and Fellenberg, as well as personally training many of the teachers in the schools. Although they consciously sought to teach to its Greek-speaking student population that they were connected to the ancient Greeks, these schools were far too few to have any impact on the Revolution.
distant yet glittering, met the experienced present, palpable yet tenebrous.” Although Koraes’s Library was admired by educated Greek elites and portrayed by the mostly illiterate rural Greek speaking communities as a vestibule to sacred and ancient knowledge, schools were a necessary component to the process of reviving a Greek identity.

Educational Challenges in the Century Following Independence

After independence was achieved in 1830, most of the Greek school system was reorganized and administered by the central government. This reorganization began during the early years of the struggle for independence; although the country was preoccupied with achieving its independence, the leaders of the nation also turned their attention to the establishment of schools. It was understood that the Greek people had to begin a long process of re-education because they had endured centuries of intellectual deprivation.

Some educational leaders, including Koraes, were convinced that the Greeks had been liberated twenty years too early—they had not reached the requisite level of education to maintain their freedom and thrive culturally and economically. Koraes and his contemporary Ioannis Kapodistrias were interested in the experimental schools of Pestalozzi and Fellenberg that were active in Switzerland and the United States.

---


respectively. They briefly considered adopting such progressive educational models, but understood that Greece needed to nationalize schools before opening its own experimental schools.

The Greek Revolution (1821-1830) brought education to an abrupt halt. By its end there were essentially no active educational institutions. However, as early as 1822 the first Greek National Assembly (held in Epidaurus in the Argolis region of Peloponnese) advocated for a free elementary education for all Greek citizens. The Assembly’s report, submitted in 1824, called for elementary, middle, and high schools. The elementary schools were divided into two levels, followed by three-year programs at so-called Hellenic schools, then optional four years of study in schools called gymnasia.

Upon achieving independence in 1830, the Greek government was bankrupt with most of its financial support derived from philhellenic groups in Western Europe and from Greek businessmen living outside Greece. The government took on the difficult task of expanding its educational system and creating educational institutions that would

---


58 Kastanis, “American Pestalozianism in Greek Mathematical Education 1830-1836,” 121.
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63 Irini Sariouglou, Turkish Policy Towards Greek Education in Istanbul 1923-1974: Secondary Education and Cultural Identity (Literary and Historical Archive, 2004).
help Greece gain some economic and social security. This was a difficult task, but approached as a serious priority.

According to some figures, in 1830 there were 71 elementary schools in Greece with 6,121 pupils. The national budget allocated about 141,120 francs in 1829 for its schools and 220,500 francs in 1830. However, the government devoted considerable resources to the school system over later decades: by 1855 there were 450 primary schools and 81 Hellenic schools and by 1910 there were 3,678 primary schools and 282 Hellenic schools (see Appendix C).

In 1833, the first King of Greece, Otto of Bavaria (1833-1862), arrived and instituted important measures for the expansion of Greek education. In that year, the Primary and Communal Education Law was enacted. In 1834 another law established compulsory education for all children between the ages of five and twelve and a training school for teachers was opened. According to one observer,

In 1840 there were 252 elementary schools with 22,000 scholars, under government control and dependent upon government support, and private schools with an additional 10,000 scholars, a total of four percent of the population.

---

64 Bickford-Smith, *Greece Under King George.*


66 Bickford-Smith, *Greece Under King George.*

67 Ibid.
The schools grew in number as the years went by, and the population of Greece grew. During the rule of King George I (1863-1913) Greece had the greatest increase in the number of schools opened\textsuperscript{68} (see Appendix C).

The first schools had two common goals: to create a literate citizenry that would be able expand agricultural and commercial sectors of the economy and to unite the Greek people around a sense of a common identity.\textsuperscript{69} Greece largely succeeded in these goals although it was well behind many of its European counterparts as of 1830.

For instance, Greece increased its GDP by nearly 240 percent between 1820 and 1910\textsuperscript{70} (see Appendix D). Greece’s literacy rates (53\%) exceeded those of France (7.1\%), Belgium (8.3\%), Hungary (15\%), Italy (28\%), and Bulgaria (50\%) by 1913\textsuperscript{71} (see Appendix E).

This is not to say that consensus rules the 19\textsuperscript{th} century school system. Some Greeks advocated that the schools both in and outside of Greece teach less about the country’s classical past and more about contemporary topics such as trade, commerce and languages such as English and Arabic. One such person, who visited the Greek schools of Alexandria, Egypt, asked,

Do we also need in the \textit{diaspora} classical schools preparing future fellows of pen and hunger? Why should only French be taught? And why not


\textsuperscript{69}Kalliniki Dendrinou Antonakaki, \textit{Greek Education: Reorganization of the Administrative Structure} (Teachers College Press, 1955).


\textsuperscript{71}Literacy rates were compiled from the \textit{Encyclopedia Britannica}, 14\textsuperscript{th} edition (1929).
Greek brethren, English and Arabic? Languages, languages, languages, this is what we Greeks shall learn overall and not Plato and Sophocles.  

Such statements were probably prompted by the difficult Greek economic situation. Between 1891 and 1905, Greece imports were almost double those of its exports; an indicator of stagnant economic growth (see Appendix F).

Summary

Although its educational institutions faced many challenges, Greece needed an educational system that took into account the culture and history of the Greek people. In other words, it needed a purely Greek school system that was built around the culture and identity of the Greek people. Indigenous political reform, in the shape of revolution, required a unified view of Greek history and identity. Greek students needed to understand that what made them part of the same nation were not just their language, religion, and common cultural practices, but also that their common past which dated back to the ancient Greeks. Important thinkers such as Rigas Velestinlis (1757-1798) and Adamandios Koraes (1748-1833) believed that the institutions that could approach such a task most expediently were school, and provided the ideological and political frameworks for affecting such plans.
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CHAPTER FOUR
HISTORIOGRAPHY, IDENTITY, AND THE GREEK TEXTBOOK

The King of Macedon Phillip, who in 338 B.C. was able to unite Greece, was not at all a foreigner or barbarian. The Macedonians during ancient times considered themselves to be Greek. The kings of Macedon even were said to be the direct descendants of Hercules and other prominent Greek heroes.

--Constantine Paparrigopoulos

Overview

This chapter begins by considering the general characteristics and organization of the Greek schools. Following this section, this chapter looks at Constantine Paparrigopoulos’s and the development of a Greek national history. Earlier histories on Greece were written by foreign authors and were imported in Greece. Almost all of these histories were only on ancient Greece. On the other hand, Paparrigopoulos’s *History of the Greek Nation* (1850-1870), would be the first Greek history written by a Modern Greek historian that would connect ancient Greece with Modern Greece. Paparrigopoulos’s history would later set the standard for Greek history textbooks. Greek history would be taught as one continuous and unbroken thread from past to present. Moreover, Greek history and civilization would be presented as being superior to all other histories and civilizations, making them a source of pride for the Greek student.

This chapter concludes with an exploration of the teaching of history, geography, and Greek language in the Greek schools. History, Geography, and Greek language were all important elements in the Greek school curriculum for much of the 1834-1913 period.
These three subjects were taught using an interdisciplinary approach, where they all came together in one overarching theme emphasizing loyalty to the state, common brotherhood and bloodlines, and unity amongst the Greek people. All these subjects assisted in the development of a Modern Greek identity.

**Organization of Greek Schools**

Within the period being considered (1834-1913), records show that subjects covered in the public Greek elementary and Hellenic (middle) schools included (1) Religious Instruction (catechism, sacred history), (2) Greek (reading, writing, grammar), (3) Arithmetic and Geometric forms, (4) Drawing, (5) Natural History, (6) Geography, (7) Greek History, (8) Vocal Music, and (9) Gymnastics. Of all aspects of education, the Greek language, history, and geography curriculum was considered significantly more important and was given significantly more attention than the other subjects. This curriculum was intended to make students aware of the fatherland (*patriognosis*), for as the *Revolutionary Proclamation of 1821* emphasized, the revolution was undertaken “For Faith and Fatherland” (*Yper Pisteos kai Patridos*). This was the primary focus of the Greek curriculum from the 19th through the early part of the 20th century. Then as now, the Greek educational system was under a centralized Ministry of Education and
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Religious Affairs, which approved the curriculum and textbooks, used in schools.³

When the national school system was created in 1834, Greek intellectuals, inspired by Koraes and Velestinlis’ vision of a western style educational system, turned to educational models borrowed from Prussia and France and not from their own recent experiences under Ottoman rule. The foundations of the Greek educational system the Bavarian Plan of 1834-1836, which was in turn modeled after the French Guizot Law (1833, mandating the creation of primary school across France) and the Bavarian school system for secondary education. The first king of Greece, Otto, approved the plan in 1834.⁴ According to this plan, a two-tier system comprising elementary and secondary education was established; it remained virtually unchanged until 1929.⁵ Elementary education consisted of grades 1-4. Secondary education was organized in a two-ladder system, the Hellenic schools and the gymnasium. The Hellenic schools were divided in three years, grades 5-7. Their goal was to prepare students for “work life” and for continuing their education beyond the Hellenic schools. Gymnasium consisted an additional four years, (grades 8-11) and their goal was to prepare students for university.

In the elementary and Hellenic schools students studied religion, Greek (both modern and ancient), mathematics, physics and hygiene, history and Greek mythology, geography, French, drawing, penmanship, gymnastics, singing, and handwork. In the
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³In 2010 the Greek Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs was renamed to “Ministry of Education, Life Long Learning and Religious Affairs.


⁵Kalliniki Dendrinou Antonakaki, Greek Education: Reorganization of the Administrative Structure (Teachers College Press, 1955).
gymnasium, these subjects were repeated. As in the elementary and Hellenic schools, much of the history curriculum found in the gymnasium focused on European and World History. Geography focused on world geography, and literature centered on Greek and European writers. Students taking ancient history or mythology at the elementary school would take it again in the gymnasium (if they continued their studies) for a third time in the Hellenic schools. Students were not required to continue their education after they had completed their studies in the gymnasium. Thus, there were fewer students attending the gymnasium than the Hellenic or the primary schools, and fewer still at the university level.

When the Past Meets the Present: The Creation of a Greek National History

As the Ottoman Empire declined in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, national liberation movements took center stage in the Balkans. The Greek state competed for these groups and territories through a variety of channels. Although the modern state of Greece succeeded in expanding its territory in the 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries, it was nevertheless the Greek schools that convinced a recently incorporated population that they were part of a larger Greek community. Assisting in this movement was a resurgence of Greek nationalism most notably from Greek intellectuals such as Constantine Paparrigopoulos, who championed national unity based on historical, linguistic, and geographic continuity—a continuity that began with ancient Greece and extended into modern Greece.\textsuperscript{6}

However, before Paparrigopoulos’ complete publication of his \textit{History of the}

\textsuperscript{6}Martin Blinkhorn and Thanos Veremis, \textit{Modern Greece: Nationalism and Nationality} (Sage-Eliamep, 1990).
Greek Nation (1850-1870), we find that Greek history in the Greek schools was being borrowed from elsewhere. In other words, history textbooks that were already in use in many European schools were taken by Greek scholars, translated into Modern Greek, and then used in the Greek schools. These textbooks were thus the primary books of instruction in the Greek schools for nearly forty years. It is uncertain why a complete history on Greece by a Greek author would not be written until the 1870’s. However, since a complete history of Greece was not written until after 1870, the Greek state had no choice but to look elsewhere.

Although not of Greek authorship, the histories of Greece, that were intended for Greek schools, generally extolled national and individual achievements from ancient Greece and glorified the ancient Greek past. It made solid sense for the Greek state to adopt these textbooks since they venerated Greek culture and civilization. Early examples include Thomas Keightly’s History of Ancient Greece for Use in Schools, Oliver Goldsmith’s Dr. Goldsmith’s History of Greece, Abridged for the Use of Schools, and J.R. Lamè-Fleury’s L’histoire grecque racontée aux enfants, and William Mitford’s History of Greece.7 All these histories were seen by the Greek state as patriotic histories that connected the Modern Greek to ancient Greece, and more importantly united the Greek people around a common national identity. As will be seen more closely in the following chapter, Greek publishers later published these books for use in schools, which were used as the main history textbooks in the Greek school until 1870.

One can examine the translations made of non-Greek authors by comparing the following text:

**Alexandros Rakavis. *Historias tns Ellados gia ta Hellenika Scholia***

'Αλλ' απ αναντια των φαινοµενων ο ερως της πατριδος εφέλτε παντο-τε του Θεµιστοκλεους το στηθος. Ο πατριωτικος ητον παντοτε εις τους Ελληνας ισχυστερος παρα εις παν άλλο εθνος, ισος διοτι δια μεγαλων αγεων εσοιζων την ανε-ξαρτησιαν των, ισος διοτι εκτιµω-μεν τα πραγµατα αναλογων των προσπαθειων τας στηθας καταβαλ-λοµεν δια να τ’ αποκτησωµεν η να τα διατηρησωµεν.⁸

**Dr. Goldsmith’s History of Greece Abridged for Use in Schools***

But nothing could erase from the breast of Themistocles the love he entertained for his country. Indeed the spirit of patriotism appears to have prevailed among the Greeks in a higher degree than among any other people. This was no doubt owing to the violent struggles they had been obliged to make in defense of their country.⁹

The excerpt from Rakavis’s, *History of Greece for the Greek Schools*, is an almost word for word translation of Oliver Goldsmith’s, *Dr. Goldsmith’s History of Greece Abridged for Use in Schools*.¹⁰ Goldsmith’s history valorizes the ancient Greeks and establishes a national narrative that testifies to ancient Greece’s superior civilization and culture. Equally important, Goldsmith’s history nationalizes Greek history, making it patriotic and heroic and within the personal and political framework of contemporary Greek society. In the above passage Themistocles is described as “loving his country” as “patriotic” and as “defending his nation.” Themistocles thus embodies those intimate
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contemporary national characteristics that the Greek state wanted its citizens to embody: loyalty to the state, defending and loving one’s country.

In these early histories, Greece appeared to be far older than most other nations in the world. Its history also seemed more impressive than those of other nations because it was understood that Greek civilization had thoroughly shaped that of the west. Contemporary Greek historians recognized these advantages and translated the ready-made histories in order to begin the process of forming a national history and national identity.

In the prologue to his 1893 Greek history textbook, A.A. Papandreou wrote,

Our ancestors through their genius and their heroic actions managed to impress humanity. Their character, sacrifices, military success, bravery and their patriotism is even popular among the civilized world today.\footnote{A.A. Papandreou, “Prologos,” \textit{Historia tis Archaia Ellados gia ta Dimotika Scholia.} “Prologue,” \textit{History of Ancient Greece for the Greek Elementary Schools} (Athens. In Greek, 1893).}

According to him, Greek history and civilization (\textit{politismos}) was superior to all other histories and civilizations in the world since the ancient Greeks influenced and continued to be admired by cultures. Such statements were a source of pride for Greek students because it provided them with an understanding and emotional feeling that their culture and civilization was far superior to most others. This would create a sense of patriotism and an intimate feeling of brotherhood and unity with their fellow Greek citizens.

**Constantine Paparrigopoulos and the Development of One Continuous Greek History**

Constantine Paparrigopoulos (1815-1891) was born in Constantinople to a wealthy Greek merchant family. In 1830 Paparrigopoulos settled in Greece and studied at the Central School in Aegina. Early in his academic career, Paparrigopoulos challenged
European assertions that the Modern Greeks were not the direct descendants of the ancient Greeks. He staunchly believed that the Modern Greeks were the ancestral heirs of the ancient Greeks and that there were few cultural and physical differences between the modern and ancient Greeks. The Tyrolean historian Jakob Philipp Fallmerayer (1790-1861), on the other hand, had earlier suggested that there were few similarities between the Modern Greeks and the ancient Greeks. Fallmerayer’s *Greek Theory* had gained significant support in European intellectual circles. Specifically, Fallymerayer argued that the ancient Greek population in the south Balkans had been replaced by a massive Slavic migration from the north around the 10th century ACE. Fallymerayer stated,

> The race of the Hellenes had been wiped out in Europe. Physical beauty, intellectual brilliance, innate harmony and simplicity, art, competition, city, village, the splendor of the column and the temple has disappeared from the surface of the Greek continent… Not the slightest drop of undiluted Hellenic blood flows in the veins of the Christian population of present day Greece.\(^\text{12}\)

Fallmerayer’s theory could not however explain why the Greeks still spoke a language very similar to ancient Greek. He claimed that even though the Modern Greek language was linguistically associated with the ancient Greek, it was corrupted by foreign (specifically Slavic) words and had retained few ancient Greek words. Paparrigopoulos refuted Fallmerayer’s theory, claiming an uninterrupted line from ancient to Modern Greeks that could be easily demonstrated with examples from language, culture, and contemporary Greek folk-culture.

In 1850, Paparrigopoulos began work on his multi-volume history of Greece. He
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became Greece’s native historiographer *par excellence* by connecting ancient and modern Greece via a continuous series of events and geographic locations that eventually became the source material for a Modern Greek national identity.\(^{13}\) He is guilty of taking portions of his work from other historians, mostly from those histories of Greece written by French and English authors. Before publication of his *History of the Greek Nation*, early Greek school textbooks were primarily about ancient Greek history, and with no real historical synthesis between ancient Greek history and Modern Greek history (the following chapter considers this in greater depth). Paparrigopoulos’s work was adopted as the standard Greek history beginning in the 1870’s. Later other Greek historians such as Pavlos Karolidis and T.T. Timayenis would follow, and use Paparrigopoulos’s work as a template for their own books adopting his thesis that ancient, Hellenistic, Byzantine, and Modern Greek history were in fact one national Greek history. Thus, Paparrigopoulos set the tone for the teaching of Greek history and writing of Greek school textbooks for most of the 19\(^{th}\) and 20\(^{th}\) centuries.

According to these histories a Greek *ethnos* had existed since ancient times and persisted through the Hellenistic and Byzantine periods into the modern world.\(^{14}\) Each period was historically connected to the next: Ancient Greece led to Hellenistic Greece, Hellenistic Greece led to Byzantine Greece, and Byzantine Greece led to Modern Greece;
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\(^{14}\) Perhaps the most colorful illustration of Greek history both ancient and modern occurred during the 2004 Olympic games in Athens. Athens presented the world with a parade of Greek history from ancient times to the modern day. Theatrical props and actors dressed in costume helped represent Greek history in the parade. The parade sought to remind the world of the nation’s long history as a continuous and definitively Greek entity.
the Greek nation had passed through time relatively intact, with few cultural changes. Paparrigopoulos begins Ancient Greek history with the Dorian invasions of Greece. These predated classical Greece and ultimately led to the development of a Greek nation on the Greek mainland, as the Dorian invaders blended with the indigenous groups on the Greek peninsula.\(^{15}\) In a similar fashion, Paparrigopoulos presented Hellenistic history as the unification of the various Greek nations and the spread of Greek culture throughout the eastern world.\(^{16}\) Paparrigopoulos credits Greek unification to Philip II of Macedon.\(^{17}\) His son, Alexander the Great, is credited for spreading Greek culture across the eastern world.\(^{18}\)

Byzantine history is depicted as the Christianization of the Greek nation and the dominance of the Byzantine Empire (presented as Greek) throughout the Balkans and much of eastern Mediterranean world. Paparrigopoulos gives little attention to Greece’s occupation by the Ottoman Turks. He described this era as a “dark period” in Greek history, wherein Greek society is enslaved by the Ottoman Turks and Greek achievements are put to an abrupt halt.\(^{19}\) Greek revolutionary history focused mostly on key figures, battles, and events during the Greek War of Independence as well as the

\(^{15}\) Constantine Paparrigopoulos (and later editions Pavlos Korolidis), *History of the Greek Nation, Volumes 1-6* (Athens. In Greek, 1877).

\(^{16}\) Ibid.

\(^{17}\) Ibid.

\(^{18}\) Ibid.

\(^{19}\) Ibid.
Greek nation’s success in regaining its freedom after four hundred years of slavery. Paparrigopoulos died before he could complete his *magnum opus* on the history of Greece. However, Pavlos Korolidis later added incomplete portions of Greek Revolutionary history and Modern Greek history. Paparrigopoulos’s work was written in a simplified form of *Katharevousa* Greek, which was easier for teachers and students to read and understand. He also introduced the terms *First Hellenism, Macedonian Hellenism, Christian Hellenism, Medieval Hellenism, and Modern Hellenism*, which was an adapted version of Spyros Zampelios’s tripartite historical typology of Greek history (comprising ancient, medieval and Modern Hellenism). *First Hellenism* represented classical Greece up until the Peloponnesian Wars. *Macedonian Hellenism* followed *First Hellenism*, but was still part of the classical Greek period; it focused primarily on the military expeditions of Philip II and Alexander the Great. *Christian and Medieval Hellenism* represented the Byzantine period and *Modern Hellenism* focused on Ottoman rule and Greek Independence.

It is almost needless to say that, what Paparrigopoulos’s work generally left out
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20 Ibid.

21 Michael Apple and Linda K Christian-Smith have found that after a national history is written very little of that history is dropped from school textbooks. On the other hand, more national history is usually *added*. This tends to be a problem for publishers who are under constant pressure to revise textbooks while also maintaining books of a size manageable for students and teachers. Nevertheless, teachers and students bear most of the burden as more history is added since they are forced to cover more and more history in the same span of class days. Michael Apple and Linda K. Christian-Smith, “Introduction,” in Michael W. Apple and Linda K. Christian-Smith, eds., *The Politics of the Textbook* (Routledge, 1991).

was that the world of the present and the world of the past were not, in fact, the same.\textsuperscript{23} Most importantly, the people of the historical periods varied in how they viewed themselves and the world around them. For example, the ancient and Byzantine Greeks did not conceptualize political borders as clearly delineated, in stark contrast to 19\textsuperscript{th} century geopolitical models of the modern nation-state.\textsuperscript{24} Moreover, ancient Greek culture was quite different from that of modern Greece in terms of religion, traditions, and to a certain extent language.

One way that Paparrigopoulos was able to gloss over these differences was by writing about ancient Greece in an entirely familiar and personal way, not as something distant or foreign—evolved, yet maintaining its original ontological cultural character. Paparrigopoulos was not the only one guilty of using this stylistic approach to his advantage while rewriting history. During his time most histories written in Europe were in narrative form and lacked the in-depth analysis and interpretation that became common in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. Rather, 19\textsuperscript{th} century histories on great figures (Great Men), important historical events or “eventual history” (\textit{l'histoire événementielle}), long historical durations and time frames (\textit{longue durée}) and “great civilizations.”\textsuperscript{25} A product of his

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{23}Lowenthal, \textit{The Past is a Foreign Country}.
\item \textsuperscript{24}Alex Papadopoulos, \textit{Exploring Byzantine Cartographies: Ancient Science, Christian Cosmology, and Geopolitics in Imperial Byzantine Mapping} (2009).
\item \textsuperscript{25}Fernand Braudel and Sarah Mathews, \textit{On History} (University of Chicago Press, 1982) and P.M. Kennedy, “The Decline of Nationalistic History in the West, 1900-1970,” \textit{Journal of Contemporary History} 1 (1973): 77-100. Kennedy’s article looks at the decline of nationalistic historiography in the west from 1900-1970. He argues that we begin to see a decline in nationalistic history in Europe after World War I primarily because of the devastation that Europe experienced during the war. After 1919, history textbooks begin to focus more on the underprivileged and social movements and less on individuals and forces of national glory. According to Volker R. Berghahn and Hanna Schissler, eds., \textit{Perceptions of History: International Textbook Research on Britain, Germany and the United States} (Berg Press, 1987),
\end{itemize}
time, *History of the Greek Nation* managed to be characterized as one of the greatest intellectual achievements in 19th century Greece, because Paparrigopoulos was the first, writing in Greek, to connect the ancient Greek world to the Modern Greek world.\(^{26}\)

The Greek school served as a medium between Paparrigopoulos’s historical and academic world and Greek society, bringing the people of the present closer to the people of the past. Paparrigopoulos and other Greek intellectuals and educators tapped into the ancient Greek historical past to inspire the Greek people to unify around a common past. The literati’s method for accomplishing this transformation was the school textbook in which similarities between past Greek society and Modern Greek society were amplified while differences between the two societies were downplayed. The key idea underpinning this unified Greek national identity was that of a single, continuous Greek history from ancient to modern times.

**General Characteristics of the Greek History Curriculum**

From 1834-1913 the teaching of Greek history was taught in chronological fashion from past to present. Generally speaking, the curriculum began in fourth grade and moved from ancient, to Medieval/Byzantine, to contemporary or Modern Greek history, with each era revisited in Hellenic school and gymnasium.\(^{27}\) Before fourth grade,


\(^{27}\)Compiled from *Programmata Hellinikon Scholion kai Gymnasion*, Apithmos Protos. National Greek Curriculum for the Greek Elementary School and Gymnasiums, Number 1, 7071 (1867) and
students typically studied Greek mythology, which was seen as a way to prepare students for their later studies in ancient Greek history. As taught at the time, Greek mythology was dominated by ideals of bravery and courage and focused around the life of individuals, while history courses were focused around the collective ideals of the nation and its people.\textsuperscript{28}

Revisions to textbooks were typically made about every ten years.\textsuperscript{29} The textbooks were also updated every so often to include information on important events that had recently occurred. Nonetheless, most of the historical content in the textbooks remained virtually unchanged.

According to official state curriculum guidelines from 1835-1914, a significant amount of hours per week were spent on the teaching of history in the primary, Hellenic and gymnasium schools. A close examination of state curriculum guidelines also finds what type of history was taught in each grade.\textsuperscript{30} For example, in grade three students examined various stories from Greek mythology, such as the Greek Gods, Trojan War, Odysseus’ journey back home to his native Ithaca, and stories of other ancient Greek

\textit{Programmata Hellinikon Scholion kai Gymnasion} (1884). The Curriculum remained mostly the same until 1929, when it was the subject to major revision.


\textsuperscript{29}Antonakaki, \textit{Greek Education: Reorganization of the Administrative Structure}.

\textsuperscript{30}Programata Hellinikon Scholion kai Gymnasion. \textit{Programs of the Greek Schools} (Athens. In Greek, 1855) and Ch. Papamarkos, \textit{Analitikon Programata ton Mathimaton tou Plirous Dimotikou Scholiou. Programs for the Students in the Elementary Schools} (Athens. In Greek, 1890).
heroes such as Hercules, Theseus, Achilles, Perseus, Alcestis and the Argonauts, and their importance to ancient Greek society and ancient Greek everyday life.\(^{31}\) The various

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Hellenic</th>
<th>Gymnasium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6 hrs</td>
<td>12 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6 hrs</td>
<td>11 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>4 hrs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>6 hrs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6 hrs</td>
<td>12 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6 hrs</td>
<td>12 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6 hrs</td>
<td>12 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>7 hrs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9 hrs</td>
<td>12 hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table above compiled from several sources of information. For the years 1835, 1881, 1890, 1906, 1913, and 1914 information was acquired from Christina Koulouri, *Dimensions Ideologiques de l’Historicite en Grece* (1834-1914) (Peter Lang, 1991), 503. The year 1855 was compiled from *Programata Hellinikon Scholion kai Gymnasion*, 1855 (Klados, II, 283-289). The year 1890, from Christina Koulouri, *Dimensions Ideologiques de l’Historicite en Grece* (1834-1914) (Peter Lang, 1991), 503 and Ch. Papamarkos, *Analitikon Programata ton Mathimaton tou Pirous Dimotikou Scholiou* (Athens, 1890). The year 1897 from official programs of 1897, Vol. 12, no.130, the year 1906 from official programs of 1906, Vol. 27, no. 244. All programs with respective publication years were located in the National Archives in Athens in October 2008. Number of hours per week means the time suggested by the Greek Ministry of Education and religion to be spent in schools. By 1914 hours spent for the study of history in the Hellenic schools increases from 6 hours in 1906 to 9 hours in 1914. Greece acquired new peoples and territories after the Balkan Wars (1912-1913), and felt it was important that these new peoples (whether Greek or not) as well as the general Greek population spend a good amount of time on the study of Greek history, which would once again help affirm a Greek identity to the Greek population.

Greek tribes noted in Homer’s *Odyssey* and *Iliad* as the Achaeans, Dorians, and Ionians were taught to students as being the proto-Greek people. Although Henrich Schliemann’s discovery of Troy and Mycenae would not occur until the later part of the 19th century, the events of Troy were treated as both mythological stories and historical events. For most of the 19th century, schools taught students that the original Greeks were said to have come from elsewhere. Some suggest from the “east” where earlier civilizations as the Babylonians, Phoenicians, Assyrians, and Sumerians had flourished. Others suggest that the original Greeks were the Pelasgians. The textbooks would then explain how a number of northern Indo-European invasions into the Greek peninsula helps blend these new groups with the resident proto-Greek groups.

As one observer of a Greek history lesson commented,

The historical course is mainly the same as that for the two highest forms of the ‘complete’ deme [elementary] schools, and includes ancient and some part of Modern Greek history, stopping short, as usual at the reign of Otho.

Similarly, a teacher’s manual from 1880 encouraged teachers to make connections between ancient Greek society and Modern Greek society by highlighting the importance of family (*oikogenia*), hospitality (*philoxenia*), and honor and loyalty (*philotimo*) that are
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33 Theodorou N. Apostolopoulou, *Helliniki Istoria: Dia tous Mathites ton Dimotikon Scholeion (Greek History For Elementary Students)* (Athens. In Greek, 1883).

34 Papparousi, *History of Ancient Greece: For Use in the Third Year*.

still valued in Modern Greek society.\textsuperscript{36} A key teaching approach by Greek teachers, and especially by those who were familiar with or used Paparrigopoulos’s text, was to stress similarities rather than differences between ancient and Modern Greek society.\textsuperscript{37} One would suspect that a goal in the teaching of history was to lead students to believe that their contemporary Greek world was very much like the ancient Greek world, or at the least to imply that the Modern Greeks were directly related to the ancient Greeks.

In grades three and four students moved into the Greco-Persian wars. This part of the curriculum began with a close examination of Sparta, ancient Athens, the major battles of the Greco-Persian Wars, and the prominent figures of classical Greece, such as Themistocles, Leonidas, and Miltiadis.\textsuperscript{38} Students also covered the “Golden Age of Athens”—Pericles’s rule of Athens and the establishment of a democracy in Athens—as well as the achievements of major ancient Greek thinkers, writers, and philosophers.\textsuperscript{39}

Following Athens’s rise, Greece enters the Peloponnesian Wars, a dark period. At this point students were informed that the nation had divided, as was described by Thucydides in \textit{The Peloponnesian Wars}. In most of the early Greek textbooks the war is

\textsuperscript{36}S. Moraitis, \textit{Odigies gia ti didaskalia tis istorias kai geographies sta dimotika scholia} (1880). (S. Moraitis, \textit{Directions for the Teaching of History and Geography in the Greek Elementary Schools}) (Athens. In Greek, 1880).

\textsuperscript{37}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{38}Antonious N. Chorafa, \textit{Istoria tis Archaias Ellados dia tin d taixį̱̣̥̊̃. History of Ancient Greece for 4th Grade} (Athens. In Greek, 1913) and I. Kologeropoulou, \textit{Elliniki Istoria: Technos D. Greek History: Grade Four} (Thessaloniki. In Greek, 1902). It is likely that Kologeropoulou’s textbook was used in the Greek schools in northern Greece, territories which had not yet been incorporated into the state of Greece. It is not clear why these ethnically Greek schools used a different textbook from the schools found in Greece. What is important is that most textbooks used in schools outside of Greece, taught the same historical content for each of the respective grades.

\textsuperscript{39}Chorafa, \textit{Istoria tis Archaias Ellados dia tin d taixį̱̣̥̊̃}.
presented as a civil war between the various Greek city-states; that is, that the Athenians
and their Greek allies were at war with the Spartans and their Greek allies.\textsuperscript{40} Athens
looses the war, but the Greek states ultimately find peace with one another.\textsuperscript{41}

Later, under Philip II of Macedon and Alexander the Great, the Greek nation is
united once again and the Hellenistic Age begins.\textsuperscript{42} Accounts of Alexander’s military
expedition in Asia inform students about the spread of Hellenistic culture to most of the
known world. Related events, such as the founding of Alexandria in Egypt and specific
instances of Greek cultural influence in the east were also stressed in most Greek school
textbooks between 1834 and 1913.

Textbook portrayals of Philip II and Alexander were highly political, in no small
part because Greece wanted to reclaim Macedonia from the Ottoman Empire. According
to Paparrigopoulos (and most other Greek textbooks from 1870-1913) there was no
distinction between the ancient Greeks and ancient Macedonians; Macedonia was part of
a larger Greece, whose history language and traditions were Greek and no different from

\textsuperscript{40}Ibid.\textsuperscript{41}

It is true that the various ancient Greek groups found a connection with one another in a common
religion, language, and literary tradition based on Homer. It is also true that their similarities seemed to
become more transparent when an outside foreign threat challenged their cultural homogeneity and way of
life. However, when the Greek cities found relief from foreign invaders, differences between the city-states
became more apparent. For example, neither Athenians nor Spartans would have had second thoughts
when enslaving a Greek from another city-state. For example, when the citizens of Melos denied the
Athenians a strategic military alliance during the Peloponnesian Wars, the Athenians proceeded by
massacring all the men on the island and taking the women and children as slaves back to Athens. The
Athenians did not view their actions as an unjust act against their fellow Greeks, but instead an act against a
society that was different from their own. The ancient Greek world was limited in its geography and global
reach. Foreign connections were also limited. Therefore, the Greeks often stared at one another looking
for difference rather than similarities. As history shows us, this was certainly a common occurrence
between the various Greek nations.

\textsuperscript{42}Kologeropoulou, \textit{Elliniki Istoria: Technos D. Greek History}. 
the other ancient Greek city-states. For instance, in *History of the Greek Nation*, Paparrigopoulos asserts,

The king of Macedon Philip, who in 338 B.C. was able to unite Greece was not at all a foreigner. The Macedonians during ancient times considered themselves to be Greek. The kings of Macedon even were said to be the direct descendants of Hercules and other prominent Greek heroes.  

Paparrigopoulos is careful on his use of words, in no small part because his historical point of view about Philip of Macedon varied from those of other European historians. Some contemporary histories written by non-Greeks describe Philip as conquering the Greek States. Paparrigopoulos’ history instead describes Philip as unifying the various Greek states as one larger Greek nation. One could argue that this is simply a matter of historical perspective, but Paparrigopoulos’ interpretation strongly affirms the political and social notion that the Greek state was historically and geographically incomplete without Macedonia. This proved to be a useful position after the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913, when Greece regained Macedonia.

By grade five, students were exposed to the rise of the Byzantine Empire and the Christianization of Greece and Europe. The Byzantine Empire was seen as almost purely Greek. Students were taught that Rome’s power rested in the eastern part of the Empire, which was inhabited by Greek-speaking Orthodox Christians. Emperors like Constantine the Great and Justinian were presented as Greek kings who helped spread the Christian

---


word throughout the Empire and Europe. The early period of Empire was portrayed as economically prosperous and scientifically and culturally more advanced than the rest of the world.

The city of Constantinople was presented as the center of Greek Christian culture and as a symbol of the survival of Greek civilization from past to present. This is vividly described in one early history textbook:

On the 29th of May 1453 the day Tuesday, the barbarian Turks bombed the Roman wall outside the great city of Constantinople. The barbarians attempted to climb over the wall of the city, but the Greeks outnumbered through their sheer bravery were able to temporarily fend off the barbarians…. Eventually the wild Turks enter the city and reach the holy Christian temple of Agia Sophia. In the church worshippers are slaughtered unmercifully by the barbarians and the blood of the Christians flowed rapidly in the streets of the city!45

The Greek defeat in Constantinople in 1453 is mythologized and over-embellished to the point where it becomes part of the romantic national ideology of the Greek nation. Moreover, throughout the section the Byzantines are described as Greeks and not Romans only the walls outside the city are Roman. The Turks are identified as barbarians (Varvaroi) and wild savages (Agrioi) or uncivilized.46 In some instances the fall of the Constantinople is said to involve a Greek traitor who leads the Turks along a cryptic path into the city. It is suggested that the city would not have fallen if it were not for this Greek traitor. This adds to the sensationalism for the fall of “The City” in the Greek textbooks. The story also reminds students of the defeat of the Spartans at


46Varvaroi or barbarians also happens to be the language used by the ancient Greeks to describe all those that were not Greek.
Thermopylae by another Greek traitor Ephialtis, who led the Persians on a circuitous route around the pass. We could assume that some teachers perhaps noted parallels between the two events and the importance of loyalty and brotherhood among fellow Greeks.\textsuperscript{47}

That the city fell May 29\textsuperscript{th} is very significant in the Greek Orthodox Christian context. In the Greek Orthodox calendar it is Ascension Day (\textit{Yiorti tis Analypseos}), the day that Christ ascends to heaven in the presence of his disciples, forty days after his crucifixion. Whether Constantinople actually fell on the same day as the Greek Orthodox holy day is not important. What is important is that the holiday and the fall of the city became symbolically intertwined and create an emotional sense of hope and optimism. That is, although the city had been lost, (for the time being) it would one day again become part of Greece, just as the disciples were later reunited with the Christ.

In grade six students explored the contributions that Greece’s ancient and Byzantine scholars made to the Renaissance in Italy, which invariably linked Greece to Europe as well. Yet even as Greek achievements are helping give rise to the Renaissance, the nation is conquered by a “barbaric Turkish horde” that impedes the Greeks from taking a direct part in this cultural reawakening. A historically misguided interpretation of Greece’s occupation by the Turks was then presented to students. Statements such as “The Greeks were the slaves to Turks for four-hundred years” and “the practice of the Christian religion and Greek language was constantly prohibited by

the Turks” were taught by teachers and school textbooks.48

Towards the end of the sixth year students examine the causes, effects, and results of the Greek Revolution. The Greek Revolution was seen as a turning point in Greek history: the point at which the modern country of Greece regained her freedom from four hundred years of Ottoman occupation. The revolution was thus presented as proof of the survival of Greek culture and identity after four centuries of Ottoman control. Certain revolutionary heroes are glorified, such as, Rigas Velestinlis, Adamandios Koraes, Father Germanos, Markos Botsaris, Papaflesas, Theodoros Kolokotronis, Odysseus Androutsos, Athanasios Diakos, Georgios Karaiskakis, Constantine Kanaris, Andreas Miaoulis, Laskarina Bouboulina, Nikitaras, Alexandros Ypsilantis, and Lord George Byron. They became the “fathers” and “mothers” of the nation and were thus discussed in detail.

Having studied the events and personages of Greek revolutionary history, the sixth year closes with an emphasis on patriotism, brotherhood, and a harmonious relationship among the Greek people. Yet what is fairly consistently left out of the textbooks is that Greece had not, in fact, become a unified modern nation state until after the Revolution. Instead, and in keeping with what was taught in earlier grades, texts and teachers taught that the Greeks had always been united, except during their occupation by the Ottoman Empire. In the remaining years of primary school and in the Hellenic schools and gymnasium this process is once again repeated.

General Characteristics of the Greek Language Curriculum

In the curriculum for the Greek language course (which would be equivalent to a Greek literature or Greek grammar studies course) students used a reader as their primary textbook. The reader included mythological stories from ancient Greece as well stories from Aesop and contemporary folk songs, poems, and riddles. Early elementary school readers called Alphabitarion and Christomathia focused almost exclusively on the Greek alphabet and pronunciation while also providing some short stories, ancient Greek mythology and poems. The curriculum for upper elementary and middle school grades centered on simplified and abridged versions of ancient Greek mythology and general works on the topics of Modern and ancient Greece. While in school, students were typically asked by their teachers to read out loud to the class from the reader, and to recite and memorize passages. This was a common teaching practice in most of the early Greek schools. Evidence shows that the most common songs and poems found in the elementary reader before 1900 is the nursery rhyme Fegaraki mou Lambro (My Bright

---


51 Th. Apostolou, Christos Anthropos kai Omiros. The Anointed Man and Homer, 3rd Grade (Athens. In Greek, 1902-1915). Charis Papamarkou, Ellinikon Alphabitarion. Ekdosis Triti. Greek Reader, 4th Grade (Athens. In Greek, 1906). Interestingly in 1914 the national Greek Reader for the 5th grade was P.P. Oikonomou, O Megas Alexandros. Alexander the Great, 5th grade (Athens. In Greek, first published in 1903 and republished in 1914). It is unclear if the book was used in schools in 1903, but according to Tasos Voltis, the book was used in 1914 after the Balkan Wars when Greece had expanded its territorial reach into Macedonia. Tasos Voltis, Anagnostika Dio Aionon sto Dimitiko Scholio: 150 Chronia Paideutikis Porias (1830-1984). Readers from the Last Two Centuries in the Elementary Schools: 150 Years of Teaching and Learning. Smyrniotakis (Athens. In Greek, 1988).
Shining Moon).\textsuperscript{52}

\textit{My Little Bright Moon} (Author Unknown)

\begin{quote}
Φεγγαρακι µου λαµπο, \hspace{5em} My Little bright moon,
φεγγε µου να περπατω, \hspace{5em} shine on my way,
να πηγαινω στο σκολειο, \hspace{5em} that I may go to school,
να µαθαινω γραµµατα, \hspace{5em} and learn to read and write,
του Θεου τα πραγµατα. \hspace{5em} and all about the teaching of God
\end{quote}

\textit{Fegaraki mou Lambro} is sung to the tune of \textit{Twinkle Twinkle Little Star}. It is a children’s song from Ottoman times that describes how children were guided at night by the lucid light of the moon so as to find their way to school at night and avoid detection by the Turks. The song is a grim reminder to students of Greek oppression during Ottoman times and the prohibition of Greek education. More generally the hidden school is symbolically used in schools in helping fashion a Greek identity.\textsuperscript{53} The poem was easily memorized and sung by early age students and got to the point to students of how important education was in maintaining a Greek identity and Greek nation after centuries of Ottoman oppression.\textsuperscript{54}

\textsuperscript{52}Vasilios Skordeli, \textit{Alphabitarion kai Anagnostika}. Ekdosis Deutera. Reader, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Grade (Athens. In Greek, 1885) and Charis Papamarkou, \textit{Ellinikon Alphabitarion}. Ekdosis Triti. Greek Reader, 3\textsuperscript{rd} Grade (Athens. In Greek, 1892).

\textsuperscript{53}Children’s school songs often have their origins in a tragic or grim historical events. \textit{Ring Around the Rosie}, \textit{London Bridge}, and \textit{Humpty Dumpty} are perhaps the best known children’s songs in Great Britain yet \textit{Ring Around the Rosie} is about the spread of the plague in Europe, \textit{Humpty Dumpty} is about the execution by decapitation of Charles I in England, and \textit{London Bridge} is about the fire of London in 1666.

\textsuperscript{54}Arguably, \textit{Fegaraki mou Lambro} is actually praising the Ottoman Empire (symbolized as the bright crescent moon) for allowing the children to practice their Greek Orthodox religion, Greek language, and Greek culture freely in the Greek schools. Achilleas A. Mandrikas, \textit{Krifo Scholio: Mythos e Pragmatikotita? Hidden School: Myth or Reality?} (Athens. University of Athens. In Greek, 1992). Nikolaos Gyzis’s famous painting “Hidden School” or “Krifo Scholio” (1885/86) does an excellent job of depicting the myth. Ghrizys’s painting shows few children, both boys and girls, around candlelight as a priest offers the youth an erudition on Greek language, history and religion. The children are mesmerized by the priest’s teachings yet fearful of being detected by the Ottomans.
Between 1900-1913 Ioannis Polemis’ poem/song *Krifo Scholio* (Hidden School) is equally present in the elementary Greek readers.55

**Krifo Scholio (Ioannis Polemis)**

Outside, black desperation,

Outside, black desperation,

Outside, black desperation,

tangible shadow of bitter slavery,

tangible shadow of bitter slavery,

but inside the vaulted church,

but inside the vaulted church,

the church which assumes every night

the church which assumes every night

the shape of a school.

the shape of a school.

there is a shivering light of the candle

there is a shivering light of the candle

lighting up the dreams

lighting up the dreams

and collecting the children of the slaves from all around.

and collecting the children of the slaves from all around.

Like *Fegaraki mou Lambro*, *Krifo Scholio* is intended for second or third grade elementary students and attests to Greek persecution during Ottoman times. In the song children find comfort in the church and the candlelight in the church symbolizes hope, Christian spirituality, classical Greek wisdom, and the survival of a Greek identity.56 Polemis uses such phrases as “black desperation,” “bitter slavery,” and “children of slaves” to describe Greek experiences during Ottoman times. *Fegaraki mou Lambro* and *Krifo Scholio*, both perpetuate the notion that the Ottoman authorities prohibited Greek education during Ottoman times. They also indicate that the Greek people were persecuted under the Ottoman Empire. They are hopeful nonetheless, as they refer to an era when Greek identity and the Greek nation were able to survive through the Greek school.

---


Between 1834 and 1913 the nation was central to the Greek language curriculum. Equally important was the student’s role in the nation. While in school students were asked about their own lives: their family and friends, games that they played, and their personal lives at home and around school. In grade one students worked on the Greek alphabet, as well as completing basic oral exercises and basic reading exercises. The readings were from a reader that was standardized in all the schools in Greece. The readings centered on family, friends, and the school. Stories, fables, and ancient Greek mythology were also introduced in the textbooks. These stories were selected to shape the moral judgment and ethical development of the child. They were usually from Aesop’s fables, which playfully dealt with animals and their interaction with one another:

Χελωνη και Αετο

Χελωνη αετου εδειται αυτην διδαξαι. Του δε μαπιανουντο πορρω τουτο φυσεως αυτης ειναι, εκεινη μαλλον τη δεησει προσεκειτο. Λαβων ουν αυτην τοις ουνξι και εις υψος ανεγον ειτ αφηκεν. Η δε κατα πετρων πετουσα συνετριβη.  

The Tortoise and the Eagle

A Tortoise asked an Eagle if he could teach him to fly. The Eagle said nature had not provided you with wings. The Eagle agreed and picked him up to a great height in the sky. He then let him go and [the Tortoise] fell and was broken to pieces on a rock.

---

57 Compiled from Programmata Hellinikon Scholion kai Gymnasion. Apithmos Protos. National Greek Curriculum for the Greek Elementary School, Number 1, 7071 (1867) and Programmata Hellinikon Scholion kai Gymnasion (1884). Both documents found in the Greek National Archives in Athens, October 2008. The Curriculum remained mostly the same until 1929, when major revisions were made to the Greek school curriculum.


59 Gerorgiou Papavasiliou, Elliniki Christomathia Pros Chrisin tov en a’ Taxi. Greek Chrostomathia. For use in the 1st Grade (Athens. In Greek, 1898), 11.
At the end of each of Aesop’s stories there was usually a comment or explanation of the moral of the story. In the story above the moral could be summed up as, “If men had all they wished, they would often be ruined.”

Stories from Greek mythology sometimes also included a message used to cultivate a child’s moral character; this is true in stories about real historical figures and those about ancient mythical figures. Ada Katsiki-Givalou study on children’s literature in Greece found that during most of the 19th and early 20th centuries, Greek children’s literature focused on patriotic and religious themes. Katsiki-Givalou states,

During the 19th Century, Greek literature was characterised by patriotic elation, religiousness, and didacticism and this in turn was used as literature for children. Towards the end of the century, various poetic collections and prose written especially for young readers (but with the same morphological and ideological elements as those of "adult" literature) began to appear. The use of mythology prevailing in children's poetry of the time could be easily explained by the fact that it not only had an entertaining nature but also maintained a mainly didactic character.

According to Katsiki-Givalou, the use of mythology in schools could be easily explained by the fact that it not only had an entertaining purpose, but also maintained a historical connection to ancient Greece. Moreover, children’s literature was directly linked to the state’s interest in children and their education. In the case of the story of Hercules the story seeks to exemplify ancient Greek bravery and heroism even if most Greek mythical figures were not purely human. However, the figures do possess many human characteristics, desires and dilemmas faced by a common person, which made then appear to be more human than godlike.60

---

Hermes

Hera bore two children, Hercules from Zeus and Iphikles from Amphitryon. When Hercules was eight months old, the goddess Hera sent two serpents to Hercules’ cradle to kill the infant. But Hercules sat up and squeezed both the serpents with his hands and killed them both.

Other stories consistently mentioned in the Greek elementary school readers included the Christomathia and the Psaltrion from Alexander Rizzo Ragavi (1809-1892) and stories from the Old Testament and Greek mythology. By 1900 works by Ioannis Karasoutsas, Andreas Laskaratos, and Achileas Paraschos appeared in the school textbooks.

In grades two and three students worked on copying and reading long sentences from the reader. They also worked on penmanship, the conjunction of verbs, and pronunciation, as well as reading short stories about daily Greek life and reciting and memorizing poems and religious prayers. The process of memorization and recitation were commonly used in the learning of the prayers and stories. Common religious prayers learned by students included Pater Imon (Our Father) and in later years

61 Kyriakos Kosma, Elliniki Christomathia: Pros Chrisin tov Mathiton tis a’ Taxeos tov Ellinikon Scholeion. Greek Christomathia for use in the 1st Greek (Athens. In Greek, 1904). The examination of stories from the Old Testament and Greek Mythology in the Greek reader is an interesting case. To omit stories from Greek mythology would neglect the Greek nationalists idea that the Modern Greeks were the descendants of the ancient Greeks, to include this would challenge Greece’s Judeo-Christian tradition. In any case, stories from the Old Testament and Greek mythology show just how the Greek school was able to blend both traditions.

62 E. Papamichali, Ellinikon Anagnofmatarion. Pros Chrisin ton Mathiton Tis Tritis Taxeos. Greek Reader for Students in the Third Grade (Athens. In Greek, 1910).
Symvolon tis Pisteos, (Nicene Creed). These were important because they captured Greece’s Byzantine Christian tradition—both prayers were used and written during Byzantine times. The prayers are also reinforced during the students’ lessons on Greek Orthodox Christianity, which tended to be a separate subject offered in the schools.

The poems that were recited and memorized tended to deal with the nation and Greek independence, such as Velesitinlis’s Thourios (Rousing Song), Dionysios Solomos’s Hymnos tis Eleutherias (The Hymn to Liberty) as well as Solomos’s Ode to the Death of Lord Byron. The Rousing Song and Hymn to Liberty eventually became national songs that were learned by all Greek students. Rousing Song captures the Greek revolutionary spirit, while Hymn to Liberty captures the ancient spirit of Greece.

**Rousing Song**

that is, a dazing Patriotic Hymn first, for the sound A GREAT COMMAND

Ως ποτε παλληκαρία, να ζουμε στα στενα,
μοναχοί, σαν λιονταρία, στές ράχες, στα βουνα;
σπηλιές
να κατοικούμεν, να βλέπωμεν κλαδία,
να φευγομ’
απ τον κόσμον, για την πικρή σκλαβία;
να χανωμεν αδελφία, Πατρίδα και γονείς,
tous
φίλους, τα παιδιά μας και όλους τους συγγενείς;
Καλλίο ναι μιας ώρας ελευθερή ζωή,
παρά σαραντα χρόνοι σκλαβία και φυλάκη!

For how long, lads, we shall spread our lives in straits, alone, like lions, to mountains and crests?

To live inside caves, the branches all we see to leave from this world, all for the bitter chain?

To loose brothers and parents, country and friends, all our relatives and children as well?

It’s better if for an hour we live our life free than living forty years in bondage and in Jail (being unfree)!
Velestinlis’s *Rousing Song* sought to transmit his revolutionary message and rally the Greeks to revolt against their Ottoman masters. It is essentially a war song composed of 125 verses, although only his first eight were included in the version taught at Greek schools. The song was not used during Velestinlis’s time, but it is clear that it was later used during the Revolution and incorporated in the Greek elementary readers. It is written in the simple *Demotic* Greek as it was intended by Velestinlis to be sung by the common Greek-speaking population. In the song Velestinlis stresses that freedom is the greatest commodity, even greater than life itself. He declares that it is better to live an hour of freedom than forty years of slavery. Notably, Velestinlis’s poem was adapted from several classical Greek poems.\(^\text{63}\) His song thus became a blend of ancient Greek works in the Modern Greek, a piece carrying major Greek nationalist undertones that could be easily learned and understood by Modern Greeks.

Solomos’s *Hymn to Liberty* was also used by schools in an overt effort to incorporate into the curriculum a message of national unity and an awareness of modern Greece’s link to the ancient past. Dionysios Solomos is considered Greece’s first modern poet. He was born in 1798 on the island of Zakynthos to a father of Italian ancestry and a Greek mother. He was an advocate of the vernacular (*Demotic* Greek). In 1823 he composed *Hymn to Liberty*, the first two stanzas of which officially became the Greek national anthem in 1865.\(^\text{64}\) As in the case of Velestinlis’s song it is important to look at

\(^{63}\)Specifically from Aeschylus’s, *Seven Before Thebes, Persians, Agamemnon*, and *Eumenides*; Sophocles’s, *Aias*; and Aristophanes’s, *Hippies* and *Frogs*.

\(^{64}\)Greek elementary students still today are required to learn the first two stanzas of Solomos’s *Hymn to Liberty*. 
Solomos’s *Hymn to Liberty* to help glean how the Greek schools inculcated its students into developing a notion of a Greek identity based on Modern Greece’s ties to ancient Greece. Solomos’ *Hymn to Liberty* is less nationalist in tone and more nostalgic of Greece’s ancient past:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Υμνος εις την Ελευθεριαν</th>
<th><em>Hymn to Liberty</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Σε γνωριζω απο την κοιη</td>
<td>I always recognize you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Του σπαθιου την τρομερη</td>
<td>By the dreadful sword you hold,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σε γνωριζω απο την οψι,</td>
<td>As the earth, with searching vision,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ποι με βια μετραει την γη.</td>
<td>You survey with spirit bold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Απ τα κοκκαλα βγαλμενη</td>
<td>Risen from the sacred bones of the Greeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τον Ελληνον τα ιερα</td>
<td>Whose dying brought birth our spirit free,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Και σαν πρωτα ανδειωμενη,</td>
<td>Now, with ancient valour rising,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χαιρε, ω χαιρε, Ελευθερια!</td>
<td>Let us hail you, oh liberty!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The entire poem consists of 158 stanzas composed of rhymed seven and eight-syllable trochaic verses. The poem is about a woman named *Liberty* who is dressed in ancient Greek attire. She represents modern Greece in the form of an ancient Greek goddess. The goddess is roaming the Greek landscape wielding a sword and searching for her enemies. The poet greets her in the first stanza when he says to her, “I always recognize you by the dreadful sword you hold.” To Solomos, *Liberty* has always existed in Greece, since ancient times, and while she might have slept under Ottoman rule, she finally rises again from the earth at the time of the Greek Revolution.

---

65Solomos’s *Hymn to Liberty* was later translated into several languages, the most famous from Rudyard Kipling, which is more of an adapted version than a literal or poetic translation. The *Hymn to Liberty* has been played at the opening and closing ceremonies of every Olympic games since the first Olympic games in Athens in 1896. B.T. Tomadakis, *O Dionysios Solomos kai in Elliniki Epavastasis*. Dionysios Solomos and the Greek Revolution (Athens. In Greek, 1957).

More importantly, she is also deeply imbedded in the Modern Greek mind. In Solomos’s words she has again “Risen from the sacred bones of the Greeks.” Liberty becomes a symbol of Modern Greece’s ancient past. The sacred bones are those of the ancient Greeks, who after centuries of cultural dormancy are once again able to rise from the ancient depths of the earth in the form of Modern Greece. It is evident in the poem that Solomos intends to make the Modern Greeks aware of their ancient Greek cultural roots: he has symbolically resurrected the ancient Greeks in the form of the Greek revolutionaries.

In grade four, student work continues from a reader. At this grade students work on composition, narration, and description as well as grammar exercises. The primary focus at this grade is writing. Grade five is a mere extension of grade four. By the final years of elementary school students compare Ancient and Modern Greek languages (mostly Demotic and Katharevousa), read stories about ancient Greece, examine Greek literature (which is mostly literature of ancient Greek playwrights) in the Modern Greek and some of the writers of the Greek Revolution. In one textbook from 1885 parallels are made between ancient Greek heroes and Modern Greek heroes as a means to connect the students to their ancient Greek past:

When Leonidas and his 300 Spartans were ready to fight the Persians at Thermopylae, one soldier said ‘There were so many Persians that if they all fired their arrows they would cover the light from the sun.’ The fearless Leonidas replied, ‘You should then be happy because then we will fight in the shade.’ Later Xerxes sent one of his men to tell Leonidas to give up his weapons, but Leonidas confidently replied ‘If you want them, come and get them.’
The textbook begins by recounting the actions of Leonidas and his three hundred Spartans immediately before their battle against the Persians at Thermopylae. Leonidas is portrayed as brave, heroic, and unyielding. This portrayal was not uncommon, since Leonidas and his 300 Spartans had been portrayed in this fashion in most histories since the time of Herodotus. However, what follows the passage is a 19th century Greek poem (author unknown) that links the Modern Greeks to the ancient Greeks. The author connected Leonidas with Greece’s preeminent Revolutionary hero, Theodoros Kolokotronis, by having the latter wear the former’s sword. Kolokotronis is thus portrayed as embodying this Greek bravery that has existed since ancient times.

By the 20th century more contemporary Modern Greek authors would be included in the Greek language and literature curriculum. But since many of the more notable Modern Greek authors, such as Constantine Cavafy, George Seferis, Odysseus Elites, Yiannis Ritsos, Angelos Sikelianos, Kostas Ouranis, Takis Papatzonis, Kostas Kariotakis George Themelis, Zoe Karelli, Andreas Karkavitsas, and Nikos Kazantzakis did not write until the early and middle part of the 20th century, their works did not appear in the Greek schools till much later. Even then, the Greek Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs selected from their works carefully, seeking those that promoted the national spirit and unity of the Greek people just as had been the case in the earlier readers.68

67Skopeli, Alphabitarion kai Anagnosmatarion, 91.
General Characteristics of the Geography Curriculum

As early as 1834, the national school curriculum also emphasized the teaching of geography. In his study on nationalism and the politics of place in Greece, Robert Shannan Peckman argues that after the establishment of a Greek nation-state, Greece claimed that the territories that were once inhabited by the Ancient Greeks were rightfully its own, since Modern Greeks were the true inheritors and ancestors of the Ancient Greeks.69 Most of those lands had been controlled by the Ottoman Empire for some four hundred years before they became part of the modern state of Greece. State sponsored explorations in archaeology and folklore served to legitimize Greece’s geographic claims by framing relations with the land through a reorganization of space and time.70

In the Greek schools, ancient and Modern Greek maps were often shown side by side; this arrangement minimized the current extent of Greek lands as opposed to their historical extent. That is, Modern Greek lands were purposefully shown to be far smaller in size than ancient Greek lands. This implies that the purpose of teaching geography in schools for much of the late 19th and early 20th centuries was to show to the Greek student what a modest portion of their ancient territories they now inhabited and what portions were missing from the Greek state.71

Evidence of this is found in a Greek geography textbook from 1880, when one

70 Ibid.
71 Moraitis, Odigies gia ti didaskalia tis istorias kai geographies sta dimotika scholia.
In the fourth grade we show our students the totality of Greek lands. We teach them that these lands are Greek, that is to say that they are the possession of and inhabited by people who are close to us, who are of the same origin, have the same religion and speak the same language as us.72

Similarly, Thomas Keightly’s translated Greek history textbook on ancient Greece begins with a discussion on the geography of ancient Greece and how it relates to modern Greece. The “ancient territories…” are said by Keightly to “include Macedonia in the north, the Ionian Islands in the east, the islands of the Aegean to the west and Crete to the south.”73 At the time of Keightly’s publications, the population of Greece was nearly three million people, with another nearly two million Greeks still living outside the borders of the nation-state. The Greek state felt that these lands should be incorporated into its territories because their populations consisted mostly of Greek-speaking and ethnically Greek people.

In 1844, Ioannis Koletis’s famous nationalist speech to the Greek assembly (Vouli) affirmed the nation’s expansionist ambitions by declaring,

And if there were to come to the Race some great idea of setting its lifeless limbs in motion and if it sought its ancestral heritage, the Empire of its Commene great-grandfathers, what rash spirit would show resistance to this and smother this voice of all the people within and without Greek borders.


Koletis’s “Great Idea” would become Greece’s *manifest destiny*—its attempt throughout much of the late 19th and early 20th centuries to reclaim its ancestral inheritance, the specific form of which was described in geographic terms. Koletis was also concerned with the unity of the Greek nation, both inside and outside of the Greek state.

Koletis’s “Great Idea” supported the broader scope of Greek nationalism by demonstrating a political and cultural connection to the ancient Greek past and the reclaiming of ancient Greek lands. Such aspirations were also found in early Greek geography textbooks. Therefore a significant number of hours were dedicated to the teaching of geography in the Greek school:

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Hellenic</th>
<th>Gymnasia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7 hrs</td>
<td>9.8 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7 hrs</td>
<td>7.4 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>6 hrs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>8 hrs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6 hrs</td>
<td>6 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6 hrs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6 hrs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>14 hrs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7 hrs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Lessons in geography began as early as grade one. These very young students studied basic concepts found in the physical environment (*perivalon*), such as the school building, the classroom, and the schoolyard, the church, the square, and any other distinctive monuments, both natural and artificial. Students also observed and learned about the trees, vegetables, flowers, and animals found in their community as well as those indigenous to Greece in general.

In grade two, students continued their exploration of the Greek town. Students again reviewed a town’s squares, churches, gardens, monuments, aqueducts, parks, and trees. The Greek landscape was also examined and forests, plains, islands, lakes, mountains, and rivers were identified. Thus even in the earliest students’ geography education, the land and its surroundings play an important personal role, attaching the students to the land and the area for which they reside. More simply, they learned that Greece is composed of “trees that look like this,” “flowers that look like that,” “all Greek towns have churches and squares,” “rivers, mountains, lakes, forest, and hills are found in Greece,” and so on. The country was portrayed as peaceful, clean, and domestic; a place of beauty, where people work together in nature under the clouds and sun. It is also the territory that the Greek people have occupied since ancient times. In concert, these teachings would have suggested to the students that the organic and synthetic geography of the region was intrinsically Greek—that the nation and its geography belong to the people, as much as the people belonged to the nation and its geography.
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75 Compiled from *Programmata Hellinikon Scholion kai Gymnasion*. Apithmos Protos. National Greek Curriculum for the Greek Elementary School, Number 1, 7071 (1867) and *Programmata Hellinikon Scholion kai Gymnasion* (1884).
Between 1834 and 1913, most of Greece was rural. Even Greece’s larger cities, such as Athens and Patra, felt more like large towns than urban centers. Most students in Greece could relate better to a rural or small town environment, since they lived in these types of communities, than to a large urban setting.\(^{76}\) By grade three, students shifted their attention to a broader examination of the political and human geography of the Greek nation.\(^{77}\) The capital, Athens, and major cities were discussed; distances between cities and towns were examined; and the professional occupations of the population, such as farmers, tradesmen, merchants, teachers, doctors, priests, and general laborers were considered. Students were thus again reminded of their local environment, this time through an examination of towns, cities, and occupation.

By grade four, attention shifted to a general overview of Greece’s borders, both physical and political. Topics included Greece’s size relative to other countries in the world, as well as Greece’s physical geographic shape. Local provinces were studied in detail, and the Greek landscape was presented as a repository of Greek culture from past to present. There was no mention of Greek minority groups as the Arvanites, Jews, Gypsies, Slavs, Vlachs, and Muslims.\(^{78}\) The nation was presented as being entirely Greek and Greek-speaking.
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\(^{78}\) In some histories of Modern Greece, (not intended for the Greek schools) Albanians are mentioned, but are presented as being Greek or linked to the ancient Greeks. In Melissou’s *History of Modern Greece*, Melissou states, “George Katriotis was born in Epirus. It is not named Albania but
By grade five students were taught world geography, including cartography; the continents, the oceans, and the world’s other major landforms (mountains, rivers, etc.); the nations and people found therein; European colonial explorations; and Greece in context of the world. In grade six, students continued their examination of maps and mathematical geography. The planets were studied, and then attention was shifted to Europe, and specifically to the geography of the Balkans. Here students were reminded of Greece’s relatively small size and that many of the territories that bordered 19th and 20th century Greece were at one time part of a larger, ancient Greek empire. The nation was essentially seen as a living organism; and its geographic space as *lebensraum* (natural living space) to be occupied by the Greek people. The ultimate achievement would be to bring “unclaimed” Greek lands and people together once again in one large state.

**Summary**

History, Greek language, and geography were all important components in the Greek school curriculum for much of the 1834-1913 period. The three subjects were taught in an almost inter-disciplinary approach, coming together in one overarching theme that emphasized loyalty to the Greek state, common brotherhood and bloodlines,
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and unity amongst the Greek people. Greece was the focus of all three subjects, which examined the nation from multiple dimensions that may be broadly characterized as *patriognosis* (knowledge of the nation). This approach had been fostered by, Constantine Paparrigopoulos’s historical thesis of one unbroken Greek historical thread from past to present and reinforced the idea that contemporary Greek history, language, culture, and geography were all linked to ancient Greece.

The teaching of history in Greek schools has been seen, historically, as an important vehicle for the formation of a Greek national identity. Since the inception of the modern state of Greece and the introduction of universal education in Greece in 1834, history in schools had been geared to the teaching of the national past and to generating a connection between that past and its citizenry. The following chapters examine more closely what Greek history textbooks from 1834 to 1913 had to say about that past, and the process by which a Greek identity was shaped through the teaching of a national history.

---

CHAPTER FIVE

CLIO IN THE HISTORY TEXTBOOK

First, as it seems, we must supervise the makers of tales; and if they make a fine tale, it must be approved, but if its not, it must be rejected. Well also persuade nurses and mothers to tell the approved tales to their children and to shape their souls with tales more than their bodies with hands. Most of those they now tell must be thrown out.

--Socrates

Overview

This chapter discusses the intricate process by which Greek textbooks were manufactured and then studied by the Greek student. One will find that a Greek history was initially imported from abroad. These first Greek histories were translated into Greek and then taught in the Greek schools. Few of these textbooks included histories of modern Greece and were almost exclusively on ancient Greece. The chapter begins by providing examples of textbooks from around the world and discussing how the past is taught may vary from nation to nation, but all seek to unite their people around a shared historical past. Textbooks are often windows to understanding the world from a particular society’s viewpoint, as well as how the society sees itself, and how it wants to be seen by others. Through the textbook the student may become politically and culturally indoctrinated and form in his or her consciousness a sense of a national identity. The way history is written and the way it is taught in schools thus plays a significant role in the shaping of a national identity.
Later, this chapter looks at common historical themes found in Greek history textbooks from 1834-1913. Following this section four history textbooks from 1834-1880 are examined. These include: William Mitford’s *Ancient Greek History for use in Schools* (1836), Oliver Goldsmith’s *History of Greece* (1849), J.R. Lamè-Fleury’s *Greek History for Children* (1860), and Thomas Keightly’s *History of Ancient Greece for Use in Schools* (1850). The texts were intended for students in Europe, but were later translated and popularly used in the Greek schools. One will find that the texts were chosen in Greece because they revered the ancient Greek past and glorified the figures and events of that past. At the same time, Greek translators found that this past could be easily tied to a Modern Greek identity. The following chapter examines specifically textbooks written between 1880 and 1913.

**Historical Change and Political Intent: The Case of American History Textbooks**

It is fair to say that curriculum is central in schools and that knowledge is imparted *via* school textbooks. Michael Apple, Linda Christian-Smith, Paulo Friere, and Henry A. Giroux are among those who have powerfully argued that the textbook is essentially a vehicle that achieves particular political, cultural, and social ends.¹ Recently there has been serious, worldwide debate regarding what type of history should be included in school textbooks. In many countries, questions have also been raised regarding the outcomes desired from the teaching of a national history. In the United States, for example, the rise of social history in the 1960’s drew more attention to groups
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that had been historically underrepresented in school textbooks. These groups included African-Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, and women; their inclusion remains controversial in several conservation states today.

During the 1980’s and 1990’s an increasing number of historians advocated the revision of American history textbooks. Those that supported this movement were called “revisionists.” They felt that American history, in general, had for too long ignored certain social and political movements, ethnic and minority groups, and major events in American history. Many revisionists also felt that it was time to add these previously neglected topics in American history textbooks.

Some revisionist histories, such as James Loewen’s *Lies My Teacher Told Me* and Howard Zinn’s *A People’s History of the United States*, became national best sellers and set shockwaves in the American historical community.² Conservatives in the United States did not accept this “new” history; they believed it would teach young people to be unpatriotic and question authority. Liberals, on the other hand, welcomed the change. They felt that these new interpretations were long overdue and that it was time for Americans to learn about the truth. Some three decades later, what to include in and what to leave out of American history textbooks remains a topic of serious debate in many of America’s schools.

Frances Fitzgerald’s study on 20th century U.S. history textbooks, for example, found that most of their content has centered on American political history. Before
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WWII, U.S. history textbooks focused primarily on the United States’ role in Latin America, from the *Monroe Doctrine* to Franklin D. Roosevelt’s *Good Neighbor Policy*.

By the 1950’s, as the United States becomes a global military and economic power, American political history intensifies in the country’s history and civics textbooks. Fitzgerald asserts that,

> The morbid fear of Communism becomes an overriding passion—to the point where in some books the whole American history appears a mere prologue to the struggle with the ‘Reds’.

American foreign policy and the struggle between capitalism and communism become hallmarks of the genre.

In another study of American textbooks, Dan B. Fleming found that the Reagan administration was very vocal in expressing its views on what type of U.S. history should be taught in America’s schools. Then Secretary of Education William Bennett was quoted saying,

> Schools should foster a national consensus in support of the administration’s policy in Central America, and that, America’s schools should teach that the United States is morally superior to the Soviet Union.

In the United States the textbook has also been used to help shore up political
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support for foreign policies about which citizens may be uncertain. During the Cold War, teaching American students about the historical moral superiority of the United States helped the U.S. government get its policies passed. In more recent times, the issues of what parts of history to include and how to present them have been topics of debate in Texas. A state board of elected officials must approve each textbook in Texas. Christian Conservatives in Texas would like to see the United States portrayed as a “Christian Nation” that has embodied Judeo-Christian principles since its founding. Because of this, serious discourse has emerged across the United States regarding “whether the founding fathers were driven by Christianity” and challenging the long held (and indeed, Constitutionally-guaranteed) notion of the “Separation of Church and State.”

Certainly the United States is not the only country that pays close attention to the teaching of its national past; education has been a battleground between cultural and ideological forces for millennia and, most nations put resources towards public education because they understand the benefits that can be reaped from teaching particular types of history.

As is no surprise, the way history is taught in schools and presented in school textbooks has been a field of scholarly inquiry among historians and educational researchers for some time. Scores of history textbooks have been investigated in terms of content, didactic presentation, and the goals a particular textbook publisher and purchaser intends to achieve for the nation and state. Scholars generally agree that textbooks have a
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long-term effect on the way that nations see themselves and the way that nations may perceive their neighbors. History textbooks may be used to unite a nation around a common national consciousness, to shape and spread a common national identity and create a feeling of belonging to a larger community. Textbooks may also be used to indoctrinate a citizenry and encourage its people to be in constant conflict with another nation. In short, the textbook is a powerful tool that may be used in many different ways.

Comparing Textbooks of the Past and Present: The Case of European Textbooks

A comparative study completed in 1987 by Hanna Schissler found that British textbooks have tended to be narrative, concrete, and stress an unbroken connection between present day England and England’s historical past. Distinctions were also made in English textbooks between the British Isles and the continent of Europe, with England and the English people presented as distinct from Europe and Europeans. On the other hand, German textbooks are more problem-oriented and less focused on Germany’s national past, and generally analyzes major political and social structures. Schissler asserts,

They [German textbooks] try to teach history rather more through a description and analysis of processes and structures than through narrative and identification of personalities of the kind to be found in British texts.

Moreover, German history is much more concerned to its relationship with the broader history of continental Europe, whereas British history is presented as separate from, but still involved in the history of Europe.
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9 Ibid., 29.
Western European curricula and school history textbooks have become more similar in the last sixty years, as well as more strictly focused on contemporary history. There is now less of a focus on national history in many European countries. European history textbooks have shifted their attention from a “centric national history model” to a focus on historical themes specifically intended to unite the various European national groups around a collective European identity. These common trends suggest that, “…the nation is being resituated within a European or a world context.”

Post World War II themes such as “human rights,” “different but equal,” and “the Enlightenment and humanity” are becoming more common as national histories are being recast in favor of broader common narratives.

On the other hand, many of Europe’s former communist nations are still struggling to find commonly accepted histories. Albania is a case in point. Albanian textbooks certainly mention Albanians from the diaspora and a formerly grander Albania nation, but less attention is given to the creation of a well-defined identity based on the Albanian historical past. Rather more attention is dedicated to the ways that Albania could succeed in the future. According to Erind Pajo, Albanian national identity is often presented as being “inferior” to other European nations. Albanian textbooks also associate wealth of a country with the success of its people thus implying that the wealthier a nation is, the better its people are. Finally, Albanian textbooks pay little


attention to the nation’s history before World War II; most of the discussions center on
the war itself, communist Albania, and post-Communist Albania.

Similarly, in post-communist Romania, Byzantine and Ottoman historiography
became prominent fields of study, information from which was later transmitted through
Romanian school textbooks. In other words, after communism Romanian history was
resituated from a focus mostly on communist political history to one that explores the
experiences of the Romanian people during Ottoman and Byzantine times.12

In the Republic of Macedonia, Nikola Jordanovski found that Macedonian history
textbooks were heavily steeped in medieval history. In the case of Slavo-Macedonian
history, Macedonia is presented as a birthplace of all Slavic people.13 The textbooks
emphasize how the Byzantine Orthodox monks Cyrillis and Methodius developed the
Slavic language in Macedonia, and that the language was later spread to the other Slavic
nations. Notably, the textbooks make no concrete assertion that the modern Macedonians
are the direct descendants of the ancient Macedonians. Instead, Jordanovski found that
the textbooks’ treat the Slav invasions into Balkans in the 10th century ACE as resulting
in an “ethnogenetic combination” of the already present “Helleno-Romanised” peoples
and the Slavic invaders.14 In other words, the books emphasize a blending of Greek,
Roman, and Slavic cultures and little or no attention is given to the Albanian people, even

12Bogdan Murgescu, “Byzantine and Ottoman Studies in Romanian Historiography,” in Christina
Koulouri, ed., *Clio in The Balkans: The Politics of History Education.* Center for Democracy and
Reconciliation in Southeast Europe (Thessaloniki, Greece, 2002), 148-162.

13Nikola Jordanovski, “Medieval and Modern Macedonia as Part of a National Grand Narrative,”
and Reconciliation in Southeast Europe (Thessaloniki, Greece, 2002), 109-117.

14Ibid., 112.
though they compose a third of the population in Macedonia. This is problematic since exclusion from the textbooks suggests they are not part of a broader Macedonian nation.

Historian Benjamin Fortna has argued that education played a critical role in the formation of a modern Turkish identity. Once an unorganized and expansive educational system, the Ottoman Empire made significant attempts to establish a nationalized school system during the end of its reign. Restructuring the school system served several purposes for the late Ottoman state, such as modernizing the country, maintaining the empire’s holdings in Europe and the Middle East, and creating a Turkish identity. Moral education and Muslim identity were brought to the forefront of the curriculum in order to foster a relatively uniform Turkish identity throughout the Empire. Fortna also discusses the use of maps in school textbooks, which highlighted the empire’s historical territorial gains in Europe and the Middle East in order to promote a sense of national pride and a sense of unity among the Turkish people.

Yiannis Hamilakis’s study on recently revised Greek history textbooks found little change between the new textbooks and the textbooks used previously by the Greek schools. If anything, Hamilakis found the revised textbooks to be more steeped in the notion that the identity and history of Greece dated to ancient times. Ironically, a strikingly obvious shift noticed by Hamilakis is that in the revised textbooks dedicated
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15 Benjamin C. Fortna, *Imperial Classroom: Islam, the State, and Education in the Late Ottoman Empire* (Oxford University Press, 2000).

16 Ibid.

more attention to ancient Macedonia than the previous history textbooks. On this topic, Hamilakis says,

For example, the new edition for the first time makes reference to the foundation of Thessaloniki, and where [in] the old edition we read that ‘Macedonians were Dorians in the area of Pindos and later moved to Macedonia,’ in the new we read simply that ‘Macedonian were Dorians,’ emphasizing thus the assumed Hellenic origin of the ethnic group, without reference to any movements.\textsuperscript{18}

It is likely that this shift in defining ancient Macedonia occurred due to a political dispute between the state of Greece and the Republic of Macedonia on the issue of Macedonian language and identity. The revised text clearly leaves little room for interpretation regarding who the Macedonians are: strong assertions suggesting that the “Macedonians were Dorians” genealogically link the ancient Macedonians to the rest of the ancient Greek world.

Similarly, Despina Karakatsani found that in recent Greek history textbooks a Slavo-Macedonian identity is almost absent. In most cases, the textbooks imply that Slavo-Macedonians are merely part of a larger Bulgarian nation. The term “Macedonia” is thus presented as a Greek nation and a part of Greek history.\textsuperscript{19}

\textbf{Textbooks and Traditional Enemies: How Neighboring Nations Portray One Another}

How traditional enemies and neighboring nations portray one another in school textbooks is a topic of interest for many nations. In the 1990’s for example, the Chinese government became irritated when Japan revised its history textbooks and omitted most

\textsuperscript{18}\textit{Ibid.}, 50.

discussion of Japanese aggression towards the Chinese during World War II. The Japanese invasion of Manchuria appears in the Japanese textbooks, but the textbooks make no mention of the massacre of Chinese civilians in Nanking. The textbooks say instead that “…. evidence has raised doubts about the actual number of victims claimed in the incident.”

In a similar contemporary example, in 2008 the nation of Turkey became concerned when revisions to French history textbooks included a lengthy discussion of the Armenian genocide at the hands of the Ottoman Turks. Most European states have included in their textbooks a discussion on the Armenian genocide, but the Turkish government continues to question the extent of the “massacre.”

The treatment of other nations in school textbooks is also of interest to Sofia Vouri. In her study of Bulgarian history textbooks, Vouri found that Greece is depicted as an historical aggressor towards the Bulgarian people. The textbooks indicate that this phenomenon has been in play for centuries, beginning when Byzantine Emperors encroached on Bulgarian lands, and continuing into the early 20th century, when Greece annexed most of Bulgarian Thrace after World War I.
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21 Sofia Vouri, “Greece and the Greek in Recent Bulgarian History Textbooks,” in Wolfgang Hopgen, ed., Oil and Fire? Textbooks, Ethnic Stereotypes and Violence in South-Eastern Europe (Hanover, 1996), 67-77.

22 In 1917, Greece entered the First World War, allying itself with Britain, France, and the United States. Greece’s contributions and participation in the war was relatively limited, as the war ended in 1918. However, diplomatic maneuvering and the political ingenuity of Greece’s Prime Minister Eleutherios Venizelos at the peace settlement in Paris (1919) convinced the western allies to accord Greece the western part of Thrace, which had previously belonged to Bulgaria. Western Thrace gave Greece more territory than the western powers had initially intended for Greece, which was able to significantly increase its territorial possessions in the Balkans and shift the balance of power in its favor.
A comparison of Greek and Turkish elementary school textbooks by Hercules Millas found that both Greek and Turkish textbooks tend to ignore any positive aspects of the other’s history. According to Millas, Greek textbooks often portray the Ottoman Empire as “barbaric” and primitive in its cultural and historical nature, whereas Turkish textbooks see the Ionians (early Greek inhabitants of Asia Minor and the Turkish word for Greek, Younan) as having no connection to the ancient Greeks.\(^{23}\) Moreover, with regard to contemporary history, Turkish textbooks describe the Ottoman Empire as treating its Balkan subjects well and hold that “nobody suffered.”\(^{24}\) On the other hand, Greek textbooks treat the 1919 Greek invasion of Izmir as the fault of the Turks because of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk’s refusal to comply with the Treaty of Sevres (which granted legal autonomy to the Greek people of Izmir).\(^{25}\) Moreover, the Greek textbooks as incredibly oppressive describe Turkish occupation of Greece from the fall of Constantinople to the Greek Revolution.

Similarly, Vasilia Lilian Antoniou and Yasemin Nuhoglu Soysal’s study on Greek and Turkish textbooks discusses the conceptualization of the nation and its “other” in terms of how history textbooks in Greece and Turkey view their respective national pasts.\(^{26}\) The authors’ state,


\(^{24}\)Ibid., 29.

\(^{25}\)Ibid.

While the Turkish textbooks stress the notion of space in conceptualizing and defining their nation, the Greek textbooks highlight the notion of time. This contrast in emphasis reflects the nations’ presumed historical evolution. Greek textbooks present the ancient Greek world as the early history of the nation, and hence place great importance on time in subsequent definitions of the nation. This emphasis indirectly panders to nationalistic ideas of Greek superiority vis-à-vis other national time frames that do not boast such a distinguished and distant ancestry.\textsuperscript{27}

As this study has uncovered, (and as will be discussed in length later in this chapter and in Chapter Six) this was also the case for Greek textbooks for much of the 19\textsuperscript{th} and 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries, while Turkish textbooks have gone through major revisions during the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. The authors also found that Greek textbooks claim that Greece is the cradle of western civilization and democracy, and that no distinction is made between ancient and Modern Greece.\textsuperscript{28} Therefore while valorizing Greek culture and civilization, the Greek textbook “…also serves the purpose of displaying the importance of Greek culture for the European world.”\textsuperscript{29} In other words, the Greek textbook helps develop in the student’s consciousness a sense of pride for his/her national past and national identity.

In 2007 the Department of Education and Religion in Greece introduced a new textbook for students in the middle school. The textbook covered Greek history from 1453 to the present. The textbook revisions were part of an agreement that the foreign ministers of Greece and Turkey had signed. One of the goals of the project was to downplay the inevitability of national/ethnic/religious conflict in the Balkans in order to reduce both the sense of Greek victimization and the demonization of the Ottoman

\textsuperscript{27}Ibid., 110.
\textsuperscript{28}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{29}Ibid.
Empire; it was believed that this would weaken the myth that Greek national independence was a gift from the Greek Orthodox Church.\textsuperscript{30} Many in Greece opposed the revisions because they felt that the changes made did not emphasize enough the role that the Greek Church played in preserving a Greek identity during Ottoman rule and the existence of secret schools and their role in preserving the Greek language and a Greek identity. The Church and leaders of the far right political party (LAOS) also vociferously denounced the textbooks. Despite efforts by the Minister of Education to maintain the changes, most of these changes were eventually overturned leaving little change in the new textbooks.

Interestingly, Christina Antonopoulou’s analysis of Greek secondary textbooks from 1955 to 1974 found that several factors had contributed towards the maintenance of a classical/traditional form of education since the inception of a Greek educational system in 1834. The first was the centralization of Greek education, wherein pedagogical uniformity occurred in all the Greek schools. According to Antonopoulou,\textsuperscript{31}

\begin{quote}
Responsible for this educational anachronism were those Greeks who controlled educational ideas and who believed that modern Greece was the continuation of ancient Greece and any deviation in teaching the past was only not only unwise and impractical but heretical.\textsuperscript{31}
\end{quote}

Another factor was insufficient funds for the Greek educational system, which inhibited changes in the textbooks from occurring more frequently.\textsuperscript{32} Most important, to


\textsuperscript{31}Christina Antonopoulou, “Political Ideology and Educational Change in Greece: A Content Analysis of Secondary Textbooks” (PhD diss., New York University, 1986), 6

\textsuperscript{32}Ibid.
Antonopoulou, the emphasis in the Greek textbooks on ancient Greek history helped maintain a homogeneous national identity in Greece.  

In line with Antonopoulou’s study, Efi Avdela’s work on the teaching of history in Greece shows how the Greek educational system today attaches particular significance to its national history.  

Avdela states, 

The continuity of Hellenism from antiquity to the present constitutes an essential component of Greek national identity and is continuously reproduced in school through the teaching of history and other courses and activities. 

In a centralized Greek school system, the teaching of history is organized around an official curriculum and an official textbook. According to Avdela’s study, the Greek nation is understood as a natural, unified, eternal, and unchanging entity; there are few distinctions between ancient and Modern Greece. Much of Greek public education has operated in this fashion since the inception of the first Greek schools in the 1830’s. However, in order for the Greek student to begin to learn about his/her long and ancient historical past and begin to think in terms of his/her personal connection to this ancient past, a national history first needed to be devised.

Examined from culturally comparative perspectives, textbooks provide windows to understanding how a particular society sees itself, how it sees others, and how it wants to be seen by others. Through textbooks, students become politically and culturally
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socialized and begin to form a sense of a national identity and national pride. The student is inundated with information this knowledge helps shape the way he/she sees himself/herself and the world around them. As A. Graham Down asserts,

Textbooks, for better or worse, dominate what students learn. They set the curriculum, and often the facts learned, in most subjects. For many students, textbooks are their first and sometimes only early exposure to books and to reading. The public regards textbooks as authoritative, accurate, and necessary. And teachers rely on them to organize lessons and structure subject matter.  

The teaching of a national history is obviously important in the shaping of a national identity. As the above passage suggests students first learn about their history in school and through their school textbooks. However, notions of historical importance are cultural constructs. Schools happen to be just one vehicle in which a “passing–on” of such constructs occurs, and where contending forces within a particular culture try to influence what history will be publicly commemorated and taught.

Several scholars contend that history textbooks have traditionally served as a tool for transmitting historical information that creates, in an individual’s conscious and collective memory, a particular national identity—especially when some form of overarching national history is explicitly introduced. A national history can enable an individual to connect to the events, movements, and personalities of the past, while at the same time collectively identifying himself/herself with the members of his/her national
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community. Hanna Schnissler and Yasemin Nuhoglu Soysal state,

As far as textbooks continue to be national narratives, they provide a key through which national and citizenship identities are projected and constructed vis-à-vis a wider world.

Therefore, it should come as no surprise that a national history, transmitted through the school, helps shape one’s national identity.

**Distorting the Past: Common Historical Themes in the Greek Textbook**

Historians have a professional obligation to use facts when examining the past. How historians present and use those facts still raises questions as to their ontological accuracy. What led to the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union? What were the causes of World War I? What were the results of the Napoleonic Wars? What were the major events that lead up to the French Revolution? These are among the many topics still debated by historians today.
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43 Many scholars have discussed the nature of historical knowledge in national textbooks. These include Efi Avdela’s study on the teaching of history in contemporary Greek schools; Keith C. Barton’s work on Northern Ireland; Benjamin Fortna’s work on education in the late Ottoman Empire; E. Podeh’s examination of Israeli history textbooks; Yasemin N. Soyosal, Teresa Bertilotti, and Sabine Mannitz’s study on French and German history and civics textbooks; Jacques E.C. Hyman’s work on French secondary history textbooks; Julian Dierkes’ investigation of German history education; J. Letourneau’s and A.B. Nicholas’ respective studies on Canadian history in schools; and Marina Hadjiyanni’s, Mary Koutselini-Ioanidou’s and Kyris, Kostas’ respective works on Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot secondary history education. The underlying argument in these studies is that national textbooks help shape a nation’s identity and help unite a nation through the development of a common history. History textbooks can also be used as a vehicle of reconciliation as is the case in Frederico Giulio Sicurella’s study on the teaching of history in several Balkan nation. Textbooks can also be a source of division and conflict, as is the case in Wolfgan Hopken’s edited book, *Oil and Fire? Textbooks, Ethnic Stereotypes and Violence in Southeastern Europe; The Balkan College Foundation’s* 1998 edited book, *The Image of the Other: Analysis of High-School Textbooks in the History of Balkan Countries;* and Dijana Plut’s edited book *Warfare, Patriotism, Patriarchy: The Analysis of Elementary School Textbooks.*
In the Balkans, Duravska Stojanovic finds that most history textbooks manipulate and distort historical facts. Stojanovic states,

Namely almost all peoples of Southeastern Europe see their main historical role as those of the victim and, what is particularly important, as a victim of most neighboring peoples. Historical events in textbooks are interpreted in a way that gives an impression that most neighboring peoples have territorial aspirations to the territories that are considered historically “ours”…

In Greece, revisions to history textbooks seldom occur; Efi Avdela found that on average Greek history textbooks are revised every thirty years. This has been the case since the first Greek history textbooks were published in the 1830’s. When history textbooks are revised in Greece, the changes are few and minor. These changes generally consist of more attention on a particular historical period or topic, such as ancient Greece, and less to other periods or topics, such as the Byzantine Empire. In essence, no major historical revisionist movement has occurred in Greece since the mid-1800’s, when Constantine Paparrigopoulos completed his comprehensive history. Moreover, contents and points of view expressed in Greek textbooks have gone almost entirely unchanged for almost one hundred and fifty years. One could compare a Greek history textbook from 1900, to one from the 1990’s and find few changes despite the books’ having been published almost 100 years apart.


45 Efi Avdela, “The Teaching of History in Greece.”
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One major consistency among such texts is the portrayal of Greece’s experience under Ottoman rule. This period continues to be described in most Greek history textbooks as *Greece Under Slavery* (Σκλαβομενη Ελλαδα). Most Greeks would agree that this historical depiction accurately sums up Modern Greece under the Ottoman Empire. However, we know that a Christian society flourished under the Ottoman Empire and that many Greek-speaking Christians held high positions within the Ottoman court. David Brewer’s recent study has determined that most of the peoples that were occupied by the Ottoman Empire during much of its presence in the Balkans were not entirely under the domination of slavery (*Hipodoulia* or *Douliia*).\(^{48}\) Yes, acts of slavery and human cruelty did occur during Ottoman rule, but slavery for the most part was prohibited in Ottoman-controlled lands. Children were also recruited by the Sultan to serve as Janissaries in the Ottoman army, but this was not slavery, as it is presented to be in many Greek history textbooks. Some Christian, Muslim, and Jewish families even encouraged their children to become Janissaries as it would provide the family with social status and economic security.\(^{49}\)

More importantly, Greek school textbooks vividly portray acts of cruelty against the Greek people as factors in the Greek Revolution. One such description is the story of Athanasios Diakos, whose heroic story is likely to be fictional, or at the least heavily embellished. Diakos the Greek military commander of a group of bandits (*Klephts* or *Armatoli*) was captured after a battle near Thermopylae against the Albanian Ottoman

\(^{48}\)Davis Brewer, *Greece, The Hidden Centuries: Turkish Rule from the Fall of Constantinople to Greek Independence* (I.B. Tauris, 2010).

\(^{49}\)Ibid.
commander, Omer Vryonis. Vryonis gives Diakos an uncanny ultimatum; either covert to Islam and join the Turks or be tortured and killed. Diakos gracefully refuses to convert to Islam, replying instead to Vryonis “I was born a Greek, and I shall die a Greek.” The following day Diakos is impaled and roasted alive. Diakos’s martyrdom becomes a cause of Revolution and is often linked to the Spartans’ last stand at Thermopylae. His statement to Vryonis becomes a symbol of Greek pride and the Greek people’s unwillingness to convert to Islam even when confronted with torture and death.

Even though the story of Diakos clearly idealizes the heroic and spirited nature of the Greek Revolutionaries, as well as the Greek Christian’s reluctance to abandon his or her Greek nationality and religion, the question that arises, is why a people who take great pride in their ancient civilization and the accomplishments of their ancestors would want to be portrayed as slaves and victims in their history textbooks? Two things help explain this phenomenon. First, the idea of *Greece Under Slavery* (Σκλαβομενη Ελλαδα) has worked for some time in uniting the Greek nation around a common enemy, the Ottoman Empire, which is projected today as the modern state of Turkey. Bulgarian, Serbian, and Romanian history textbooks have also portrayed their societies as slaves or victims to the Turks.50 A second reason has to do with ancient Greece’s cultural and intellectual decline. Greece’s occupation by the Ottoman Empire gives a direct explanation for the decline of classical Greek civilization. In this case, the Ottoman Empire takes most of the blame for dissolving classical thinking and learning in Greece. Ottoman domination is also blamed for what Greece “lost out,” such as its
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rightful participation in and contribution to the European Renaissance and Enlightenment. Be this as it may, the fact is that the Byzantine Empire and the Christianization of Greece were more at fault for this decline than the Ottoman Empire; we know that the Church and the Byzantine Empire had already done away with most of the cultural and intellectual practices of the classical world prior to the arrival of the Ottomans. Byzantine Emperors like Theodosius persecuted Greek pagans by tearing down their temples and cultural institution. He also put a stop to pagan cultural practices (most notably the Olympic Games) and forced Greek pagans to convert to Christianity. However, in most history textbooks blame in the diverted from the Church and to the Ottoman Empire.

Generally speaking, Greek history textbooks published between 1834 and 1913 contain several examples of historical inaccuracy. For instance, the event that usually marks the beginning of the Greek Revolution is the raising of the Greek flag by Father Germanos at Agia Lavra. The texts often include a detailed illustration of Father Germanos on top a mountain, courageously raising the flag, while Greek rebels declare their loyalty to him and the state of Greece. Yet according to most contemporary historians this event never occurred. Many textbooks entirely omit the early attempt by

---
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Alexander Ypsilantis to spark a Greek Revolution in Romania. Those that do mention the event portray it as Greece’s first attempt to revolt. No mention is made that it was mostly Greeks who were responsible for putting down Ypsilanti’s insurrection in Romania; they feared disrupting the status quo in Europe as well as their own economic and social status, and for the most part remained loyal to the Sultan. In the case of ancient Greek history, the Greco-Persian Wars are portrayed as a unified effort by the Greek city-states to halt the conquests of Greece by Darius’s Persian army. However, most historians agree that several Greek city-states had joined Darius’s military expedition to conquer Greece and that as a result the Persian army included more Greeks than the Greek allied forces. In the following section of this chapter, the time period of 1834-1880 is discussed. It is during this time period when a form of Greek national history was borrowed from the west, translated into Modern Greek, and then taught in the Greek schools. Most of this type of history focused on ancient Greek history and civilization. Later in the chapter four history textbooks from this period are examined.

The Greek History Textbook: 1834-1880

From 1834 to 1880 most Greek textbooks were written in the purified Greek *Katharevousa*, although revisions to the use of vernacular Greek would begin as early as 1850. Mass publication of textbooks also assisted in the spread of a standardized Greek history and identity. Although early Greek textbooks were not printed in Greece (few Greek publishers owned the infrastructure or had the technology to print the books),
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fairly inexpensive and quick printing was available in France, Italy, England, and what is now Austria. This meant that rather than having a few textbooks for an entire class to share (as had previously been the case during Ottoman times), each Greek student would now be provided with his/her own personal textbook.\textsuperscript{56} Thus, if one charts the “travels of the Greek textbook” one would find that Greek history was written in France, England, and Austria, then translated into Modern Greek in Greece, sent back to France, Italy, England, and Austria for printing, and finally returned to Greece.\textsuperscript{57} The early textbooks were mostly on ancient Greek history, as Modern Greek history was of little concern to European historians at the time. Nevertheless, Western Europe provided the Greek school with an already constructed national history, based almost exclusively on ancient Greek history.

Christina Koulouri’s study on Greek textbooks found that out of the 191 textbooks published for Greek schools between the years 1834 and 1882, focused was general history or world history (63 books), ancient Greece (59), Greece from the ancient past to present (25), ancient Greek archaeology (essentially another form of history (10),

\textsuperscript{56}Phillip G. Altbach found that publishers have seldom owned their own printing presses as it is more effective to hire private firms to print their books. In one particular case Albach found that school books in former British Africa and Asia were originally produced in English, then translated into native languages, then printed in England, and finally sent back to their respective countries. Although Altbach does not discuss specifically Greece, he does confirm that most publishing did occur in just a few European countries. Phillip G. Albach, “Textbooks: The International Dimension,” in Michael W. Apple and Linda K. Christian-Smith, eds., \textit{The Politics of the Textbook} (Routledge, 1991).

\textsuperscript{57}An interesting similarity that comes to mind with this journey of Greek history is the journey that Greek thought takes in Europe during the Middle Ages. Many ancient Greek works had been lost to Europe and were only preserved thanks to Arab thinkers who translated the texts from Greek into Arabic. Only later were the texts re-introduced to European civilization by the Arab world.
Roman history (7), historical chronology (7),58 Greek history from ancient times to 1453 “The fall of the Byzantine Empire” (2), and Byzantine history (7).59 Koulouri argues that the 63 textbooks on general history were not studied in their entirety, but instead that schools used only those parts of the texts that discussed ancient Greek history.60 Clearly, ancient Greek history dominated the Greek history curriculum for most of the period from 1834 to 1880 in the elementary and Hellenic schools (middle schools).

The teaching of history consisted primarily of memorizing people, places, and dates; in many instances students were expected to memorize entire passages from their history books and recite those passages to the class.61 The schools believed that this was the best approach to learn history, and most teachers believed that the subject of history could be understood through rote memorization of such facts. Elementary school teachers were also instructed to focus on specific heroic ancient Greek personalities and the “brilliant” acts these figures accomplished. A teacher’s manual from 1880 states,

…we [teachers] should remove from Greek history the ideas that limit the children’s capacity to learn. We also should remove the grim parts of history a leave in only those things that interest the child as acts of brilliance by major Greek figures.62

58The chronologies were the least used and were essentially additions to the regular history textbooks. It is likely that the chronologies were used for advanced study in history in the upper grades, and particularly in the lyceum, by those students interested in entering university or becoming historians.


60Ibid.


These major Greek historical figures and their acts were central to the teaching of history in the elementary classroom.

Table 4

Distribution of Textbooks By Historical Period: 1834-1882

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Periods</th>
<th>Number of Titles Published for Use in Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General History</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient History</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek History</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Archaeology</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman History</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Chronologies</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek History to 1453</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantine History</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled from Christina Koulouri, *Dimensions ideologiques de l’historicite en grece (1834-1914)* (Peter Lang, 1991). Most of the above mentioned texts were used in the elementary and Hellenic schools.

As illustrated in Table 4, the fewest titles were those specifically on the Byzantine Empire. The limited number of titles on this topic may be a result of the low interest in Byzantine (Eastern Roman) history experienced by both Greece and Western Europe for much of the 19th century. Most European historians at the time were more interested in what was occurring in the West during the Middle Ages, as developments there had a far greater impact on Modern European society and culture.

To the extent that it was considered, the Byzantine Empire was typically presented in Greek textbooks as Christian and Greek. In just a few textbooks it was depicted as not so much Greek, but Roman. An example of this is Spiros Antoniadis’s
“Introduction” to his 1850 translation of Thomas Kieghtly’s *History of Ancient Greece*, in which he states, “The Greece under the despotism of the empires of Rome, of Byzantium and of Turkey, did not exist as a nation.”63 Some of the early Greek textbooks thus considered the Byzantine era as a period of Greek subjugation to the Romans. Antoniadis’s translation even suggests that the Greeks had been subjugated for the greater part of their history and only found their freedom again in 1821, through Greek Independence.64 On the other hand, Alexandridis’s translation of Goldsmith’s *History of Greece* presents the Byzantine Empire a bit differently. Alexandridis writes, “The accession of Constantine the Great to the throne, promised a new glorious era for the Greeks.”65 Although most of Alexandridis’s history is an honest translation of Goldsmith’s original, the Byzantines are presented as Greeks. Goldsmith’s history also helped connect the Greek student to his/her Christian identity.

In the Greek secondary textbooks on “general history or world history” very little attention was paid to the Byzantine Empire. The general histories were essentially simplified world histories that began with ancient Greece and continued through to the present time. For example in Constantine Paparrigopoulos’s translation of David Eugène Lèvi-Alvarèz’s *Nouveaux éléments d’histoire générale* (1834), only a few paragraphs are dedicated to Byzantine history, and the majority of the book is focused on ancient Greek
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Lèvi-Alvarèz’s original history was far more historically comprehensive than the Paparrigopoulos translation. In other words, Lèvi-Alvarèz’s history seems more like a survey of world history than a history on Greece. It seems that Paparrigopoulos intentionally left out parts that were not concerned with Greece to make his translation appear more Greco-centric and appeal to the Greek reader and Greek student. Most of portions omitted by Paparrigopoulos were on European and world history. Therefore, Paparrigopoulos’s translation catered to a Greek audience where the Lèvi-Alvarèz’s original was intended for a western European audience. However, like Lèvi-Alvarèz, Paparrigopoulos dedicates just a few paragraphs on the Byzantine Empire. Notably, Paparrigopoulos’s later *History of the Greek Nation* would not only include more coverage on the Byzantine Empire, it would make the Byzantine Empire exclusively Greek, silencing the debate among Greek textbook writers. Nonetheless, Paparrigopoulos emphasized ancient and Modern Greek history over the Byzantine period.

Internal debates over particular eras aside, the importance of the past and its cultural and national role in the formation and maintenance of a Modern Greek identity could only be upheld if some sort of continuity from past to present was expressed and maintained. Early Greek school textbooks centered primarily on ancient Greek history and there was no real historical synthesis between ancient Greek history and Modern
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Greek history. Consequently, a turning point in Modern Greek historiography and textbook production was the articulation of an almost seamless link between the ancient Greek past and the Modern Greek present that inevitably shaped the Greek identity promoted by schools.

A Borrowed Past: Ancient Greek History in Four Translated Textbooks

The following sections of this chapter compare and contrast four early textbooks, each of which was translated from English or French into Greek: William Mitford’s *Ancient Greek History for Use in Schools*, published in 1836; Oliver Goldsmith’s *History of Greece* (1849); J.R. Lamè-Fluery’s *Greek History for Children* (1860); and Thomas Keightly’s *History of Ancient Greece for Use in Schools* (1850). All the textbooks are on ancient Greece. The texts were intended for students in Europe, but were later translated and used in the Greek schools.

William Mitford’s *Ancient Greek History for Use in Schools* (1836)

As noted in a previous chapter, the first history texts used in the Greek school system were translations of books originally published in other parts of Europe. One of the earliest of these was William Mitford’s *The History of Greece*. Mitford’s original history of Greece was a multi-volume piece that took nearly three decades to complete. Its Greek version was greatly abridged, comprising less than five percent of the original work, and was titled *Istoria tis Archaia Ellados eis Chrisin ton Scholion* (*Ancient Greek History for Use in Schools*). The revised text includes no credit to the translator/editor
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or evidence regarding which grades it was indented to serve. Indeed, it is not certain how many schools or students used it. Despite these unknowns, this text is important because it is among the earliest that were specifically published for use in schools.

Mitford was born in England in 1744, the scion of a wealthy family. He attended Oxford and was urged to write a history of Greece by his friend Edward Gibbon, author of *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. \(^{71}\) Brennan A. Rapple has characterized Mitford’s history of Greece as “…a political rather than an intellectual or social history, his main interest being the political interplay of society’s forces and factions.” \(^{72}\) This perspective is evident in many parts of the translation used in the Greek schools, which focuses on the key political figures, political power plays, and governmental organization of the ancient Greek city-states.

As is common to many early histories of Greece, Mitford begins with a discussion of geography, though no illustrations are provided. He divides Greece into regions, and briefly explores each, beginning with the northernmost regions. The discussion proceeds to the southern parts of the Greek peninsula, and finally to the geography of the Aegean and Ionian islands. Following this, the textbook provides a short chronological overview of ancient Greek history. The overview is fairly pedestrian—it begins with the Trojan War and ends with the rise of the Kingdom of Macedonia. What is interesting, however, is that Mitford makes reference to the Pelasgians, an ancient civilization of the Balkan

\(^{71}\) Edwar Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (Strahan & Cadell, 1789).

region. Mitford presents the Pelasgians as non-Greeks who were later supplanted by Greek speaking tribes, while later Greek textbooks present the Pelasgians as Greek.

Although a strong effort was made to incorporate Mitford’s history into the Greek schools, it was quickly dropped for reasons unknown, but possibly because of its anti-democratic tone. Mitford was described by one prominent writer of his generation as “…a vehement admirer of tyranny and oligarchy…” By the 19th century Mitford’s history had lost much of its popularity in schools.

**Oliver Goldsmith’s *History of Greece* (1849)**

Oliver Goldsmith’s history of Greece was translated by A.P. Rakavi and published in 1849. Rakavi’s translation appeared in Greek schools. It was intended for Greek schools, but does not specify the grade level. It was likely used for several grade levels in the elementary school; the language used and the historical details that are provided indicate that it was likely written for students in the Greek gymnasium. It is 190 pages in length, and does not include any illustrations. Rakavi’s translation is an almost literal translation to Goldsmith’s original. Some have criticized Goldsmith’s historical accuracy. An early critic says,

> He [Goldsmith] committed some strange blunders, for he knew nothing with accuracy. Thus, in his *History of England*, he tells us that Naseby is in Yorkshire; nor did he correct this mistake when the book was reprinted.
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He was very nearly hoaxed into putting into the *History of Greece* an account of a battle between Alexander the Great and Montezuma.\textsuperscript{75}

One marvels at such incredible, if in the end corrected, error.

Almost equally unusual is how Goldsmith opens his *History of Greece*. He writes,

> The history of ancient Greece, like that of modern Germany, is not so much the history of any particular kingdom, as of a number of petty independent states, sometimes at war, and sometimes in alliance with one another. Of these different states, therefore, we shall now give an account, with as much brevity as in consistent with perspicuity; and we shall begin our narrative at that period, where real and authentic history commences: for as to the more early, that is, the fabulous times of Grecian republics, these belong to mythology rather than history.\textsuperscript{76}

Unlike Mitford’s history, Goldsmith is not interested in providing his readers with a discussion of Greek mythology; he is only interested in “real and authentic history.”

On the other hand, Rakavi’s translation does not begin in the same fashion. Like the translator for Mitford’s work, Rakavi begins with a discussion of Greek geography and than moves into a discussion of the various ancient Greek tribes.\textsuperscript{77} Rakavi also dedicates sections of his first chapter to ancient Greek religion and ancient Greek mythology.\textsuperscript{78}

Both Goldsmith’s and Rakavi’s histories dedicate a substantial amount of coverage to ancient Macedonia. In the case of Rakavi’s history, 72 out of the total 185 pages are on ancient Macedonian history. This part of history begins in Rakavi’s textbooks with a section titled, “From the Birth to the Death of Philip of Macedon” and

\textsuperscript{75} *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11\textsuperscript{th} edition, Vol. XII (Cambridge University Press, 1910), 216.

\textsuperscript{76} Oliver Goldsmith, *The History of Greece*, Abridged (Chiswick, 1826).

\textsuperscript{77} Rakavi, *Epitomi tis Ellinikis Istorias kata ton Goldsmith*, 1-5.

\textsuperscript{78} Ibid., 5-11.
ends with a section on the “Fall of Macedonia and Greece under the Romans.”79 No discussion is provided thereafter on the history of Greece during Roman rule. However, the ubiquitous coverage on ancient Macedonia makes it seem to be an integral part of Greek history since so many pages are dedicated on this topic.

J.R. Lamè-Fleury’s *Greek History for Children* (1860)

Similar to Midford’s and Goldsmith’s histories of Ancient Greece, J.R. Lamè-Fleury’s *Histoire Grecque Racontée aux Enfants* (Greek History for Children) begins with a discussion of Greek geography.80 In addition, as with Midford’s and Goldsmith’s histories, it is not certain how many schools or students used this textbook. The text begins with a short preface discussing Greek geography, which is followed by a chapter on the civilization of the Pelasgians. The first line of the chapter reads,

Την Ελλάδα κατα τους αρχαιοτατους χρονους κατοικήσαν οι Πελασγοι, λαοι αγριοι και βαρβαροι κατοικον εις τα σπηλαια και τα δαση και [ετρογαν] αγρια χορτα...

In ancient times the Pelasgians inhabited Greece, it was a wild and barbaric nation and they lived in caves and forest and ate wild grasses.81 In other words, he presents the Pelasgians as non-Greeks. However, what is important in the above description is that Lamè-Fleury says, “…the Pelasgians inhabited Greece” instead of, “In ancient times, the region that is now Greece…” This suggests to the reader that a nation and a modern state of Greece have always existed. Throughout the chapter the Pelasgians are described as foreign to the region,” barbaric,” “wild,” and

79Ibid., 114-185.


81Ibid., 2.
“uncivilized.” It also suggests that the territory of Greece would not become civilized until the arrival of a Greek civilization.

Most of Lamè-Fleury’s history of Greece focuses on ancient Athens and the development of democracy. His entire history is nearly 200 pages in length and includes eight illustrations of ancient Greek busts. The illustrations include Theseus, the mythical founder of Athens; Miltiadis and Themistocles, Athenian generals; Pericles and Alcibiades, Athenian statesman; Plato and Demosthenes, Athenian philosophers; and Lykourgos, a Spartan Statesman.

Lamè-Fleury’s text ends with the rise of Philip II of Macedon. Athens and Macedonia are described as eternal enemies and at constant military and political odds with one another. On the assassination of Philip II Lamè-Fleury says,

Τοῦτο [ο θάνατος του Φιλιππο] ομως
ητο πολλα κακκον πραγµα, διοτι,
καθως ελεγεν ο Φωκιων, δεν πρεπει να χαιρωµεν δια τον φονον ενος
ανθρωπου, οσον ηναι εχθρο εµων.

This [the death of Philip] was a horrible event, because as Phokios had said, we should not celebrate the murder of a man, even if that man happens to be our enemy. 82

Lamè-Fleury is stressing this conflict between Athens and Sparta but Philip is not identified as someone who is not Greek, but only as a belligerent to Athens.

82 Ibid., 193.
Thomas Keightly’s *History of Ancient Greece for Use in Schools* (1850)

Like the histories written by Mitford, Goldsmith, and Lamè-Fleury, Thomas Keightly’s *History of Ancient Greece for Use in Schools* begins with a discussion of the geography of Greece. Keightly’s translated history is nearly 240 pages in length and includes no illustrations.

The next section of Keightly’s translated history is titled “Heroic Years.” In this section he discusses the various Greek tribes including the Achaens, Aeolians, Ionians, and Dorians. He also discusses the Trojan War and mythical stories from ancient Greece such as those of Jason and the Argonauts, Theseus, King Oedipus, and King Minos and the Minotaur. His next chapter is specifically on the Greek Olympian Gods.

Keightly eventually shifts his discussion from Greek mythology to ancient Greek history. In this section he begins with the rise of ancient Athens and Sparta. He dedicates several pages to ancient Athens, touching on its rise to power, its antagonisms with Sparta, and its democratic system of government. Like Goldsmith’s history, Keightly includes a long discourse of Philip II and Alexander the Great. In his chapter on Philip II, titled “Philip of Macedon,” Keightly’s translated history says,

Οι Ελληνες επολεµουν µερχι τουδε προς αλληλους, η κατακαι κατα του βασιλεως της Περσιας. Ηδη δε ανεφανη νεος εχθρος, ο Φιλιππος βασιλευς της Μακεδονιας.

---

The Greeks for years had been preoccupied warring with the ancient Kingdom of Persia. Later, a new enemy appeared, Philip, King of Macedonia.  

In this case Philip II is treated as a non-Greek and an enemy of Greece. Keightly stresses this in a section on Demosthene’s political opposition to Philip II. In the final section of the text a brief two-page history spanning from Greece under the Romans to the Greek revolution is provided. These pages do not appear in Keightly’s original history and were likely inserted in Keightly’s translated version in order to help better convey that there was a single continuous Greek history from ancient times to the present.

Summary

This chapter delved into the intricate process by which Greek textbooks were manufactured and then studied by the Greek student. Several textbooks from 1834-1880 were analyzed in this chapter. The textbooks analyzed were: William Mitford’s Ancient Greek History for Use in Schools, published in 1836; Oliver Goldsmith’s History of Greece (1849); J.R. Lamè-Fluery’s Greek History for Children (1860); and Thomas Keightly’s History of Ancient Greece for Use in Schools (1850). All the textbooks were on ancient Greece. The texts were intended for students in Europe, but were later translated and used in the Greek schools. Few of these textbooks included histories of modern Greece. This chapter also discussed the impact that Greek history textbooks have had on the formation of a Greek national identity. The following chapter examines several textbooks written by Greek authors. Unlike the 1834-1880 period the textbooks
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that follow between 1880-1913 connect modern Greek history to ancient Greek history, establishing one continuous national history from past to present.
CHAPTER SIX

THE HISTORIES: A TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF
SEVERAL HISTORIES OF GREECE

How to deal with the situation Xerxes had no idea: but just then, a man from Malis, Ephialtes, the son of Eurydemus, came, in hope of a rich reward, to tell the track which led over the hills to Thermopylae…Later Ephialtes, in fear of the Spartans, fled to Thessaly, and in his absence a price was put upon his head. Some time later he returned where he was killed.

--Herodotus

Overview

Previous chapters discussed the ways that political independence, the Orthodox Church, and a sense of Greek history adopted from the French, English, and Austrians, and later customized by the Greeks themselves shaped the organization and curriculum of the Greek school in ways that promoted a national identity after the Greek Revolution. Those chapters demonstrated that curricular choices and teaching methods reflect ways that societies and cultures wish to be viewed by both themselves and others.

Textbooks also help one understand how a national identity may be constructed via a school system. This chapter focuses on a close examination of a cross-section of history textbooks published between 1880 and 1913. An analysis of their nuances in their presentations of the Greek past fosters a deeper understanding of the ways that the teaching of Greek history in schools assisted in the development of a Greek national identity. This analysis emphasizes three issues: 1) how the Greek past is tied to the
Modern Greek identity; 2) which individuals, groups, and events are consistently represented in Greek textbooks; and 3) how historical changes in the social, political, and cultural structures of Greece, including the development of indigenous historians, influenced the contents of the textbooks. Such an analysis provides insights as to how and why the textbooks changed over time.

The Greek History Textbook: 1880-1913

As mentioned previously, a Greek history written by a Greek historian would not be completed until the 1880’s, so until then, most Greek history textbooks were imported from elsewhere. These textbooks were dominant for some time, but in 1884 they were officially rejected by the Greek government.¹ The Greek state wanted the nation’s history to be purely Greek in both its historical content and national authorship. As historians were writing history textbooks in the 1880’s, there was no reason to continue the uses of foreign translated texts, thus translated texts were forbidden. The Greek Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs largely controlled the production and reproduction of school history textbooks for much of the 19th and early 20th centuries. The approval process was quite intricate. First, historians submitted various versions of Greek histories to a text approval committee within the Ministry of Education.² The committee which was typically composed of Greek historians and other Greek academics typically composed this committee provided some general guidelines on what subjects and topics should be covered in the history textbooks; all agreed that Greek history should be

¹National Decree, July 4, 1884, “Peri Didaktion Biblion mi Ipokeimenon eis Diagonision” (In Greek).

periodized in the fashion constructed by Paparrigopoulos (Ancient, Byzantine, and Modern). The books would be reviewed and edited by the committee, and the Ministry would make the final decision of approval or rejection. Those approved were used in schools in Greece and in some schools abroad.

Major revisions were made to Greek history textbooks in 1882 in terms of the coverage of specific historical periods, topics, and content. Before the revisions, most had focused primarily on ancient Greek history; Byzantine history had never occupied more than 20 percent of the content, whereas ancient history had almost always occupied at least half of it (see Table 5). However, Christina Koulouri notes that by 1882 about 31 percent of coverage was devoted to Modern Greek history, where prior to 1882 only 12.5 percent was devoted on Modern Greek history.

---

3 Constantine Paparrigopoulos would be one of the earliest members of this committee. Christos Papadopoulos, “I Didaskalia tis Istorias en to Dimotiko Scholio,” “The Teaching of History in Greek Elementary School” (Athens. In Greek, 1883).

4 In Romanian schools serving the Greek community were allowed to operate freely for much of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. By the late 19th century the Romanian government evaluated all Greek books used in the Greek schools. In 1898 some of these books were prohibited by the Romanian government including A. Ioannidis, Greek History from the Beginning to the Present Day; S. Vlastou, Scenes from the Greek Revolution (1894); and P. Kassimi, Geography of Greek Lands (1892). It is believed that the Romanian government banned these books for fear that the Greek communities would become loyal to Greece and not their home country of Romania. Leonidas Rados, ed., The Greek Schools of Romania (1857-1905) (Athens. Omonia. In Greek and Romanian, 2006).


6 Ibid.
Table 5  
Comparison of Historical Coverage in Selected Greek Textbooks: 1850-1880  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ancient</th>
<th>Medieval/Byzantine</th>
<th>Modern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keightly (1850)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papari (1853)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantazis (1863)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoniadis (1875)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakellarios (1882)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partially compiled from Christina Koulouri, *Dimensions Ideologiques de l’historicite en grece (1834-1914)* (Peter Lang, 1991). All the above mentioned texts were used in the elementary and Hellenic schools during their respective time periods.

After the 1882 revisions, ancient Greek history continued to dominate Greek textbooks, coverage of Modern Greek history increased, and Byzantine history was given the least attention. All the textbooks were also written by Greek historians and produced by Greek publishers (see Appendix F). Typically, a single author wrote a comprehensive history of Greece for use in schools. The textbooks were then divided according to Paparrigopoulos’s original Greek periods, of Ancient, Medieval/Byzantine, and Modern Greek history. Some textbooks were used for several grade levels. For example, in Grade 4 students would use Pantazis’s comprehensive *History of Greece*, but only read the beginning sections on ancient Greece. The later sections on Byzantine and Modern history were left to be studied for later grades.
In 1881, Thomas Keightly’s *History of Greece for Greek Schools*, had its final print run, while J.R. Lamè-Fleury’s *History of Greece* was decommissioned by the Greek Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs in 1883.

Modern Greek history gained some significant ground in the late 19th and early 20th centuries in Greek school textbooks, but not enough to trump the teaching of ancient Greek history.7 Prior to 1882 few textbooks existed on the Greek Revolution. Most of what was taught in school about the Greek Revolution had been supplementary; in some cases pages were inserted at the end of extant history textbooks to cover the topic. After 1881, several history textbooks exclusively on the Greek Revolution were produced. The Greek state found this period of history important because it had the most direct impact on Greek society at the time. It was also a period that the public was very much interested in learning about, because not much had been written about the period.

Two things contributed to the increased interest in Modern Greek history. First, by 1882, The Greek Revolution history was no longer seen as too recent to be considered “historical”; historians had achieved the chronological distance necessary to analyze the period. Second, by the mid-1800’s several memoirs and personal accounts from the Revolution had been published and could serve as primary source documents since all were written by participant of the Revolution; prominent examples included Theodoros Kolokotronis’s *Memoirs* (1846), Thomas Gordon’s *History of the Greek Revolution* (1844), and George Finlay’s *History of the Greek Revolution* (1861).8

7Ibid.

8Thomas Gordon, *History of the Greek Revolution and Wars and Campaigns Arising From the Struggles of the Greek Patriots in Emancipating Their Country From the Turkish Yoke, Volumes I and II*
Medieval/Byzantine history gained the least amount of attention in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, but at times found itself almost the equal of Modern Greek history. A program report from 1886 found that “Byzantine history in the Hellenic schools [upper elementary] occupied an inferior place in contrast to ancient and modern history.” While students at the elementary schools and gymnasium studied Byzantine history, the Hellenic schools offered the instruction on the topic, instead emphasizing biographies of individual figures, such as Constantine the Great, Helen of Constantinople and the Emperor Justinian. However, in many ways Byzantium remained very important because it was seen as the missing link between the ancient Greek world and the Modern Greek world. Thus, while historians like Paparrigopoulos did not go into great detail about Byzantine history, they did present it as part of the historical bridge that linked ancient and Modern Greece. By 1880, the national point of view held that Byzantine civilization was purely Greek.

Constantine Zachariadis’s History of Rome and Byzantium, which was authorized for use in Greek schools in 1884, describes Byzantium as “…conserving the light of the ancient Greek spirit” and “…preserving and transmitting ancient Greek civilization onto the world.” In addition to valorizing the Byzantine Empire, Zachariadis makes a clear

---

9 I. Pantazidis, Gymnasiaki Paidagogiki (Athens. In Greek, 1889), 263.

10 Constantinos Zachariadis, Stichiodis Istoria Romaiki kai Byzantini (Athens. In Greek, 1884), 4-5.
distinction between the Latin speaking West and the Greek speaking East—to the point where the Latin “occident” is described by Zachariadis being at odds with the Greek “orient.” When Zachariadis states, “Although the division of the two Churches may seem like a sad event, it was for the preservation of a Greek identity,”11 he is suggesting that if the schism between the Roman Catholic Church and the Greek Orthodox Church had not occurred, Greek culture would have been overtaken by a Latin-based Catholic culture. Similarly, Zachariadis portrays the conquest of Constantinople by the Crusaders as a betrayal by the West: he describes how the Byzantines opened the gates of Constantinople to a Frankish army that was on its way to re-take Jerusalem for Christendom, only to have the Crusaders take the city and betray the Byzantine Emperor.12 Europe’s hesitancy to help defend Constantinople in 1453 is also described by Zachariadis as a betrayal by the west.13 However, the most interesting part of Zachariadis’s textbook is his chronological synthesis of ancient Greek Hellenism and Greek Christian Hellenism (Hellenochristianismos). According to Zachariadis, after ancient Greece, “…you have the intellectual and moral formation of medieval Hellenism.”14 Byzantium does not magically appear as a unique culture and civilization, but is instead built on the foundations of ancient Greek civilization. It is therefore in Byzantium that Christianity blends with ancient Hellenism and gives rise to the Modern Greek who carries on the legacy of his noble ancestors.

11Ibid., 35.
12Ibid., 63.
13Ibid.
14Ibid., 66.
Although the Ministry of Education approved his text, the state noted some problems with Zachariadis’s treatment of Byzantine history. Zachariadis’s work was seen as being too opinionated and biased. His history of Byzantium was thought to be overly concerned with contrast between the “orient” and the “occident.” His portrayal of the latter in the form of the Franks was poorly received because it brought Greece into conflict with the West and displaced the traditional association of Greece and Greek civilization with Western and European civilization.

The state’s concerns become evident in 1894 when the committee responsible for reviewing textbooks for use in Greek schools opted to drop the textbook in favor of a revised history of Byzantium by Theodoros Venizelos and Andreas Spathakis. Venizelos and Spathakis’s portrayal of Byzantium differs from Zachariadis’s portrayal not so as regards on the Empire itself or the identity of the Empire’s people, but about the ways the Empire was ruled and how Byzantium was related to the overall history of the Greek nation. Zachariadis’s history focused primarily on the spread of Christianity and Byzantine culture in Europe and the East. Venizelos and Spathakis’s history placed Byzantium within a cultural and national framework that emphasized Byzantium’s ties to Modern Greece. For example, the authors compared Byzantium to a “…bridge through which the spirit of our immortal ancestors were transported, through the preservation of language, culture, and history.”

---

15 According to Koulouri, the committee was composed of S. Lambros, N. Politis, P. Karolidis, C. Kasimatis, and C.N. Papamichalopoulos. Koulouri, 365.

Despite increasing attention to the Modern and Byzantine periods, most of the coverage in Greek history textbooks continued to be devoted to ancient Greek history. As the 19th century gave way to early the 20th, ancient history was still thought to be the key to shaping a Greek identity in schools. Beginning in the 1880’s many textbooks on ancient Greece opened with a general introduction on ancient civilizations and the ways that they were connected to ancient Greece. Civilizations that were older than ancient Greece were briefly discussed and some cultural links between ancient Greece and ancient civilizations from the Middle East were made. Some of these assertions could be taken as myth, since there is no archeological evidence that suggests that the Greek peninsula had first been settled by advanced societies from that region. However, as new discoveries were made the textbooks were updated to include innovations, such as the decipherment of hieroglyphics and cuneiform as well as the linguistic categorization of the world’s languages. Such discoveries disconnected Greek civilization and culture from the older eastern civilizations by demonstrating that Greek civilization shared few cultural similarities with ancient Egypt, Phoenicia, Sumer or Assyria. Modern Greek was also shown to be an Indo-European language, as so quite different from the Semitic languages spoken in most of the ancient near eastern world. Thus, the idea that Greek civilization somehow came from somewhere in the ancient Middle East was supplanted by the idea that Greek civilization was purely Greek, emerging in Greece and through Indo-European invasions into Greece.

17“Peri Teleseos Diagovismou pros Syntaxin Didaktikon Biblion tis Mesis kai Katoteras Ekpedeuseos, November 23, 1882 (In Greek), 104-114.

18“Ekthesis ton Kriton ton Didaktikon Biblion. St. Emitropia.” Reports to the Committee on the Examination of Textbooks, October 19, 1894 (In Greek).
In the 1870’s Heinrich Schliemann’s discovery of Mycenae and Troy reinforced this notion by pushing back ancient Greek history some five hundred years; Greek history was shown to be as old as some of the ancient civilizations of the Near East. By the 1890’s the Greek Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs included this information in their history textbooks, as it would serve to strengthen Greek identity. A report in 1894 makes the first references to Mycenae.\(^{19}\)

The turn of the century was a time of strong local and national support for the teaching of ancient Greek history. In Vl. Skordelis’s manual for the teaching of history at elementary schools the author says, “Our students should imitate the private and intellectual life of our ancestors.”\(^{20}\) The educational theorist D. Zagonianis said in 1889 that ancient history was “…a source of inspiration” and from studying it “students would not adhere to partial and false ideas about life.”\(^{21}\)

By 1897 a new program of study was approved by the Greek Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs. A. Eftaxias wrote the new program and his changes were primarily to the curriculum of the gymnasium (high schools).\(^{22}\) The most significant change was that the teaching of ancient history moved from the second to the third year of gymnasium. This change aligned the teaching of ancient history with the teaching of ancient Greek language—an interdisciplinary “double dose” of ancient

\(^{19}\)Ibid.


\(^{21}\)D. Zagonianis, Simbolai eis tin Anamorfozin tis Parimiv Mesis Ekpedeuseos (Athens. In Greek, 1889), 33.

\(^{22}\)A. Eftaxias, To Ypourgio tis Padias. Pos Litourgii tin Simeron. The Greek Ministry of Education. How it Operates Today (Athens. In Greek, 1900). In this document, Eftaxias discusses the changes made to the curriculum in 1897.
Greece. Conceptually, the new program was also more globally orientated, considering
Greek history through the lens of cultural evolution and addressing the social, cultural,
and economic interaction of societies. However, this conceptual framework was mostly
found in the teaching of contemporary Greek history and not ancient Greek history.

The foci of contemporary history were the role of Greece in the world and the
impact that events had on Greece specifically and the world more generally. In the
textbooks from the later 19th century, contemporary Greek history begins with the Greek
Revolution and ends with the fall of Napoleon in 1815. This was not much of a
historical time span to cover in a course. As the years went by information was added to
the textbooks, often comprising short biographies of the Greek Kings and Greece’s
heroes during the Revolution.

Nevertheless, some events immediately after the Greek Revolution were added to
the textbooks in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. These included the assassination of
Ioannis Capodistrias (1831) and the attempt in 1843 to overthrow King Otto. There is
little analysis of their causes, effects, and long-term consequences for Greece, and one

23Ibid.


suspects that the events were far too recent to allow any critical historical review. What do the textbooks include? Both Copodistrias and the King are portrayed positively. Capodistrias is seen as a martyr to the Greek Revolution (even though his assassination occurs after the Revolution). He is portrayed as a Greek even though he did not see himself as entirely Greek and his descendants spoke Italian and bore an Italian last name, *Capo di Istria*. Otto is often characterized as a sincere ruler and true Philhellene. It is also interesting that Otto is described as a philhellene and not a Greek and likely means one of two things—either that Otto, despite holding the title of “King of the Greeks,” is not ethnically a Greek, or that Otto transcends beyond nationality.26

Around the same time, S. Tsiavanopoulos was making subtle suggestions advocating the *Megale Idea* or *Grand Idea*: the notion that the Greek state was incomplete in terms of regaining its past territories and people, and that it should pursue their annexation from other sovereign states.27 According to Tsiavanopoulos, “Our forefathers, after 380 years of slavery and seven consequent years of heroic fighting, finally became free and created the little Kingdom of Greece.”28 This passage hints at the state’s irredentist ambitions for the expansion of Greek lands. Notably the annexation of Arta and Thessaly had occurred in 1881, while Tsiavanopoulos’s book was approved for

---

26 In 1967, a military junta in Greece overthrew the Greek monarchy. The monarchy had been in power in Greece since the inception of the modern state in the late 1830’s. For many Greeks the monarchy represented the country’s bridge to the west, while for others it was a way for the western powers to keep an eye on Greece. George Papadopoulos, the leader of the coup, forced the King of Greece to leave. The king would never return to Greece bearing the title given to his royal line, “King of the Hellenes.” Richard Clogg, *Inside the Colonel’s Greece* (W.W. Norton, 1972).


28 Ibid.
use in the Greek schools in 1891. The timing suggests that the Greek state would continue its efforts to incorporate new territories.

Although the Great Idea would be included in Greek textbooks for much of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, other important historical phenomena were excluded. This is particularly the case in terms of an internal civil war, which occurred during the Greek Revolution. It is described less as a civil war and more as internal infighting, and in some textbooks it is not mentioned at all. The Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs and the committee that reviewed the textbooks probably excluded this event because it portrayed Greece as a divided nation rather than one united around the common cause of the Great Idea.

Most textbooks of this period also omit detailed historical discussions about Greece and the Greek people during Ottoman times, with the exception of passages considering the Hidden or Secret Schools and general comments about the Greek people as slaves under the Ottoman Empire. This is particularly significant since nearly 400 years of Greek history are almost completely ignored. The reasons for this are unclear, but some obvious possibilities are that the authors, the approval committees, and the Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs saw the Ottoman period as such a difficult part of Greek history that it deserved little attention. Another possible explanation is that historians had yet to examine the period extensively. For whatever reasons, the Greek

---

29Penelope Stathi’s analysis “Dealing with the Ottoman Past in Greek Chronicles” finds that several Greeks in high positions in the Ottoman administration recorded some of the events occurring within the Empire. These documents included both private manuscripts and printed periodical and gazettes. Stathi found the chronicles to be biased in favor of the Sultan. It is unclear whether the historians that sat in the committees were aware of these documents, or if they simply disregarded them because they looked at the Ottoman administration favorably. Penelope Stathi, “Dealing with the Ottoman Past in Greek
government used the Ottoman period to its advantage by calling it “A Time of Slavery” and “A Period of Oppression,” thus uniting its people around a common experience and a common enemy.

**Competing for the Past, Recasting Common Enemies**

As new nations such as Bulgaria emerged around Greece, nations that were competing for the same lands that Greece desired, such as Macedonia and Thrace, portrayed them as enemies in the Greek textbooks.

Christina Koulouri finds that prior to 1882 there was no reference to the Bulgarians in most Greek textbook on the Byzantine Empire. After 1882 Byzantine figures as Basil II, who had previously been mentioned in the textbooks as someone traveling to Athens to see the Parthenon (which had been converted to a church), is now referred to as “Basil the Bulgar Slayer” (*Vassilios o Voulgaroktonos*). The school textbooks thus became political tools not only by casting the Bulgarians as a barbaric and primitive people, but also by creating a “longstanding conflict” between Greeks and Bulgarians. These tools served to unite the people of Greece against an enemy seen as infringing on Greek territorial rights. At the same time, ancient Macedonia and its cultural connection to ancient Greece receive more emphasis. Ancient Greek figures like Demosthenes—who had earlier been characterized in the Greek textbooks (mostly from those written before 1880) as a protector of democracy, specifically against Philip of

---

30 Koulouri, *Dimensions Ideologiques de l’Historicite en Grece, (1834-1914).*

31 Ibid.
Macedon and Macedonian ambitions to dominate the Greek peninsula—is by the late 19th century criticized for his lack of political judgment and his vocal opposition for a united Greece. Philip II and Alexander the Great, on the other hand, are portrayed as finally uniting the Greek people into a single Greek nation and expanding Greek cultural influence in the eastern world.

In 1913 P.P. Ekonomou’s *Alexander the Great* is published for use in the Greek schools. The decision to incorporate Ekonomou’s book could have been purely experimental, but events occurring at the time lead one to suspect that a history of Alexander the Great helped affirm the notion that ancient Macedonian civilization was tied to the broader civilization of ancient Greece and that the ancient Macedonians were, in fact, Greeks. It is not certain whether this textbook was used exclusively as a standard text or as a supplement to another textbook, but it does show that the teaching of ancient Macedonian history within the larger scope of ancient Greek history could only benefit Greece in achieving its social, cultural, and political goals. This was the case after the Balkan Wars (1912-1913) when Greece expanded its borders into Macedonia and Epirus and again after the First World War (1914-1918) when Greece annexed western Thrace from Bulgaria.

---


This section considers the similarities and differences in four histories of Greece. However, the texts reviewed in this section were written by Greek historians rather than foreigners: Theodoros N. Apostolopoulou’s *Greek History for Elementary Students*, published in (1883); K. Vlousou, G. Kouzou, and A. Illidou’s *History of Ancient Greece* (1886); Nikolaou I. Vrachnou’s *History of the Ancient Greeks* (1909); and Antoniou N. Chorafa’s *History of Ancient Greece* (1913). The books are intended for a Greek audience and attempt to connect a modern Greek identity to ancient Greece. The textbooks were chosen because they cover a cross-section of textbooks published between 1880-1913, which is the period covered in this chapter. All the textbooks books were taught in the schools in Greece except for Vlousou et al’s textbook. This text was used primarily in the Greek schools in Turkey. All of the following textbooks however are on ancient Greek history.

Theodoros N. Apostolopoulou’s *Greek History for Elementary Students* (1883)

One of the earliest histories of ancient Greece written by a Greek author is Theodoros N. Apostolopoulou’s, *Helliniki Historia: Dia tous Mathites ton Dimotikon Scholeion* (*Greek History for Elementary Students*), published in 1883. The textbook was written after the implementation of the “New Teaching Methods” of 1880. On this topic the author says,

---


It has been some time since the ostracizing of textbooks from the elementary schools …. For this reason, we consider it as our duty to publish our opinion on this topic. In fact, we have many years experience, and a long relationship with the people who serve in elementary education; and we have had the pleasure to teach this new educational method to over four hundred teachers.\\footnote{Apostolopoulou, \textit{Helliniki Istoria: Dia tous Mathites ton Dimotikon Scholeion}, “Prologue,” a.}

Apostolopoulou points out to how history textbooks and the teaching of history in the elementary school had been reconsidered. The “New Teaching Methods” that were incorporated in the school curriculum in 1880 did away with most of the translated textbooks since it was thought more appropriate that Greeks write and teach the nation’s history. Apostolopoulou’s textbook is 80 pages long and adorned with several illustrations. Though this textbook was intended for students in the elementary school, no specific grade is mentioned. However, it is likely that it was used in grade three, since students at this grade level studied ancient Greek history. Apostolopoulou begins his textbook with the Pelasgians. Unlike previous textbooks, he treats the Pelasgians as Greeks.

\begin{quote}
Οι Ελληνες τοτε ελεγοντα Πελασγοι απο ενα βασιλεα της Αρκαδιας ο οποιος ωνομαζετο Πελασγος.
\end{quote}

The Greeks at that time were called Pelasgians, who took their name from the king of Arcadia, Pelasgian.\\footnote{Ibid., 8. This descriptive shift of the Pelasgians from being non-Greek to Greek is interesting since it predates Paul Kretschmer’s 1896 theory that introduced the Pelasgians as Greek speakers. Paul Kretschmer, \textit{Einleitung in die Geschichte der Grieschischen Sprachen (Introduction to the History of the Greek Language)} (In German, 1896).}

In the following section Apostolopoulou discusses the “Argonautic Expedition” and mythological ancient Greek Heroes such as Hercules, Theseus, and King Oedipus; he also discussed the Trojan War. Interestingly, the author treats these sections as history no
mention is made that the heroes were mythical, and they are instead described as

“Kings.”

The Trojan War is also treated as history and is described as an effort by the Greeks to defeat a foreign enemy. In this section Apostolopoulou says,

Μετά την Αργοναυτική εκστρατείαν οι Ελληνες επολεμήσαν εναντίον ενός αλλού βασιλέως, το οποίον ἔλεγετο βασιλείον τῆς Τρωάδος. Ο βασιλεὺς τῆς Τρωάδας ἔλεγετο Πριαμός.

After the Argonautic expedition, the Greeks fought against another kingdom, which was called the kingdom of Troy. The king of Troy was called Priam.

Although Apostolopoulou describes the Trojan War as a contest between the Greeks and the kingdom of Troy, it is worth pointing out that the various Greek-speaking tribes at the time did not identify themselves as Greeks. This notion of a united Greece and the existence of a Greek nation since ancient times would have led students to believe that a unified Greek nation had existed in ancient Greece.

The rest of the textbook focuses on the histories of ancient Sparta and Athens. Again, the theme of the Greco-Persian Wars is a Greece united against an external or foreign enemy. The Persian Wars are depicted as heroic and Greek success in the wars is attributed to Greek unity and ingenuity. For example, the last stand of Leonidas and his 300 Spartan at Thermopylae is treated as an example of Greek bravery, heroism, and Greek unity against a foreign enemy; Themistocles’s defeat of the Persians at the naval battle of Salamis is treated as an example of Greek ingenuity and craftiness. Although Apostolopoulou is clearly pro-Greek, the Spartan defeat at Thermopylae is attributed to the Greek traitor Ephialtes. On this topic Apostolopoulou says,

---

Ephialtes received great gifts from Xerxes. When Judas betrayed Jesus he received 30 pieces of silver, but later he hangs himself. Similarly, Ephialtes did not get to enjoy his gifts for too long. The traitor always finds a painful and tragic end.

Ephialtes is compared to Judas in order to emphasize the importance of loyalty to the nation and to make the point that treachery always leads to one’s demise. In the case of Ephialtes, he never received his gift from Xerxes and he is eventually killed after the Greeks put out a reward for his death.\footnote{Herodotus, \textit{The Histories} (Oxford University Press, 1998).}

Unlike previous textbooks, Apostolopoulou’s work includes several maps, including an illustrated topography of the battle of Salamis. Other maps included in Apostolopoulou’s textbooks are topographies of the Battle of the Marathon and the Battle of Thermopylae.

In his next sections, Apostolopoulou provides brief biographies of Pausanias, a king of Sparta; Themistocles, an Athenian general; Aristides and Pericles, Athenian statesmen, Cimon, an Athenian general and statesman. A section on the Peloponnesian Wars follows in which Apostolopoulou describes as “\textit{εµφυλιων σπαραγµων}.”\footnote{There is no true translation to this phrase. \textit{Εµφυλιος} could translate to “internal” or “between friends” or “between brothers.” It is often used to describe a civil war as in the “Greek Civil War (\textit{Εµφυλιος Πολεµος}). \textit{Σπαραγµων} could translate to “division”, or “dismemberment”. Historically, however, its meaning is much harsher. In classical Greece \textit{σπαραγµως} was a ritual practiced in honor of Dionysius during which animals, and sometimes human beings, were sacrificed and then dismembered.} He also
dedicates one section to Socrates titled “Socrates and his Death.” In this section Apostolopoulou says,

[Ο Σωκρατης ειπεν] ’Αλλ’ εγω συγχωρω αυτους και παραδιδοµαι εις την δικαιοσυνην των θεων και των ανθρωπων.’ Τους χριστιανικωτατους και ευαγγελικω− στατους τουτος λογους ελεγεν ο Σωκρατης, οταν ο Χριστος δεν ειχεν ακοµη γεννιθη.

[Socrates said] ‘But I forgive them, and deliver myself to the gods, and man’s justice.’ These very Christian words were spoken by Socrates at a time when Christ was not yet born.\(^{41}\)

Apostolopoulou compares Socrates to Jesus. Although his reasons behind this comparison are unknown, he was perhaps attempting to help students better relate Socrates by linking the ancient philosopher to the students’ own religious tradition.

Apostolopoulou ends his textbook with a section titled “Greece Under the Romans.” Most of this section, which is just over one page in length, recounts information about Constantine the Great and the Christianization and Hellenization of the Roman Empire. Although Apostolopoulou argues that Roman civilization was heavily influenced by Greek society, the Romans are still presented as outsiders and occupiers of Greece.\(^{42}\)

\(^{41}\)Ibid., 59.

\(^{42}\)Ibid., 80.
K. Vlousou, G. Kouzou, and A. Illidou’s *History of Ancient Greece* (1886)

K. Vlousou, G. Kouzou, and A. Illidou’s *Istoria tis Achais Ellados (History of Ancient Greece)* was published in 1886 and intended for the Greek elementary schools of Constantinople. In 1860, Constantinople and its suburbs boosted some 453 primary schools. The schools were divided according to the various religious millets, with independently operated Armenian, Catholic (Latin), Jewish, Muslim, Greek Orthodox, and Protestant school systems. The largest number of primary schools was Muslim with 279; next were the Greek Orthodox schools, with 77. The Muslim primary schools included 16,757 students, of which 9,975 were boys and 6,782 were girls; the Orthodox millet had a total of 6,477 students.

According to Irini Sarioglou, Greek primary schooling for boys had existed in Constantinople since 1833 through the Parochial School of the Holy Virgin of Pera. By 1890 several Greek schools had opened in Constantinople. Among them was the Zographion School for boys in 1893, which was funded by Christakis Zographos, a wealthy Greek merchant from Constantinople’s Phanar district. An early observer commented that, “Where there are only public schools they are built out of funds of the

---
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church and community.” In other words, the schools were independently operated and funded and most of the financial assistance for the schools came from the church and community. It was in these Greek schools that Vlousou’s et al. textbook was used.

Although all the students in the Greek schools of Constantinople were Greek, both Greek and Turkish were taught in the schools. The textbooks on Greek history were typically written in Greek, but because the schools were not in Greece, the books were usually written and published in Constantinople and varied significantly from those used in Greece.

In Vlousou et al’s. “Prologue” the authors say,

…του βιβλιου τουτο πληρη και καθαρον εικονα της πατριδου ιστοριας ακριβως δε τουτο ενεκα αναγκαιον ενωμισμεν να ευρυνωμεν, οσον εφποσουμεν δυνατον εις διδακτικου βιβλιον, τον κυκλον των εκ της ελληνικης ιστοριας διδακτεων γνωσεων, απρεπε νομιζοντε, οι παιδε των Γαλλων, Αγγλων και των Γερμανων να διδασκονται εν τοις κατωτεροι σχολειοι της αυτων πατριδος ιστοριαν λεπτομερεστερον και ακριβεστερον η οι Ελληνοπαιδε.

[We]…considered it necessary to broaden the circle of knowledge on Hellenic history, assigned to be taught [in Greek schools] as we thought it was possible to be done in a textbook. In fact, we regard offending the fact that the French, English, and German children are taught the history of their homelands in a more detailed and precise way than the Greek children.

In fact, the authors felt that the Greek history textbooks used in Greece did not suffice because they did not provide accurate depictions and detailed portraits of the

---


50 Vlousou et al., “Prologue.”
“homeland.” The use of the word “homeland” helps to convey what type of Greek history was being sought outside Greece as the term had a somewhat different meaning in Constantinople than what was perhaps understood in Greece itself. To a Greek from Constantinople, homeland represented any place such as Turkey, Asia Minor, Constantinople, or Smyrna that was historically Greek-speaking. In contrast, to those living in Greece, homeland referred to the state of Greece with, perhaps, an extension of that state into the Greek-speaking communities of Ottoman Turkey. The Greek residents in Turkey had no major desire to leave their homes, towns, cities, and communities in order to relocate to Greece. To them, the nation of Greece then was not a homeland; instead the Greeks of Turkey saw themselves as originating and belonging in their current geographic space of Asia Minor. They were interested in maintaining their Greek cultural identity while also remaining in Turkey.

In their introduction the authors state,

History, namely the narration of the most important actions of humankind, is divided in three intervals or sections: a) ancient, b) medieval, c) modern
history. Ancient history, namely the history of the world as it was known by the Ancients, starts from prehistoric times and ends in 476 A.D., when barbarian peoples from the northern parts of Europe, destroyed the Western Roman Empire, which had dominated the known world and created new states. It [ancient history] is subdivided in three sections: a) history of the so called oriental peoples, b) history of the Greek people, c) history of the Romans.51

The authors’ explanation that history is divided in three periods is congruent with Paparrigopoulos’s vision of one continuous Greek history from past to present. The authors also divide ancient history in three periods: the history of oriental people, which likely means the history of East Asia and the Near East, the history of the Greek people, and the history of the Romans.

Vlousou et al.’s textbook is 110 pages in length and includes several illustrations. The authors begin their text with a description of Greek geography and followed that with a discussion of the various ancient Greek tribes. Like many of the Greek textbooks written at the time, sections are dedicated to Greek mythology, the Trojan War, and the ancient Greek heroes. However, Vlousou et al. give more attention to those parts of ancient Greek history and mythology associated with the geographic space in which their students reside. An example is a short discussion of the Ionians, a pre-classical Greek tribe that settled the Aegean and Asia Minor. They are discussed under a section titled “Greek Colonies.”52 None of the previous textbooks authored by Greeks mention the Ionians in such great detail. Moreover, in the text the Ionians are treated as residents of Attic Greece who expanded their settlements into the islands of the Aegean and Asia
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Minor. This confirms that the Ionians are inarguably Greek because they originated in the Greek mainland. The Ionians are described as one of the four original Hellenic tribes, and as such appear to be the ancestors of the Greeks living in Turkey. Asia Minor is portrayed as part of the broader ancient Greek world. In another example, Vlousou et al. present the epic Greek poet Homer as a resident of Smyrna. This also helps reinforce the notion of a Greek presence in the region since ancient times.

Like other authors, Vlousou et al. include a section on ancient Greek religion. In this section the authors cover the Greek gods and major ancient Greek heroes. Unlike other authors however, Vlousou et al. give special attention to a mythical Greek figure named Niobe. Niobe was the daughter of the king of Phrygia, who originated from Asia Minor; she angered the gods, who killed her children, prohibited her from burying them, and in mourning the gods transformed her into a rock on Mount Sipylus in Turkey. The story of Niobe is mentioned in the works of several ancient Greek writers and was a symbol for many Greeks of what happens to one who possesses unwarranted pride. Homer mentions her for her disdainful hubris (which is a common trope in Homer’s Iliad especially with Agamemnon and Achilles). In Sophocles’s Anitigone, Antigone the protagonist of the story compares herself to Niobe as she is marched to her death. Antigone, like Niobe was prohibited from burying her brother, which according to ancient Greek religion prevented her brother’s soul from entering the after life. Niobe

53Ibid., 44.
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55For the detailed account of Niobe and other stories from mythology, see George William Cox, Tales from Greek Mythology (Biobliobazaar, 2008).
does not appear in most of the textbooks in Greece, but seems to be significant to those Greeks living in Turkey. Why Niobe is significant to those Greeks living in Turkey could be perhaps summed up to, because she originates from those parts of ancient Greece that the Greeks in Turkey continued to inhabit. Thus, this type of Greek population could better relate to the story of Niobe and perhaps had a stronger cultural connection to the story of Niobe.

Similarly Vlousou et al. dedicate a section on the Ionian Revolt, which was put down in 492 B.C.E. by Darius, King of Persia and in which the Athenians had assisted their Greek Ionian brethren.\textsuperscript{56} These and other examples are dedicated to those parts of ancient Greek history that are associated with the areas in which those living outside of the modern nation of Greece resided. Such content demonstrates that the Vlousou et al. text is intended for a different type of Greek audience than the other texts reviewed herein. This is an audience that is not living in Greece, but which nonetheless sees itself as being as one with the ancient Greek past and community.

The rest of the textbook resembles most of the school books found in Greece at the time, especially in the two sections on “Ancient Athens” and “Ancient Sparta.” The authors also dedicate a subsection to the Golden Age of Athens in which they discuss Athenian democracy, philosophy, architecture, literature and sculpture. Several illustrations are offered on the various types of Greek colonnade.

Also mentioned is the Greek sculptor Phidias, and an illustration of his famous statue of the goddess Athena is provided. The columns and statue of Athena were

\textsuperscript{56}Vlousou et al., 61.
probably familiar to the students. The colonnade styles still appeared on many of the buildings, both old and new, in Constantinople and western Turkey. Phidias’s statue of Athena was well known although it had been destroyed centuries earlier shortly after the rise of the Byzantine Empire, the statue was transported from Athens to Constantinople, where it was destroyed after the Christian crusaders sacked the city in the early 13\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{57} Nevertheless, the statue was an icon of the region’s ancient Greek past and one can surmise that the Greek community of Constantinople felt an intimate connection to it. For many of them the Athena also symbolized a transfer of Greek achievement and culture from Athens to Constantinople, which for many was seen as the cultural and religious center of Greece.

Vlousou et al. end their text with a section on the “Peloponnesian Wars.” Unlike Apostolopoulou’s textbook, which provides a brief synopsis of Greek history after ancient Greece, Vlousou et al. make no mention of the Byzantine Empire, Greek occupation under the Ottomans, nor the Greek Revolution. This seems reasonable since the textbook is on ancient Greece and not Byzantine and Modern Greece. However, Ottoman occupation may have also been omitted in order to prevent trouble, as this group of Greeks was still under the control of the Ottoman Empire. Alternatively, rather than seeing themselves as being occupied by the Ottoman Empire, they may have viewed themselves as an integral part of Ottoman society. The Greek Revolution was likely omitted because it had nationalist undertones that would have been unwise to teach in a

\textsuperscript{57}No one is certain why or by whom the statue was destroyed. There are two major theories. The first blames the crusaders and holds that they destroyed the statue after sacking Constantinople during the Fourth Crusade. The second holds that a superstitious Greek mob destroyed the statue because its members thought she was welcoming the crusaders into the city. R.J.H. Jenkins, “The Bronze Athena at Byzantium,” \textit{Journal of Hellenic Studies} 67 (1947): 31-33.
place where the Greek state had expansionist ambitions and where the Ottomans were
still recovering from their losses in the Balkans.

Nikolaou I. Vrachnou’s *History of the Ancient Greeks* (1909)

Nikolaou I. Vrachnou’s *Istoria ton Archaion Hellinon* (*History of the Ancient Greeks*) was published in 1909 and used primarily in the first year of the Hellenic schools. Vrachnou’s book is 110 pages in length and adorned with several illustrations.

Vrachnou begins his text with a description of Greek geography and then moves into a discussion of the Greek mythological heroes. Like many of the textbooks published around the same time, Vrachnou’s textbook discusses Theseus, Perseus, King Oedipus, Jason and the Argonautic expedition. In the next section Vrachnou covers the Trojan War and in the section following that he discusses the Greek gods and the Olympic Games. The Olympic Games are treated as a pan-Hellenic cultural event that brought together the entire Greek world at the exclusion of outsiders—non-Greeks were strictly prohibited from participating.

Following the section on the Olympics, Vrachnou introduces the Dorian migrations, which do not appear, or appear only briefly, in the other textbooks reviewed herein. The Dorian migrations are also covered in greater detail than on other textbooks. While Keightly described them as the “Dorian Invasions,” and Mitford as the “Dorian Revolution,” Vrachnou describes them as “Καθοδος των ∆ωριεων” or the “Dorian Settlements.” Moreover, Vrachnou presents the Dori ans as a Greek civilization, not a
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foreign one they are described as a proto-Greek tribe who migrated from the northern parts of the Balkans into the Greek peninsula, where according to Vrachnou, they eventually blended with other Greek tribes. Because the Dorians were a proto-Indo-European group they provide Greek civilization a European ancestry that helped to dispel the continental assertions that the ancient Greeks were not European.

Vrachnou next considers ancient Athens and Sparta. He discusses the major military, political, and intellectual figures, such as Lycurgus, Pericles, Alcibiades, Cimon, and Demosthenes. He follows with the Greco-Persian Wars, which are recounted in great detail and adorned with several illustrations and maps.

Nearly 80 percent of Vrachnou’s book is on ancient Sparta and Athens, focusing on the periods from the Greco-Persian Wars in 490 B.C.E to the end of the Peloponnesian Wars in 404 B.C.E. His final section is on the death of Epaminondas, the Theban general and statesman who liberated Thebes from Spartan domination in the 4th century B.C.E, after the Peloponnesian Wars. No mention of Epaminondas appears in most of the previous textbooks. The lack of coverage elsewhere makes Epaminondas seem insignificant; however, to Vrachnou Epaminondas signified a turning point in Greek history: the end of classical Greece and the beginning of the Hellenistic Age. In his final
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61 Martin Bernal reintroduced the idea that the ancient Greeks were not Indo-European. Although interesting, most linguists and historians have disputed Bernal’s theory today. Bernal argues that beginning in the 18th century European intellectuals manufactured the idea that the ancient Greeks had linguistic roots in Europe when in fact the ancient Greek language was more aligned with Afro-Asiatic languages. Martin Bernal, Black Athena: Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization, Volume 1: The Fabrication of Ancient Greece, 1785-1985 (Rutgers University Press, 1989).
paragraph Vrachnou asserts that after the death of Epaminondas “….a new power, Macedonia from the northern fringes of Greece, once again gave life to Greece…”62

Antoniou N. Chorafa’s History of Ancient Greece (1913)

Antoniou N. Chorafa’s *Istoria tis Achaias Ellados* (*History of Ancient Greece*) was first published in 1913 and intended for students in the elementary schools.63 This textbook is ninety-five pages in total and is adorned with several illustrations. Chorafa begins with a discussion on the various ancient Greek tribes, the Dorians, Ionians, Aeolians, and Achaeans. He follows with sections on ancient Greek religion, Pan-Hellenic and Olympic Games, and a section specifically on major Greek cities.64 Unlike previous textbooks, Chorafa’s provides a topographic map of ancient Greece to help illustrate to his reader the physical barriers that were overcome as Greek influence spread across the world. Most of these settlements are found on the Greek peninsula, Southern Italy, the Aegean and Ionian Islands, and Asia Minor.

Chorafa next discusses ancient Sparta. He provides a section on the rearing of Spartan children as well as sections on Spartan religion, government, and the social organization.65 He continues with ancient Athens and than moves into the Greco-Persian Wars. He begins his section on the Greco-Persian Wars with a discussion of Greek settlements in Asia Minor. A map was also provided detailing these settlements.


64 Ibid., 4-8.

65 Ibid., 12-13.
The map helped give a sense of the physical area and terrain of the ancient Greek world. Most of the territories now part of Greece, including Thrace, Crete, and most of the islands in the Aegean, had not yet been incorporated into the state of Greece. Like Apostolopoulou, the theme of a Greece united against an external or foreign enemy emerges in the section on the Greco-Persian Wars, which are depicted as a unified Greek success. Leonidas and his 300 Spartans are recognized for their heroism and sacrifice and Themistocles is credited for defeating the Persians at the battle of Salamis. Chorafa provides illustrations of the types of Greek ships (pentekontors and triereis) used by Themistocles to defeat the Persians.

The Greco-Persian Wars are followed with a section that considers the Persians’ final defeat at Plataea, the founding of the Delian League, the betrayal of Pausanias, the ostracizing of Themistocles and the rise of Cimon in Athens. Chorafa follows with the Golden Age of Athens, emphasizing Pericles and the establishment of a democracy in Athens. He also dedicates a section to Ancient Athens’ monuments in which he provides an illustration of the Acropolis and highlights its major features.

In the next section Chorafa discusses the Peloponnesian Wars. He divides the wars into three sections: the first, the second and third periods noting that after several years of fighting, Athens is defeated by the Spartans. The next section, “The Thirty
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“Tyrants,” does not appear in most of the Greek textbooks at the time. These were the pro-Spartan puppet oligarchy of thirty men that were installed to rule Athens after her defeat.70

Like Vrachnou, Chorafa also discusses Epaminondas, suggesting that he symbolizes the end of the classical period and the beginning of the rise of Macedon.71 However, unlike Vrachnou, Chorafa dedicates nearly twenty-seven pages on the rise of Philip II to the conquests of Alexander the Great, far more than Vrachnou and most other contemporary textbooks. Chorafa begins his discussion of Macedonian with a section titled “The Macedonians.” In this section Chorafa says,

Οι Μακεδόνες οι Ελληνες και αυτοί, είχαν την ίδιαν γλώσσαν και τα ίδια εθιμα με τους αλλούς Ελλήνας.

The Macedonians as Greeks spoke the same language and shared the same values with other Greeks.72 He clearly identifies the Macedonians as Greeks. The following section is specifically on Philip II, Philip’s antagonisms with Athens, Philip’s “Sacred War,” the Battle of Chaeronea, and finally Philip’s death.73

Unusually, the following section is on the rise of Alexander the Great. Unlike previous authors, Chorafa dedicated substantial coverage to Alexander the Great, who is presented as Greek and given credit for spreading Greek culture around the known world. Chorafa includes an illustration of the man and detailed subsections titled “Alexander in
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Greece," “Alexander’s Expeditions in Asia,” “The Battle of Granicus,” “Conquest of Asia Minor,” “Battle of Issus,” “Conquest of the Phoenicia and Egypt,” “Battle of Arvilon,” Conquest of the Persian Nations,” “Expeditions to India,” and “Alexander’s Death.” He also includes a map showing the physical extent of Alexander’s Empire. The map is titled “Greece during Alexander’s Time.”

Chorafa’s text continues with a consideration of the kingdoms into which Alexander’s Empire was divided and ends with rise of the Romans and the conquest of Greece by the Romans. He does not give an overview of Greek history from the Romans on; rather Greece is presented as being “under the control of the Romans.”

Unlike the history textbooks written by foreign authors from 1834-1880, Greek textbooks after 1880 were interested in linking Modern Greece to ancient Greece. This was the case in the textbooks written by Theodoros N. Apostolopoulou, K. Vlousou et al., Nikolaou I. Vrachnou, and Antoniou Chorafa. Like the textbooks from 1834-1880, the Greek authored textbooks were also mostly on ancient Greece. However, unlike the foreign written textbooks, the Greek authors intended their textbooks for a different type of audience. This was a Greek audience that the authors sought to connect to the ancient Greek past.

Having in mind a Greek audience, Greek authored textbooks on ancient Greece (1880-1913) became far more personal than previous textbooks. The student could better connect to the people and events found in the textbooks and develop a sense of how the
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past was connected to his/her own life. For example, the origin of ancient groups as the Pelasgians and Dorians were presented as indigenous Greek groups for which later Greek groups had derived from. Historical figures were often recast as being Greek and adjustments were made in the textbooks to stress this so as to favor modern Greek geopolitical ambitions. This was especially true in the case of Macedonian history when the state of Greece was claiming the territory of Macedonia. Macedonia became purely Greek, Philip II and Alexander the Great were presented as Greek, and ancient Macedonian history was connected to ancient Greek and modern Greek history. Greek history was essentially on its way to becoming purely Greek, not just because it was being written by Greeks, but because it was being taught to an audience that was developing a strong notion of what it meant to be Greek, and a strong sense of how their past had shaped who they were.

**Linking the Past to the Present: Byzantine and Modern Greek History in Five Greek Textbooks**

This following sections consider five texts written by Greek historians, each of which focuses on more recent Greek history: Theodoros N. Apostolopoulos’ *The Rebirth of Greece*, published in 1881; N.G. Philippidou’s *A Short History of the Greek Nation: 1453-1821*, published in 1900; Georgiou Giege’s textbook *History of the Greek Nation*, published in 1903; Nicholaou I. Vrachou’s *History of the Greek Nation*, published in 1906; and Antoniou N. Chorafa’s *History of Ancient Greece*, published in 1913. The textbooks were selected because they cover a cross-section of textbooks on
Byzantine and Modern Greek history published between 1880-1913. The texts attempt to connect a modern Greek identity to ancient Greece.

Theodoros Apostolopoulou *E Palliggenesia tis Ellados* (1883)

Theodoros Apostolopoulou’s *E Palliggenesia tis Ellados* (*The Rebirth of Greece*) was published in 1883. The textbook was written after the implementation of the “New Teaching Methods” of 1880. The entire textbook is on the Greek Revolution. It is intended for students in the elementary schools.

The title of Apostolopoulou’s textbook suggests that Greece was once again reborn or liberated after centuries of Ottoman occupation, in other words, that a Greek nation has been in continuous existence since ancient times. Apostolopoulou begins his textbook with a section on Istanbul, a city known at the time as Constantinople. In his first line of the textbook he says, “Constantinople is a well known Greek city on the Bosporus.” He continues by asserting that the Turks later conquered the city. He describes the fall of Constantinople by the Turks as follows:

> Οι Τούρκοι ήσαν βαρβαρος λαος, ο οποιος ανεφανη απο ενδοτερα μερη της Ασιας. Οι Τούρκοι υπεταξαν πολλας ελληνικας πολεις, μεχρι ου εκυριευσαν και αυτην την Κωνσταντινουπολιν τη 29 Μαιου του ετους 1453 μετα Χριστου.

The Turks were a barbarous nation, who originated from the depths of Asia. The Turks conquered several Greek cities until finally capturing Constantinople on the 29th of May in the year 1453 A.D.

---


77 Ibid., 1.

78 Ibid.
In the above passage Apostolopoulou gives no clear indication as to where the Turks are from. They are portrayed as a mysterious Asiatic group that roams into Greek territory and conquers Greek cities, finally taking Constantinople. They are not indigenous to the region but described as outsiders and foreigners. Moreover, the Turks are portrayed as abstract personalities, and as such they appear to be cruel, inhuman, and uncivilized. A subtle conceptual divide emerges, “Us vs. Them” or “Us vs. Other”, which places the Greek nation at constant odds with the Turks. Later, Apostolopoulou provides his readers with a sense of hope:

Η Κωνσταντινούπολις εκ τοτε μεχρι της σημερον ειναι πρωτευουσα της Τουρκιας. Αλλα γρηγορα μαλιν θα ελθη εμερα, κατα την οποιαν οι Ελληνες θα παρουν πα- λιν την Κωνσταντινουπολιν απο τους αθλιους Τουρκους.

Constantinople, from that time [Fall to the Ottoman Turks] to today is the capital of Turkey. However, there will be a day, when the Greek will once again retake Constantinople from the miserable Turks. Apostolopoulou concedes that the Turks control Constantinople but maintains that it will always be Greek; the Turks still occupy it but only as temporary hosts, and it will one day be returned back to its rightful residents.

This is an example of the sensationalism that develops around Constantinople or “The City.” It is part of a Greek nostalgia and imagination that looks at Constantinople as a symbolic link to modern Greece’s Byzantine and Christian past. As such, the city is caste as being purely Greek. Apostolopoulou marshals a variety of evidence to support
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his claim: the headquarters of the Orthodox Church is located there, the Greek patriarch
rules from there, there is a large Greek community there, the city’s name
(Constantinople) is Greek, it is home to the greatest of Greek cathedrals, the Agia Sophia,
and Greece’s medieval and Orthodox past resides within Constantinople; therefore the
city naturally belongs to Greece.

During this period, imaginative myths and fanciful tales developed about how the
city was destined to return to Greece. Stories about six fingered kings, a marble statue of
Constantine Palaiologos taking a human form, and wars of Armageddon were devised in
the Greek imagination to signal when the city will be returned. However, such myths
only fueled Greek nationalists’ ambitions; these proponents of the Grand Idea pushed
ever harder to reclaim the city and continue Greece’s expansionist goals at the expense of
other nations.

Apostolopoulou’s next section is titled “Greece Under the Turks.” He states that,
“The Greeks suffered greatly by the barbarian and wild Turks.”82 He stresses this by
discussing the Ottoman practice of devshirme or in Greek paidomazoma, in which
children where indiscriminately rounded up and forced to convert to Islam and serve as
Janissaries (permanent troops) in the Ottoman army.83 According to Apostolopoulou the

82Ibid.

83The paidomazoma has for some time been a sensitive issue in Greece. It reemerged after the
Greeks Civil War (1945-1949), when Greek communists after fleeing Greece rounded up children and took
them to communist block nations. Historians have often characterized this event as a “communist roundup”
or outright “kidnapping” of Greek children. In some cases, families that were too poor to feed and care for
their children willfully gave them to the communists—painfully aware that this was the only way their
children could survive. For the Greek communists these children represented the next generation of
comrades, who would one day return to Greece as socialist leaders and bring the nation to the communist
Greeks were constantly pressured by the Turks to convert to Islam and acculturate. However, according to Apostolopoulou “Our [Greek] holy faith and our Greek education…saved the Greek nation.”

Apostolopoulou gives a grim portrayal of the Greek people’s experience during Ottoman rule. Yet, given his political agenda, one must question the accuracy of these depictions of the Ottoman Empire and its treatment of Greeks. David Brewer suggests that unlike other minority religious groups in Europe, the Greeks had the advantage when it came to Ottoman religious toleration. He states,

The Greeks did not suffer like the Cathars and the Huguenots in France, the Catholics in England and the Jews almost everywhere, except in the Ottoman Empire where they were welcomed. Also, the Greeks were free to educate their children despite the myth that schools had to be secret…

In contrast, Apostolopoulou asserts that because of religious intolerance and pressures to convert by the Ottoman authorities, many Greeks left for the mountains and became Klefts or bandits.

These Klefts would become early Greek revolutionaries who helped to set Greece free after 400 years of Ottoman control. Apostolopoulou presents a Kleft in this section, including the following verse:

Μαννα σου λεο δεν μπορω του Τουρκου να δουλευω
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Δεν ηµπορώ, δεν δυναµαι, εµαλλίας′ η καρδιά µου.
Θα παρω το τουφεκι µου να µα να γινω κελφτη,
Θα φυγω µαννα και µην κλαι,
Κ′ ευχησουµε, µαννουλα µου, Τουρκους πολλους να σφαξζω.

Mother, I am telling you I can no longer tolerate those Turks
I can’t take it anymore, I am powerless, and my heart longs.
I will take my rifle and become a bandit
I will leave mother and don’t cry, just give me your blessing
And only hope mother, that I will slaughter many Turks.87

Clearly this is the song of a Greek youth who longing to take to the mountains and fight
the Turks pleads with his mother to let him go. The song is in the Demotic Greek and
appealed to those Greeks from the rural countryside. Notably, at the time of the
Revolution the Klefts were romanticized by the west. They were often portrayed as
rugged and free spirited Greeks and depicted sporting an upturned mustache and dressed
in a traditional Greek foustanela (Greek kilt). The French saw them as former slaves who
were inspired to revolt for love of their country.88 The British were interested in them
because they reminded them of the Scottish Highlanders, who once roamed the hills of
Britain. Others often compared them to Robin Hood for their gutsy ambushes on Turkish
caravans and Turkish soldiers and their concern for their people’s welfare.89

The Armatoloi and Palikaria (sometimes used interchangeably) are a topic of
discussion in Apostolopoulou’s next section, “Armatoloi and Palikaria.” The Armatoloi
were Greek irregular soldiers commissioned by the Ottomans to enforce the Sultan’s laws
in the Greek territories. During the Revolution they turned on their patrons and formed
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the main fighting force of the Greek revolutionary army. *Palikaria* is a broader characterization of the *Armatoloi* including any heroic or brave Greek who fought against the Ottomans. Like the *Klefts*, the *Armatoloi* were portrayed as rugged, tough, and incorrigible.

Apostolopoulou associates a particular group, the Souliotes, with the *Armatoloi*. The Souliotes were a Greek clan from the mountainous northwestern part of the country; they fought against the Ottoman appointed Albanian landlord Ali Pasha. Ali Pasha failed to take the semi-autonomous Souliote territories, so the Ottomans sent in an army to put an end to the Souliote resistance. It is said that after all the Souliote men were killed in the fighting, the Souliote women and their children were trapped on the edge of a cliff. When the Turkish army neared the cliff, the women and children decided to throw themselves off the cliffs. Clearly the Souliote mass suicide signals that it was better for Greeks to die rather than become slaves (perhaps of anyone, but especially of the Turks). The story encapsulates both the harsh and oppressive nature of the Ottomans and the sacrifice of a brave stalwart people who refuses to bow to their oppressors no matter what the cost.

The remainder of Apostolopoulou’s book is about the Greek Revolution and the establishment of the modern Greek state. This part of the text reads more like a biographical sketch of major revolutionary figures than a general history of the revolution. Major figures, and their roles in the revolution are discussed, among those included are: Rigas Velestenlis and Adamandios Koraes (writers and early advocates for a Revolution), Patriarch Grigorios (Greek Patriarch who was hung after Greece declared
independence), Theodoros Kolokotronis, Athanasios Diakos, Odysseus Androutsos and Andreas Miaoulis (Greek revolutionary fighters). Illustrations are presented for several of these personalities. Apostolopoulos’s textbook ends with the rule of King Otto and the establishment of a monarchy in Greece in 1833.

N.G. Philippidou *Epitomos Istoria tou Ellinikou Ethnous: 1453-1821* (1900)

The second text to consider the more modern periods of Greek history is N.G. Philippidou’s *Epitomos Istoria tou Ellinikou Ethnous: 1453-1821* (A Short History of the Greek Nation: 1453-1821). It was published in 1900 and was likely used in the Hellenic Schools.\(^90\) Philippidou’s book primarily covers the period from the fall of Constantinople to the Greek Revolution.

The textbook is divided into chapters and each chapter composed of sections. The first two sections of the first chapter are on Gennadius Scholarius who was appointed ecumenical patriarch by Mehmet II or Mehmet the Conqueror after the fall of Constantinople.\(^91\) This is quite unusual—Scholarius was rarely mentioned in the beginning of most textbooks of this era, yet Philippidou uses him to introduce the early Ottoman occupation in Greece.

It is uncertain why Philippidou begins with Scholarius and not the fall of Constantinople in 1453, as most of the textbooks at the time had done. Perhaps it was an attempt to overshadow the hardships of conquest occupation with a slightly more upbeat tale of perseverance and bravery.
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In contrast to Apostolopoulou’s textbook, Philippidou portrays neither the Turks nor Mehmet II as aggressors. Nonetheless, this section includes an ode to Scholariu’s bravery and honor:

Ωσ οἰωνον καὶ μελλοντος  
Λαμπρου υπανατελλοντος....  
Λοιπον αφου και συνετο εδειχθης πατριωτης  
Pατριδος αμα και Χριστου γενναιος στρατιωτης  
Αφου τα μεγιστ’ αγαθα και εθνους κ’ εκκλησιας  
Απο βαρβαρου αβλαβη ετηρεις εξουσιας  
Κ’ εσ χρονοισ ουτω χαλεποις της προσφιλου πατριδος  
Απο βαρβαρου αβλαβη ετηρεις εξουσιας  
Αστηρ εφαινου δι’ αυτην παρηγορες ελπιδος,  
Ευλογητη η μνημη σου! ασ θαλη αιωνια  
Εν παση φιλοματριδι ελληνικη καρδια!....

Omen of rising bright future  
For being a noble prudent patriot  
Brave soldier for Christ and homeland  
For protecting the nation’s and Church’s greatest goods  
Unharmed from the barbarism of the [Ottoman] authorities  
You looked like a star of comforting hope  
For your beloved homeland during [those] hash years  
Be your memory blessed!  
Let it eternally blossom in all Greek patriots hearts.  

In short, Scholarius is extolled as a hero of the Greek nation and of Greek Christianity, a protector Hellenism and the Greek Orthodox faith. Philippidou’s next section is on the Agia Sophia and comprises nine pages. Like Apostolopoulou, he casts Constantinople as a Greek city and the Agia Sophia as a Greek church. Unlike Apostolopoulou, Philippidou goes into detail about the church’s history. He credits Emperor Justinian for hiring the architects Isidoros and Anthemios to design it, noting after the church is completed,
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First he [Justinian] lifted his hands in the air, he praised God for helping him complete such a great task….and from his joy he yelled out loud, ‘νενηκα σε Σολομον.’

In other words, Justinian’s completion of the Agia Sophia outdid Solomon’s Temple.

Philippidou follows by describing the building’s architectural and decorative characteristics, its grand domes, mosaics, marble columns, and a well known palindrome inscribed on a fountain outside the church, “νιψων ανομηµατα µη µοναν οψιν.”

This section on the Agia Sophia includes an illustration of the church as well as a poem written about it by Ioannou Karasoutsa. Although he mentions that the church has been converted to a mosque, Philippidou ends this section with a declaration that the church and city in which the church stands will one day be returned back to Greece.

The most interesting portion of Philippidou’s book is his section on George Katrioti Skanderbeg. Recently, the ethnicity of Skanderbeg has come into question, Greece, Albania, and Macedonia have all claimed him. He is a hero in all these nations, remembered for his struggle against the Ottoman Empire in the 15th century.

Philippidou makes the following comment about Skanderbeg,

George Katriotis was born in Epirus. It is not called Albania, but upper Epirus…which in ancient times was called Illyria. The Albanians of this region are the descendants of the ancient Pelasgians, as are the Greeks. As such, because the Albanians and Greeks have a homogenous ethnic
descent, they are considered brothers. The language that the Albanians speak, is ancient Pelasgian, which is pan-archaic Greek…

Philippidou attempts to caste Kastrioti as Greek by connecting Albanians to the ancient Pelasgians and Illyrians. As noted above, the Pelasgians were mentioned in several of the textbooks on ancient Greece and were portrayed by Greek authors as the earliest Greeks. In this case, as both Albanians and Greeks they are the ancient descendants of the Pelasgians, Kastrioti may be assumed to be both Greek and Albanian.

This dual identity seems as bit convoluted: rather than claiming Kastrioti is a Greek, Philippidou highlights Greek and Albanian ethnic similarities through Kastrioti. Notably, most textbooks of the period classify the Turks and Slavs quite differently from the Albanians and in none of them does one find Slavic and Turkish peoples described as “brothers” or “related” to the Greeks. Both the Turks and Slavs are instead classified as being completely foreign to the region and as having no relation to the ancient Greeks. Albanians, on the other hand, are projected as brothers to the modern Greeks and as connected to the ancient Greeks. Both they and the Greeks are seen as native to the region, and their language seen as being related to Greek. By taking this position, Philippidou is only affirming how Greeks viewed the Albanians at the time: as a native Balkan group that shared similar cultural attributes to themselves. The Greeks also did not feel threatened by the Albanians, as there was no Albanian nation-state at the time; instead the Greek state was surrounded (and felt threatened) by the region’s Slavic and Turkish populations.
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Phillipidou’s book includes sections on the Palaiologos and Komeneno Dynasties. He ends his book with the Greek Revolution. Like Apostolopoulou, this section of his textbook is composed mainly of short biographies of the main characters of the revolution.

**Georgiou Ggele Istoria tou Ellinikou Ethnous (1903)**

A third text on modern Greek history is Ggele’s *Istoria tou Ellinikou Ethnous (History of the Greek Nation)*, first published in 1903. This book was intended for students in the third year of the Hellenic schools and is 187 pages. It is divided in three parts: 1) “From the Fall of Constantinople to the Franks to the Fall of Constantinople to the Turks (1204-1454),” 2) “Greeks Under the Turks to the Greek Revolution,” 3) “World History and Significant Events of the Modern World.” Each is divided in smaller sections and after each of these sections the author includes a list of reflective questions. The most coverage is dedicated to the Greek Revolution the least to recent World history. Ggele’s book is adorned with several illustrations, but includes no maps.

Ggele’s textbook is mainly on the Byzantine Empire and Modern Greece. His entire history is presented chronologically, Byzantine, Modern Greek, and contemporary world history. His history is mostly centered on Greece and Greece’s struggle to be liberated from Ottoman oppression. Although Ggele divides his textbook in three parts, one reading his textbook would find that his history seems to be divided in four historical phases: 1) Greek prosperity during Byzantine times, 2) Slavery, oppression, and Ottoman rule, 3) Hope, heroism, and independence, and 4) World history.
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While Apostolopoulou and Philippidou begin their texts near the time of the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople, Gegle begins his more than two centuries earlier with the sack of Constantinople by the Christian Crusaders. This occurred during the Fourth Crusade, in 1204 ACE. It is an event for which he mostly blames the Franks, and particularly Baldwin of Flanders noting that after Baldwin captured the city he was able to conquer the rest of the Empire. However, Baldwin would hold the title of αυτοκρατωρ, or Emperor of the Byzantine Empire, only until 1205 ACE.

In most textbooks of the period, the conquest of Constantinople and the Byzantine Empire are treated as acts of betrayal by the west; the Crusaders were welcomed into the city by the Byzantines because they were seen as fellow Christians, yet these supposed Christians sacked the city when its gates were opened. Speros Vryonis describes the sack of the city as follows,

The Crusaders vented their hatred for the Greeks most spectacularly in the desecration of the greatest Church in Christendom. They smashed the silver iconostasis, the icons and the holy books of the Hagia Sophia, and seated upon the patriarchal throne a whore who sang coarse songs as they drank wine from the Church’s holy vessels.\footnote{Speros Vryonis, Byzantium and Europe (Harcourt, Brace and World, 1967), 152.}

Gegle gives no similar details of what occurred in the city when the Crusaders entered, he merely states that the Crusaders took the city through trickery. The Crusaders are portrayed as foreign occupiers of the city, and their conquest of the city is described as an attempt to Catholicize Greece.

The next section of the text is on Frankish rulers of Greek lands who are put in power after the conquest of Constantinople. At the end of this section, Gegle provides a
list of reflective questions for the student. One question asks, “When did Constantinople and neighboring Greek territories fall?” “Which Greek lands in the Peloponnese was recognized by the high princes?” “Which lands did Baldwin administer? Which lands did the Venetians?”

The following section is on the relationships between the Franks and Byzantines. In this section Gegle says, “Moreover, the Greeks detested their foreign conquerors.”

Many of the Greek lands after the fall of Constantinople continued to be occupied by the Franks. Gegle notes that the Greeks were prepared to take up arms against the conquerors and take back those lands. Gegle in other words presents the Franks as foreign occupiers of Greek lands.

This leads into Gegle’s next section titled “Antagonisms between Frankish princess and Greek rulers.” The section highlights the conflicts between the Greeks and their Frankish occupiers and how Greek Byzantine rulers like Theodoros Laskaris and John Vatatzes are able to re-take control of most of those lands.

In much of Gegle’s discussion on the Byzantine Empire, the Empire is presented as Greek and its people as being Greek. Gegle seldom refers to it as Byzantine Empire Βυζαντινη Αυτοκρατορια or Roman Empire Ροµαικη Αυτοκρατορια, but instead as Greek Empire Ελληνικη Αυτοκρατορια or Byzantine nation Βυζαντιακον Κρατος.
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Moreover, his illustrations of the Byzantine Emperors also resemble those figures depicted in the textbooks on ancient Greece. In other words, the Byzantine kings look more like ancient Greek figures rather than medieval personalities.

Gegle follows with a discussion of the Palaiolog Dynasty, which was the last ruling dynasty of the Byzantine Empire. He dedicates sections to Michael Palaiologos, Andronikos Palaiologos, Andronikos III the Younger, John Katakounzinos, John Palaiologos, Manuel II, and ends with the last Byzantine Emperor Constantine XI.\textsuperscript{107}

What follows are the events that lead up to the fall of the Byzantine Empire.\textsuperscript{108} This includes the fall of Greek territories around the city. Gegle’s section “29\textsuperscript{th} of May: Fall of Constantinople. Heroic Death of the Glorious Constantine” describes the fall of Constantinople to the Turks.\textsuperscript{109} Constantine is seen as a hero for his refusal to surrender the city to Mehmet II. When the Turks enter the city they are described as “Asiatic Barbarians” and “Wild Conquerors.”\textsuperscript{110} Europe is also blamed for not assisting in the Byzantine’s struggle to defend the city. Constantine the emperor is recognized for his bravery for fighting till the bitter end and dying defending his people and Empire, while the \textit{Agia Sophia}, is converted into a mosque. Gegle states, “Our St. Sophia was
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converted into a Mosque after the blood of thousands of Christian’s spilled.” In other words, the Turks killed thousands of Greeks before taking over the church.

Gegle’s next part of his book is on “Greece under the Turks” and the Greek Revolution. His first section of this part of the book is on George Kastrioti’s resistance against the Turks. Unlike Philippidou, Katrioti is described as an Albanian Christian who fights against Turkish rule.

Gegle’s following section is on Greek life under Ottoman rule. In this section internal conflict between Greeks and Turks is discussed. He mentions how the Turks converted the Parthenon into a mosque as a way to encourage Greeks to convert to Islam. Moreover, Greeks were required to pay high taxes to the Sultan and the Sultan had the right to take anyone’s life. Greeks status is summed up as a life of slavery. A section on “Greek Education” during Ottoman times emphasizes the prohibition of Greek education during Ottoman rule, but recognizes the work of the Phanariotes and individuals like Adamandios Koraes to maintain a Greek educational system.

Gegle’s next two sections are on the Armatoloi and Klefts. Like Philippidou, the Klefts and Armatoloi are described as free spirited bandits or rebels who take to the
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mountains to fight against the Turks. They become identified as the early revolutionaries. Gegle offers a short ode on the Klefts:

Διψούν οι καμποί για νερό,  
Και το βουνά για χιονιά  
Διψά κ’ ο δολιο Ζαχαρίας  
Για Τουρκικά κεφάλια

The plains thirst for water  
And the mountains for snow  
Thirsts the slave Zacharias  
For the heads of Turks.\(^\text{118}\)

Like the Kleftic ode found in Philippidou’s textbook, Gegle’s ode gets into the notion that the Klefts are itching to fight the Turks and free their nation from Ottoman oppression. In another passage, Gegle gives a story of how a pasha asks a group of Klefts to fight with him against the Turks, the Klefts responded to the pasha, “Pasha, we always carry with us our swords and guns, it is better to live with a beast as yourself than a single Turk.”\(^\text{119}\)

The story gets into the Klefts cavalier and free spirited nature, their unwillingness to conform, and their hatred for the Turks.

Gegle’s next section is titled “The Movement Towards Revolution: 1770.”\(^\text{120}\)

This section is on the Orlov Revolt of 1770, which was an early attempt by the Greeks to revolt against the Ottomans. A section is also dedicated to Lambros Katsonis, who was a Greek naval hero who joined the Orlov Revolt seeking to spark a revolution in Greece.\(^\text{121}\)

Katsonis was able to force the Turks off the island of Kastelorizo, freeing its Greek
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inhabitants from Ottoman control. However, the revolt is eventually suppressed by the Turks.

Later, Gegle dedicates a section on Rigas Velestinlis (Feraios), recognized for his early attempts to spark a revolution in the Balkans as well as his martyrdom for the cause.\textsuperscript{122} Gegle also includes the first stanza of Velestinili’s \textit{Thourios}.\textsuperscript{123}

The next fifteen pages of Gegle’s textbook are on Ali Pasha and the Souliotes.\textsuperscript{124} He begins this section by describing the Souliotes as a “…militaristic free nation who lived in nature and were the descendants of Albanian Christians.”\textsuperscript{125} He later compares them to the ancient Spartans, asserting that they like the Spartans were a fierce warrior culture.\textsuperscript{126}

Just prior to the revolution, the Souliotes formed an independent confederacy in the area of Epirus. They were at constant odds with Ali Pasha and the Turks. Gegle mentions Tzavelas, Drakos, Zervas, and Botsaris as “glorious” leaders of the Souliote nation.\textsuperscript{127} Like the \textit{Armatoloi} and \textit{Kleits}, the Souliotes are the first revolutionaries in Greece and presented as imperious, and brash. They are symbols of freedom and revolt. Their brazen attitude is best captured in Fotos Tzavelas’s letter to Ali Pasha:

\begin{quote}
I am ready to defend my country against a robber like thee. My son may die, but I shall avenge him before the grave receives me. Now that I am
\end{quote}
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free, we may be conquerors; my wife is still young, and I may have other children. If my son murmured at being sacrificed for his country, he would be unworthy of living, and of bearing my name. Come on then, infidel. I burn for vengeance!\textsuperscript{128}

The remainder of this part of Gegle’s textbook is almost entirely on the Greek Revolution. Like Phillipidou’s textbook, most of the Greek Revolutionary heroes are discussed as well as their roles in the revolution: Alexandros Ypsilantis (for his failed attempt to spark a revolution in Romania); The Philiki Eteria (recognized for its work in lobbying Europe for military and financial support); Athanasios Diakos’s (remembered for his martyrdom at Thermopylae and for refusing to become a Turk); Theodoros Kolokotronis (acknowledged for his leadership throughout the Revolution as well as his defeat of the Turks in Tripoli); Patriarch Grigorios (for his execution by the Turks in Constantinople); Andreas Miaoulis, Gerogios Kanaris (for their naval successes and use of fire ships); Odysseus Androutsos’s (for his defeat of Omer Vryonis); and Georgios Karaiskakis (for his bravery at Missolonghi).

Gegle goes into greater detail on the events that lead up to the revolution, as well as the major battles of the revolution than most textbooks of the period. Nearly 85 pages are dedicated on the Greek Revolution, which is about 47 percent of the entire textbook.

Unlike Phillipidou and Apostolopoulou, Gegle dedicates a section on the Philhellenes and Lord Byron.\textsuperscript{129} The Philhellenes and Byron are recognized for helping galvanize the Greeks’ sense of national identity and pride in their past. Solomos’s first verse of his \textit{Ode to Lord Byron} is offered in this section:
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Solomos’s ode honors the English poet for fighting alongside the Greeks during the Revolution. His death at Missolonghi was recognized during the time of the revolution and seen by many as a significant setback on the course of the Greek struggle. Moreover, Solomos immortalizes Byron by placing him alongside the other major figures of the Greek Revolution.

Following the Phillhelenes, Gégle offers the following sections: “Greek Divisions”, “Ibrahim’s Invasion of the Peloponnese”, “Siege of Missolonghi”, and finally European intervention and the “Battle of Navarino.” The following section is on Ioannis Copodistria and the first Greek government.

Following his coverage on the Greek Revolution, Gégle discusses the establishment to the Greek state and the institution of the Greek monarchy. Gégle follows by covering the current Greek Royal family and while at the same time covering major events from the time.
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Gelge’s final part of his book is on key events in world history. This is Gelge’s shortest section. He only dedicates 18 pages on this topic, which is about 10% of his entire textbook. This section begins with the 14th century and the beginning of European exploration into China. He follows with the Guttenberg Press and its impact on printing and mass publication. The following section is dedicated to Columbus and his “Discovery of the Americas.” Gelge follows with Martin Luther and John Calvin and the Protestant Reformation, and ends with the French Revolution and the rise of Napoleon in France.

Nicholaou I. Vrachnou *Istoria tou Ellinikou Ethnous* (1906)

A fourth text on modern Greek history is Nicholaou I. Vrachou’s *Istoria tou Ellinikou Ethnous* (*History of the Greek Nation*), first published in 1906. Like Gelge’s textbook, Vrachnou’s textbook is intended for students in their third year in the Hellenic Schools. Vrachnou’s textbook is 160 pages and adorned with several illustrations. Like Gelge’s textbook, Vrachnou’s textbook is divided in three parts: 1) “From the Fall of Constantinople to the Franks to the Fall of Constantinople to the Turks (1204-1454),” 2) “Greeks Under the Turks to the Greek Revolution,” 3) “World History and Significant Events of the Modern World.” Like Gelge’s textbook, each of these parts is divided into
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smaller sections. After each of these sections Vrahnoú includes a list of reflective questions. The most coverage is dedicated to the Greek Revolution and the least coverage is on World history.

Vrahnoú’s textbook is almost identical to Ggle’s textbook. He begins his first part of the text with the fall of Constantinople to the Franks in 1204 ACE and concludes with the fall of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453 ACE. This part is 27 pages long, where Ggle’s was 33 pages. In this section Vrahnoú’s textbook includes only two illustrations, the Agia Sophia and Constantine Palaiologos.

Vrahnoú’s next part titled “Greeks Under the Turks to the Greek Revolution” is again almost identical to Ggle’s. However, in Vrahnoú’s text, George Kastrioti has been omitted, and the section begins with the survival of a Greek identity after several centuries of Ottoman occupation. In this section Vrahnoú discusses the tax system implemented by the Sultan, how Greek Christians were forced to pay higher taxes than Muslims, and Turkish attempts to convert the Greek population into Islam. Vrahnoú states, “It is estimated that by 1826 there were 500 thousand Greek children that were converted to Islam.”

Vrahnoú’s following section is titled “Religious and Political Privileges of the Greeks.” Unlike Ggle, Apostolopoulou, and Philippidou, Vrahnoú recognizes that some Greeks received special privileges from the Sultan. One such figure is Gennadius Scholarius who was appointed Patriarch of the Greek Orthodox Church after the fall of
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Constantinople. As head of the Church, Scholarius had the authority to rule over his own flock, collect taxes, and punish criminals.\textsuperscript{142} Vrachnou’s characterization of Scholarius in this section shifts from previous textbooks. In Vrachnou’s textbook Scholarius is no longer as a defender of Greek culture and a preserver of a Greek identity, but rather he is cast as someone who benefited from working with his Ottoman authorities. The following sections cover the Phanariotes, the \textit{Klefts}, and \textit{Armatoloi}.\textsuperscript{143} Like Apostolopoulou, Vrachnou includes the same \textit{Klefiic} ode found in Apostolopoulou’s text.\textsuperscript{144}

Vrachnou’s following section is titled, “The Destruction of the Peloponnese by the Albanians.”\textsuperscript{145} This again is a shift from previous texts. Previous texts make almost not reference to this event. The same section also covers Russian attempts during the Orlov Revolt (1770) to free Morea from the Ottomans. According to Vrachnou, the failed Russian attempt to liberate the region led to the destruction of the Peloponnese by Albanian mercenaries who were sent in by the Turks.\textsuperscript{146} Vrachnou says, “Out of 200 thousand [Greeks] only 100 thousand were left.”\textsuperscript{147} The Albanians took control of territory and forced most the Greeks to resettle into Central Greece and the Ionian
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Islands. Later, the Turkish commander Hasan Pasha was sent in to defeat the unbridled Albanians and take back control of the region for the Ottomans. In Vrachnou’s text, the Albanians are no longer presented as brothers to the Greeks as was the case in Apostolopoulou’s and Philippidou’s texts. This may be because of an Albanian movement at the time to create an Albanian nation-state. Thus, the Greeks may have found the Albanians to be a threat to Greek territory as well as Greek territorial ambitions in the region.

Like Gegle’s textbook, Vrachnou’s textbook is primarily on the Greek Revolution and most of the coverage is on this period of history. Most of the major pre-revolutionary events and figures are covered in this section. Included are, Rigas Velestenlis and Lambros Katsonis early revolutionary attempts outside Greece, the Souliotes and Tzavelas’s antagonisms with Ali Pasha and Alexander Ispsilantis failed attempts in Romanian lands to spark a revolt.  

Like Gegle, Vrachnou follows with the revolution. The major figures of the revolution are discussed as well as the major battles and events of the revolution. A section is also dedicated to Philhellenes and Lord George Byron’s support for the Greeks
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during their struggle. Vrachnou ends this part of his text with the establishment of a Greek government after the Revolution and the institution of a Greek monarchy. Vrachnou’s final part of his book “World History and Significant Events of the Modern World.” This section covers European explorations, Columbus’s discovery of the new world, the conquest of the Aztecs and Incas by the Spanish conquistadors Hernan Cortez and Francisco Pizzaro, Martin Luther, the Protestant Reformation and the spread of Protestantism in Europe, and finally the French Revolution and the rise of Napoleon. 

Antoniou N. Chorafa History of Modern Greece (1913)

A fifth textbook on modern Greek history is Antoniou N. Chorafa Istoria tis Neas Ellados (History of Modern Greece), first published in 1913. Chorafa’s textbook is intended for students in their third year in the Hellenic Schools. Chorafa’s textbook is 120 pages and adorned with several illustrations.

Unlike previous textbooks Chorafa’s textbook begins with a section on “Relations Between Greeks and Turks during Ottoman Rule.” He does not include the Byzantine Empire or the fall of Constantinople to the Turks. His coverage of the Greek Revolution and the events that lead up to the revolution are organized in a similar fashion to Gggle’s and Vrachnou’s texts. However, unlike Gggle’s and Vrachnou’s textbooks, Chorafa ends
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with the Balkan Wars (1912-1913), rather than a section on major events in world history.

Chorafa’s textbook is primarily a history of modern Greece from Ottoman rule to recent events in Greek history. He includes only thirteen pages on Greece under Ottoman Rule. He follows with sections on Greek attempts to spark a revolt outside of Greece. The most interesting section in this part of his book is a section titled, “The French Revolution and the Greeks.” In this section he argues that the French Revolution and the Enlightenment inspired many Greeks to seek independence. Previous textbooks do not credit the French Revolution. This is a major shift from most textbooks of the period, which presented the Greek Revolution as a purely Greek phenomenon.

Chorafa’s next part on the Greek Revolution is almost identical to Gegle’s and Vrachnou’s texts. Like those textbooks, most of the Greek Revolutionary heroes are discussed as well as their roles in the revolution. He follows with the establishment of the Greek monarchy and Greek government, as well as short biography’s of the Greek kings. Where Chorafa’s textbook differs from most textbooks of the period is his section on recent Greek history. Interestingly, included in this section is the Franco-German War of 1870, which leads to the unification of Germany. Such events are important since they impact the modern state of Greece. The Greek kings are related to the royal line of German monarchs. Moreover, good relations with Germany may be in the interest of the
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Greek monarchy and Greek government since Germany is becoming a major power on the continent of Europe.

His next section is titled, “The Balkan Nations and the Russian-Turkish War of 1877.” The war was mainly over Russian attempts to take back territories it had lost in the Crimean War (1853-1856), establish itself again in the Black Sea, and free the remainder of the Balkans from Ottoman control.

The following sections are on the independence of other Balkan nations from the Ottoman Empire. Chorafa begins with Serbian independence in 1830, Montenegrin independence (1878), Romanian independence (1877), and Bulgarian independence (1878). Much of the coverage is on Bulgaria independence and Russian support of Bulgaria. Under the Treaty of San Stefano (1878) a large Bulgarian state was created on the doorstep of Greece. Chorafa describes Bulgaria as a Russian “province” rather than a free state. For a few years, Bulgaria would serve as a Russian foothold in the Balkans. However, under the treaty of Berlin, Thrace which was incorporated into the new Bulgarian state was later made autonomous by the great powers for fear that a large Bulgaria would shift the balance of power in the region. It is evident in this section that Bulgaria is slowly becoming a threat to Greece and that these new nations in the Balkans are competing with Greece for territories not yet liberated from the Ottoman Empire. Territories such as Macedonia, Epirus, and Thrace are suggested to be Greek.
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His following section is on “Greek Involvement in the War of 1885.”\textsuperscript{162} The War of 1885 began under a dispute between Bulgaria over Bulgaria’s annexation of the city of Plovdiv. The annexation went against the terms of the Treaty of Berlin signed some seven year earlier by most of the Balkan states. Both Greece and Serbia opposed Bulgaria’s annexation of the territory because it would strengthen Bulgaria in the Balkans.\textsuperscript{163} In the fall of 1885 Serbia declared war on Bulgaria. Greece did not formally enter the war with Serbia, but supported the Serbian campaign. In the end, much to the chagrin of Serbia and Greece, Serbia was defeated and Bulgaria maintained the territory. The War of 1885 is a pre-cursor to the Balkan Wars (1912-1913). It is obvious from the textbook that Greece’s relations with Bulgaria are becoming tense and Greece is seeking to ally with Serbia.

Chorafa’s next section is on the “Greek and Turkish War of 1887.”\textsuperscript{164} The war was fought over the status of the island of Crete, which officially remained part of the Ottoman Empire, but was ambitiously recruited by Greece. Chorafa’s reasons for Greek intervention against the Ottoman Empire is described as attempt to protect the Greek population of the island after the “…Turko-Cretes [Turkish Population of Crete] slaughtered a number of Greeks.”\textsuperscript{165} After the war the island of Crete becomes

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{162}Ibid., 103-104.
\item \textsuperscript{163}M. Lascaris, “Greece and Serbia in the War of 1885,” \textit{Slavonic and Eastern European Studies} (University College London, 1932).
\item \textsuperscript{164}Chorafa, \textit{Istoria tis Neas Ellados}, 104-105.
\item \textsuperscript{165}Ibid., 104.
\end{itemize}
autonomous. The war is not described as a failure for Greece, but a success since Crete would join Greece in 1908.

Chorafa’s next section is titled “Antagonisms of Balkan Nations Over Macedonia and the Young Turk Revolution.” Macedonian becomes a contested issue in much of the early 20th century. Bulgaria, Serbia, and Greece are all vying for control of the region. The Greek state sees the territory as belonging to Greece since it fits within the framework of Greek history and identity. Chorafa’s first line of this section best describes Greece’s position on Macedonia: “Macedonia since ancient times was Greek.” After the Young Turk revolution of 1908, the Turkish government’s paramount stance on the Macedonian question was to maintain the territory by strengthening the Muslim element in the region. The question of Macedonia and its status remained unresolved until after the Balkan Wars, when Greece took control of much of the region.

Chorafa’s following section is on the revolt in Greece in 1909 more commonly known as the “Goudi Coup.” The Goudi Coup was a military *coup d'état* that took place in Athens in 1909. The coup resulted in the appointment of Eleutherios Venizelos as prime minister.

---

166Ibid., 105-107.

167Ibid., 105.
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Chorafa’s final sections are on the Balkan Wars (1912-1913).\textsuperscript{169} The first Balkan War broke out in 1912 when the Balkan League, which was composed of Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia, and Montenegro attacked Turkey. The league managed to push Turkey out of much of the Balkans and take control of its former territories in the region. The second Balkan War broke out in 1913, over Bulgaria’s displeasure over the territories it was awarded after the first Balkan Wars. Bulgaria attacked her former allies Serbia and Greece, and Romania and Turkey intervened against Bulgaria seeking to take parts of Bulgarian territory. In the end, Greece and Serbia were successful against Bulgaria. Greece was able to significantly increase its territory. A large part of Macedonia and Southern Epirus were awarded to Greece after the war. Greece’s dream of incorporating those ancient Greek territories into the modern state of Greece was quickly becoming a reality.

Although Byzantine history found the least amount of attention in most of the Greek history textbooks from 1880-1913, this period of history served as a bridge between ancient Greece and Modern Greece. Most of the Greek authored textbooks on Byzantine history did this by casting the Byzantine Empire as being purely Greek. On the other hand, textbook writers from 1834-1880, such as Thomas Keightly, Oliver Golsmith, and Levi Alvarez had presented the Byzantines as non-Greeks.

The Greek Revolution on the other hand gains more and more popularity from 1880-1913. Few of the textbooks from 1834-1880 make any mention of the Greek Revolution. Even though most of the textbooks on the Greek Revolution begin with

\footnote{\textsuperscript{169}Ibid., 110-119.}
Ottoman rule, they are limited in their historical coverage. The time period from 1453-1821 is broadly cast as a time of Greek oppression at the hands of the Ottoman Turks. On the other hand, significant coverage is provided on the Greek Revolution. We also find that the Greek Revolution is connected to ancient Greek history. Figures from the Revolution are sometimes compared to ancient Greek figures; battles from the Revolution are at times associated with famous battles from ancient Greece, and modern Greek identity if often lined to the ancient Greek past.

**Summary**

History textbooks are among the most important mechanisms in shaping a national identity and historical awareness. This was the case in Greece from 1834-1913. While Greek history textbooks were imported from other countries between 1834-1880 (as was examined in the previous chapter), by 1880 Greek textbooks were written by Greek authorship. This chapter delved into the textbooks produced from 1880-1913. A selection of textbooks were analyzed in detail each coming from this period. The textbooks from this period looked at Greek history as one continuous history from past to present covering the major historical periods, Ancient, Medieval/Byzantine, and Modern Greek history. Specifically this chaptered explored: 1) how the Greek past is tied to the Modern Greek identity, 2) which individuals, groups or historical events seem to be consistent in the Greek textbooks, and 3) how changes in the social, political, and economic structure of society impacted they way textbooks were written.
CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

Nations are not something eternal. They began, so they will come to an end. A European confederation will probably replace them. Such, however, is not the law of the century we are living in. At present time, the existence of nations is good, even necessary. Their existence is a guarantee of freedom, which would be lost if the world had only one law one master.

--Ernest Renan

Greek History and the Location of a Greek National Identity

This project explored the ways in which the teaching of Greek history in Greek schools assisted in the development of a Greek national identity. The years this project covered 1834 to 1913 were significant because they were a time of major social, political, and cultural change in the state of Greece that ultimately led to the formation of a modern Greek national identity.

A major focus of this project was exploring the contingencies which led to a modern Greek identity. In contrast to most 19th century European national narratives, (whose national identities were mostly developed around contemporary indigenous models) Greece looked to its ancient past when constructing its own notion of what it meant to be Greek. Unlike Greece, most European nations such as Germany, France, and Spain, developed their national identities by looking for those cultural traditions and
practices that were common to their societies. This was a very different approach from Greece, because these nations did not necessarily need to look for answers of who they were in their distant pasts. What they used instead was their local literary, artistic, religious, and folklore traditions—practices and traditions that their societies were familiar with.

As discussed in this project, Greek claims to an ancient Greek past did not at first go unnoticed. Jakob Philipp Fallmerayer (1790-1861) challenged Greek and European claims of a modern Greek link to ancient Greece. Fallmerayer asserted that there were few similarities between the modern Greeks and the ancient Greeks, because an ancient Greek population had been replaced by a Slavic-speaking population sometime in the 10th century ACE.

To complicate matters, just prior to the Greek Revolution (1821) most Greeks did not necessarily see themselves as being part of a broader community that shared a common historical past. Rather, they saw themselves as being part of a kin, a local or regional community and/or part of a religious community. Moreover, skeptics of modern Greek cultural links to ancient Greece often asserted that the modern Greeks were culturally different from the ancient Greeks and that the two cultures varied in not just language and religion, but also in the ways that the two societies viewed themselves and the world around them.

---

Despite all this, during the Greek Revolution (1821-1830), most of western Europe accepted a modern Greek cultural and historical link to ancient Greece. Eric Hobsbawm and Terrence Ranger found that the modern Greeks are probably one of the few people in the world who did not need to invent or reinvent their own history and traditions on their own.\(^2\) For the most part, a type of Greek national identity already existed in western Europe. This identity was later imported into Greece in the early 19\(^{th}\) century. Constantine Tsoukalas asserts,

> As a direct ideographic side product of a consciously modernizing Europe in search of its classical origins, “Greekness” referred to a semantic heritage that concerned the whole civilized world.\(^3\)

As suggested by Tsoukalas, when projected onto modern Greece, this type of identity connected modern Greece to ancient Greece.

Supporting this belief were popular 19\(^{th}\) century European artistic and literary representations of Greece. Eugene Delacroix’s *Scenes de Massacres de Scio* (1824), *La Grèce sur les Ruins de Missolonghi* (1826), and Revault’s drawing *Reveil de la Grèce* (1821) symbolically suggested that there was a modern Greek connection to classical Greece. Similarly, prominent romantic writers and poets of the period such as George Byron and Percy Bysshe Shelley often referred to the modern Greeks as the “heirs of the ancient Greeks.”

Also influential were Greeks living outside of Ottoman Greece. Adamandios Koraes, Rigas Velestinlis, and a number of wealthy Greek families living in Europe and


Ottoman Turkey were also responsible in projecting a national identity onto Greece. As such, using Greece as a political and cultural blueprint, Europe and a number of Greek elites (re)created the classical Greek world in the form of modern Greece by advocating the creation of the modern state of Greece.

According to several scholars, there were three reasons for this: first, Greece (as an imagined community) gave a birthplace to western European civilization and culture, second Greece supported Europe’s geopolitical interests in the Balkans, and third a free state of Greece championed prevailing European notions of a superior European culture.\(^4\)

By the mid-19th century the Greek state supported the creation of a national history that considered the ancient Greek past. It was believed that such a history could be used effectively in convincing a Greek public that they were the heirs of the ancient Greeks.

From the perspective of the Greek state, a Greek identity with links to ancient Greece would help support several of its national goals. First, it would unite a Greek public around a common identity based on a shared historical and cultural space. Second, it would legitimize the existence of the state of Greece, and third it would advance Greek territorial claims in the Balkans. Using Paparrigopoulos’s historical template of one continuous Greek history from past to present, the Greek state set forth to unite its citizenry around a common historical experience.

---

Constantine Paparrigopoulos (1815-1891) took on the task of developing a Greek national history. In his *History of the Greek Nation* (1860-1877), Paparrigopoulos was successful in making Greek history appear as one continuous history from past to present. Equally important was that Paparrigopoulos was able to link ancient Greek history, language, and geography within the framework of a modern Greek identity. Ioannis Koubourlis describes Paparrigopoulos’s history

...as transforming itself into something else, everytime that it moves to a different geographical terrain or historical era, and this in order to accomplish each time a different historical mission, without, nevertheless, losing its one and only identity. \(^5\)

According to Kourboulis, although Paparrigopoulos’s historical focus may have often shifted, it still remained pure with respect to maintaining a conception of a Greek history and identity from past to present. In other words, Paparrigopoulos’s history was able to connect ancient and modern Greek history by presenting it as one unbroken national history.

However, even prior to Paparrigopoulos’s work, after the formation of a Greek national school system and universal education in Greece in 1834, an idealized modern Greek identity was constructed that specifically intended to pin down an exclusive and original Greek historical past.

More importantly, a modern Greek identity was shaped mainly through the Greek school and the crafting of a Greek national history—both of which sought to link the modern Greek individual to the culture and history of ancient Greece.

---

\(^5\) Ioannis Koubourlis, “European historiographical influences upon the young Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos,” in Roderick Beaton and David Ricks eds., *The Making of Modern Greece* (Center for Hellenic Studies, 2009), 61.
Findings

The primary research in this project came from Greek history textbooks that were used in elementary and middle schools from 1834 to 1913. Specifically this project addressed how these textbooks connected modern Greece to ancient Greece and the process by which the Greek school magnified a notion of one continuous Greek history from ancient Greece to modern Greece. The textbooks analyzed in this project were a cross-section of Greek history textbooks that were published between 1834 and 1913.

From 1834 to 1913 the teaching of Greek history, Greek language, and geography in schools became essential handmaidens for the creation of a Greek national identity. The three subjects, which examined the nation from multiple dimensions, broadly characterized as *patriognosis* (knowledge about the nation/fatherland), emphasized loyalty to the Greek state, common brotherhood and bloodlines, and unity amongst the Greek people. All the subjects were used in an effort to construct a Greek national identity and unite a Greek public around a common cultural and historical experience. Even though all three subjects were effective in shaping a Greek national identity, the subject of history was given the most attention in schools.⁶

This project found that the production of Greek history textbooks and the teaching of Greek history could be divided into two periods. The first occurred between 1834 and 1880. This period could be described as “Borrowed Greek history.” The second occurred between 1880 and 1913. This period could be described as “Greek Authored History.”

The two periods differed significantly both in terms of the textbooks’ historical content and the way that Greek history was presented.

It was discovered in this project that from 1834 to 1880 Greek history was at first primarily imported from western Europe. The first Greek history textbooks were written by west Europeans and were originally intended for students in western Europe. Later they were translated into Greek and used in the Greek schools. Popularly used history textbooks from this period were William Mitford’s *Ancient Greek History for Use in Schools* (1836); Oliver Goldsmith’s *History of Greece* (1849); J.R. Lamè Fluery’s *Greek History for Children* (1860); and Thomas Keightly’s *History of Ancient Greece for Use in Schools* (1850).

This project also found that these textbooks almost exclusively covered ancient Greece. Few of these textbooks included histories of modern Greece. It appears that initially, these textbooks were chosen for use in the Greek schools because of the reverence they showed for the ancient Greek past and the ways they glorified major figures and events from that past. At the same time, Greek translators believed that this type of history could be easily tied to a modern Greek identity. This was evident in some of the introductions of the translated textbooks when translators compared ancient and modern Greek geography.\(^7\)

---

Generally speaking, most of these early textbooks did not make a viable historical connection to modern Greece because they only covered mostly ancient Greek history. Some of the textbooks even challenged modern Greek claims to the Greek past. This was evident in Thomas Keightly’s *History of Ancient Greece* (1873) when he described Philip II and ancient Macedonia as a “foreign empire.” In other words, Philip II and ancient Macedonia were presented as not being Greek. Similarly, other histories presented the Pelasgians and Dorians as non-Greeks. This was evident in Lamè Fleury, *L’Histoire Grecque Racontée aux Enfants* (1860) and Oliver Goldsmith *History of Greece* (1840).

This project found that a major shift in the production and teaching of Greek history began to occur around 1880. Between 1880 and 1913 Greek history became purely Greek both in its historical content and national authorship. In most of the textbooks from this period, ancient Greek, Byzantine/ Medieval, and Modern Greek history were presented as one national history that moved seamlessly through time, as one unbroken national history.

Having in mind a Greek audience, Greek-authored textbooks on ancient Greece from 1880 to 1913 became far more personal and political than previous textbooks. In most of the textbooks Greek history was presented as one continuous history from ancient past to present. Moreover, the Greek-authored textbooks considered the Greek

---


student’s daily life, his or her personal experiences, as well as the physical and natural environment in which he or she lived.

Evidence of this was found in Theodorou N. Apostolopoulou’s *Greek History for Elementary Student* (1883) when the author compared the ancient Greek traitor Ephialtes to Judas, and the ancient Greek philosopher Socrates to Jesus. 11 Such comparisons attempted to connect the Greek student to ancient Greece by considering the students’ Christian tradition.

In another textbook, students learned how Greece was composed of “trees that look like this,” “flowers that look like that,” “all Greek towns have churches and squares,” “rivers, mountains, lakes, forest, and hills are found in Greece,” and so on.12 In other words, by the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the Greek student could better connect to the people, places, and events found in the textbooks and develop a strong sense of how Greek history was connected to his or her own life.

Other textbooks attempted to connect the student to ancient Greece by often highlighting the importance of bravery, patriotism, sacrifice, honor, and loyalty, values that were often commonly associated with both ancient and modern Greece. This was evident in A.A. Papandreous’s 1893 Greek history textbook. The authors said,

Our ancestors through their genius and their heroic actions managed to

---


impress humanity. Their character, sacrifices, military success, bravery and their patriotism is even popular among the civilized world today.13

Furthermore, Papandreou connects the Greek student to ancient Greece by referring to the ancient Greeks as ancestors of the modern Greeks.

Moreover unlike the textbooks from 1834 to 1880, in the Greek-authored textbooks, ancient Greek history was presented as being purely Greek and connected to modern Greek history. In other words, historical figures that had previously been cast as non-Greek were now being presented as Greek. This was evident in the case of Philip II and Alexander the Great when most of the Greek textbooks from 1880 to 1913 were presenting these figures as Greeks.

Also significant was that the Greek nation was presented as a unified Greek nation since ancient times. This type of historical presentation gave the Greek student the impression that a unified Greek nation had always existed and that Greek history and culture was superior to all other cultures.

In the case of Byzantine/Medieval history, this period of history served as a cultural bridge between ancient and modern Greece. At first, Greek textbook writers struggled in finding a place for Byzantine history within the broader framework of Greek history. Moreover, many textbook writers were divided on the cultural identity of the Byzantine Empire. In many of the textbooks the empire was referred to as Roman or Byzantine, while others described it as Greek and Hellenic. This project found that by the late 19th century many of the Greek authored textbooks on Byzantine/Medieval

history were in almost unanimous consensus that the Byzantine Empire was Greek. This was achieved by presenting it as a Greek empire that shared a common language, religion, and history to modern Greece.

Similarly, the Greek Revolution was presented as being linked to both ancient and Byzantine history. This was achieved by comparing figures from the Greek Revolution to figures from ancient and Byzantine Greece, such as in Vlasiou K. Skopelí’s textbook (1885) which compares the ancient Spartan figure Leonidas to the modern Greek revolutionary hero Theodoros Kolokotronis.\(^{14}\) In other textbooks, Dionysios Solomós’s *Hymn to Liberty*, which appears in many of the textbooks from 1880 to 1913, symbolically represents a reawaking of ancient and Byzantine Greece in the form of modern Greece.

Moreover, in many of the textbooks battles from the Greek Revolution were sometimes associated with famous battles from ancient Greece. For example, Georgiou Gegle’s *History of the Greek Nation* (1903) likens Athanasios Diako’s loss to the Turks in Thermopylae in 1821 ACE to Leonidas’s loss to the Persians in 480 BCE.\(^{15}\)

Even though attempts were made by textbook writers to connect ancient Greece to modern Greece, Greek history from 1880 to 1913 was still not entirely “indigenously” Greek. It was influenced by major European and world events and many of the textbooks as Georgiou Gegle’s textbook *History of the Greek Nation* (1903); Nicholaou I. Vrachou’s *History of the Greek Nation* (1906); and Antoniou N. Chorafa’s *History of...*  

\(^{14}\) Vlasiou G. Skopeli, *Alphabitarion kai Anagnosmatarion* (Athens, 1885).

Ancient Greece (1913), included sections on contemporary events that were impacting Greece.\textsuperscript{16}

In most of these textbooks we find sections on the rise of the Greek monarchy and the line of succession of Greek kings to the present. We also find sections on the Balkan Wars (1912 and 1913). These historical themes seem to crop up in the textbooks while the events are unfolding and/or immediately after they occurred. In this way, Greek history and Greece was being advanced as “new” history was added into the Greek textbook.\textsuperscript{17}

Looking to the Future

Between 1834 and 1913 the Greek state was successful in creating a Greek nation based on the notion of modern Greek links to ancient Greece. However, in the midst of achieving this goal, several minority groups were permanently silenced. This project found that in many of the Greek textbooks between 1834 and 1913 there was no mention of minority groups such as the Albanians, Slavs, and Vlachs. In some cases, some of these groups are in fact mentioned and named but are described as being Greek. For example, the Souliotes, who were an Albanian speaking group that was active during the Greek Revolution, were presented in many of the Greek textbooks as being purely Greek, with no mention of their Albanian speaking. On the other hand, religious minority groups as Jews and Muslims were almost never mentioned, which suggested that all of


\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.
Greece was Christian. Similarly, minority groups such as the Vlachs and Slavs were also almost non-existent in many of the textbooks suggesting that Greece was an “ethnically” pure state. Eventually over the twentieth-century these ethnic and religious minority groups did in fact drop most of their traditional cultural practices and became Greek.

The Greek school and Greek history also assisted in helping Greece expand its territory in the Balkans. Because of Greece’s historic links to ancient Greece, Greece was able to claim territory that had not been Greek for more than two thousand years. In most instances this came at the expense of other nations. In many of the Greek textbooks, several nations were cast as enemies of Greece so as to support Greek expansionist goals and unite the Greek people around a common enemy.

Nonetheless, Greek irredentism and the Megali Idea came to a screeching halt after Greece’s unsuccessful military campaign in 1922 when Greece attempted to annex Asia Minor from modern Turkey. Ultimately, the Greek military disaster at Asia Minor forced the Greek state to put an end to its expansionist policy.

However, prior to this, between 1834 and 1913 there was a sense of optimism in Greece. The Greek people were no longer under the yoke of the Ottoman Empire. They, on the other hand, had finally become free after 400 years of Ottoman occupation. The Greek people were also becoming united around a common historical past and developing a sense of pride for their history and nation. Greece was also growing more and more powerful as it was claiming new lands and territories, expanding its borders and resituating once displaced Greek speaking groups back into the Greek state. The Greek people were also looking forward to the future and what it had to offer. All this however
could not be achieved if Greece had not resurrected its ancient past in its schools. As this project found, by 1913 a Greek identity is constructed in schools. The Greek nation would take pride in its past. For many modern Greeks, they were who their ancestors were, and once again became what their ancestors had been.

**Implications**

Greek educational history from 1834-1913 provides a particularly striking case study that elucidates the ways in which schools and the teaching of history help in developing a national identity. As such, the present study of Greek history textbooks has a number of significant implications for historians of education who study the teaching of history and the writing of history textbooks in the 19th and 20th centuries.

First, for scholars not interested in modern Greece, a study such as this one could be applied to other nations. There has been extensive scholarship on how historical narratives and reasoning about a nation’s “past” have been (selectively) drawn upon in school textbooks and in the projects of fashioning national citizens through schools. However, not all researchers have examined how antiquity or ancient history is or isn’t present in 19th and 20th-century schoolbook national histories. The research could be extended to a discussion of how archeological findings are co-opted (or resisted) in the national histories presented in school textbooks. For example it could be interesting to study how the country of Iran changed the way it taught ancient Persian history after the Iranian Revolution (1979). It would also be worthwhile for scholars to explore the teaching of history in Israeli schools and how ancient Jewish/Israeli history in connected
to a modern Jewish/Israeli identity or even how ancient Egyptian history is being presented in modern Egypt.

Further inquiry is needed on why certain nations deliberately exclude parts of their history from their textbooks. More broadly, what are the reasons behind why some nations have decided to “leave-in” or “leave-out” certain parts of history from their textbooks and what are the social, cultural, and political implications for such a decision?

This project also found that during the 19th and early 20th centuries, Greek history textbooks and the presentation of Greek history was often used to unite the Greek people around a common enemy. The Ottoman Empire was often presented as an oppressive regime that was mostly interested in converting the Greek nation into Islam. In many of the Greek history textbooks, this period of Greek history (1453-1821) was summed up as *Greece Under Slavery* (Σκλαβομένη Ελλάδα). Other nations have used traditional enemies and/or created enemies so as to unite their people. How have other nations portrayed their traditional enemies? What was the process by which and what factors have led other nations to create an enemy? More generally, how have neighboring nations historically portrayed one another are questions that could lead to further research on the ways that specific nations use their national histories and history textbooks to unite their people.

The ways that new nations and those that have gone through drastic political change reconsider their past is another topic that may warrant further inquiry. Are nations like Albania welcoming an Albanian national identity that dates back to the
ancient Illyrians? Similarly, will nations like the Republic of Macedonia be able to construct a Macedonian national identity using a Slavic and/or ancient Macedonian history or will they look to claim an exclusive ancient Macedonian past. How will nations in Europe that are uniting under the umbrella of a broader national identity be able to maintain their local national identities while adopting a common European identity? Finally, how are these nations and other nations around the world presenting their histories so to maintain their national identities?

**Limitations**

As with any study, this study had its set of challenges and limitations. The most obvious is that I did not have the ability to walk into a history classroom within the respective time examined and investigate what actually students were learning in the classroom. A first-hand account on the methods in teaching Greek history would have added to this project’s overall perspective. However, this would have been impossible.

Moreover, it would be dishonest to say that all teachers have always followed the curriculum mandated to them by their schools and governments. Most teachers today would acknowledge that they sometimes stray away from the curriculum, choosing instead to spend more time on those topics they find most interesting. Thus, it is difficult to know for certain what teachers actually covered and what additional resources they brought into their classrooms so as to enhance student learning. In any case, if such information does exist it could assist this project’s overall research.

Primary and secondary sources are also always important for any historical study. An attempt was made to find as many of these sources as possible during the course of
my research. My research expanded beyond the borders of Greece and the United States as I discovered the existence of number of sources published in France, Germany, and Romania. Ultimately these sources assisted in the completion of this project, but I am also aware that more such sources likely exist. As such yet discovered sources may offer new insight to my project.
APPENDIX A

KORAES AND VELESTINLIS VISIONS OF A GREEK EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language of Instruction:</th>
<th>Koraes</th>
<th>Velestinlis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Middle Way”: Between Koine Greek and Demotic Greek</td>
<td>Need for a literary tradition</td>
<td>Demotic. Mandatory teaching of Ancient Greek. Teaching of French and Italian.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Organization: | | |
|---------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Centralized, Free and public Universal elementary education | Based on French/Prussian Models Non-Secular. Considers religion and Church role in schools. Believes more schools are needed in rural areas. |
| Based on French/Prussian Models Secular in Orientation. Considers Pestalozian and Fellenberg experimental models on education. Considers vocational and professional training. | |

| School Composition: | Mostly Homogenous Greek Speakers State would include most areas where Greek speakers are found. | Heterogeneous and inclusive to other groups including Muslims. Free representation for all groups, but Greek speakers would be dominant. Large Balkan State would include all groups that were Orthodox Christian. |

| Teaching: | Professional schools to train teachers Considers the teaching of ancient Greek History. | Focus on literacy and teaching of ancient Greek History. No mention on the training of teachers. |

APPENDIX B

NUMBER OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN GREECE: 1833-1910
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>National Population</th>
<th>Primary Schools</th>
<th>Hellenic Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>751,000</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>968,988</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1,005,966</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1,053,515</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>1,089,886</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>1,375,043</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1,440,920</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1,528,298</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1,679,470</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>2,187,208</td>
<td>2278</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>2,504,070</td>
<td>3334</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>2,594,761</td>
<td>3504</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>2,684,090</td>
<td>3678</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C

GDP PER CAPITA IN SELECTED EUROPEAN COUNTRIES: 1820-1913
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1820</th>
<th>1870</th>
<th>1913</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>3,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>2,697</td>
<td>4,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>3,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>1,821</td>
<td>3,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1,707</td>
<td>3,191</td>
<td>4,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greece</strong></td>
<td><strong>666</strong></td>
<td><strong>913</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,592</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX D

ILLITERACY RATES IN SELECTED EUROPEAN COUNTRIES: 1900-1913
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Population in millions (1913)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX E

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS IN SELECTED BALKAN COUNTRIES: 1891-1905
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX F

HISTORY TEXTBOOKS AND AUTHORS: 1880-1913
### Sample: Greek History Textbooks and Authors (1880-1913)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Textbook</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.A. Sakellarios</td>
<td><em>Greek History from Ancient Times to Today</em></td>
<td>1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodoros Apostolopoulos</td>
<td><em>The Rebirth of Greece in 1821</em></td>
<td>1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Zachariadis</td>
<td><em>History of Rome and Byzantium</em></td>
<td>1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Vlouzou et.al.</td>
<td><em>History of Ancient Greece</em></td>
<td>1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Paparrousi</td>
<td>History of Ancient Greece</td>
<td>1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th. Venizelos A. Spathakis</td>
<td><em>Roman and Byzantine History</em></td>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgios Ggle</td>
<td><em>History of the Greek Nation</em></td>
<td>1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolaou Vrachnou</td>
<td><em>History of the Greek Nation</em></td>
<td>1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolaou Vrachnou</td>
<td><em>History of Ancient Greece</em></td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonious Chorafa</td>
<td><em>History of Ancient Greece for 4th Grade</em></td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in the table in Table 12, Greek historians authored most of the history textbooks used in the Greek schools between 1880 and 1913. The table is merely a small sample of textbooks from 1880-1913. According to this sample, one finds three textbooks that cover all of Greek history, one textbook specifically on Greek revolutionary history, two textbooks on Roman and Byzantine history, and three textbooks on ancient Greek history.
APPENDIX G

LIST OF TEXTBOOKS ANALYZED IN CHAPTER SIX
Apostolopoulos, Theodoros, N. *Greek History: For Use of Students in the Elementary School*. Athens. In Greek (1883).


APPENDIX H

GLOSSARY OF TERMS
Since the reader may not be familiar with all terms or phrases used in this study, a reference of terms and phrases in listed below to help enrich the reader’s interpretation and understanding. The following terms are mentioned in this study.

*Agrioi:* Greek for those that are “wild” or “uncivilized”.

*Anagnorisis:* translates to recognition. Refers to recognition of private education in Greece.

*Anastasis:* Translates from Greek to mean “resurrection”. Often used in religious terms in Greece to identify the resurrection of Jesus during Easter.

*Armatoli:* See also klephts. Means “those that are armed” are also referred to as klephts during Ottoman Greek times. The armatoli were Greek bandits who fought against the Ottoman Empire during the Greek Revolution.

*Arvanites:* is an ethnic group in Greece who speak Arvanitka, a sub-linguistic branch of Tosk Albanian. They have traditionally identified themselves as being Greek.

*Berbatiotes:* Arvanite name for the residents of Prosymni in Greece. It is not certain where the term originates.

*Bey:* Turkish for a provincial governor of the Ottoman Empire.

*Bildung:* German term that could probably best translate as the process of spiritual growth or the inner formation that a human being could attain beyond the formal setting of education. The term is much more comprehensive than just “education”. It is above all, and encompasses all.

*Charta:* Greek for “map”.

---

*Agrioi:* Greek for those that are “wild” or “uncivilized”.

*Anagnorisis:* translates to recognition. Refers to recognition of private education in Greece.

*Anastasis:* Translates from Greek to mean “resurrection”. Often used in religious terms in Greece to identify the resurrection of Jesus during Easter.

*Armatoli:* See also klephts. Means “those that are armed” are also referred to as klephts during Ottoman Greek times. The armatoli were Greek bandits who fought against the Ottoman Empire during the Greek Revolution.

*Arvanites:* is an ethnic group in Greece who speak Arvanitka, a sub-linguistic branch of Tosk Albanian. They have traditionally identified themselves as being Greek.

*Berbatiotes:* Arvanite name for the residents of Prosymni in Greece. It is not certain where the term originates.

*Bey:* Turkish for a provincial governor of the Ottoman Empire.

*Bildung:* German term that could probably best translate as the process of spiritual growth or the inner formation that a human being could attain beyond the formal setting of education. The term is much more comprehensive than just “education”. It is above all, and encompasses all.

*Charta:* Greek for “map”.
Demotic: A variety of the Modern Greek language that means, “language of the people”. It is thought to have evolved naturally from the ancient Greek to the Modern Greek.

Diaspora: In this projects context, it refers to the dispersion of Greek identity outside of Greece.

Didaskali: teachers or scholars.

Douia: Slavery.

Ethnos: Greek for “nationality”.

Foustanela: Nineteenth century Greek highland kilt.

Graikoi: originally Latin term that means “Greek”.

Great Man Theory: a historical approach that explains looks at the past through the accomplishments of individual and heroes.

Greek Theory: Attributed to Jakob Phillip Fallmerayer. Fallmerayer’s Greek Theory argued that Slavic speaking peoples had replaced most of the Greek population in Greece and that the Modern Greeks were truly the descendants of Slavic peoples and not the ancient Greeks.

Gymnasia: Division of the Greek elementary schools that included the final years of elementary school study.

Hellenic Schools: In Greek “Hellinika Scholia”. The Hellenic Schools were a division of the Greek elementary schools that included the first years of elementary study.

Hellinismos: Translates from Greek to “Hellenism”.

Hipodouli: Under Slavery.
**Historicism:** The natural succession of developments and how those developments help impact latter time.

**Kambos:** agricultural plain.

**Katharevousa:** Literally translates to “purified Greek”. It is a form of the Modern Greek language advocated by Adamandios Koræs. It is often interpreted to be a midpoint between the Ancient and Modern Greek.

**Klepht:** See also *armatoli*. Originally means “thieves”. In Ottoman Greece klephts were Greek bandits and warlike people who were fleeing Ottoman capture for their crimes i.e. unpaid taxes, looting, outstanding debts etc. Eventually they would actively participate in the Greek War of Independence.

**Koine:** Means “common Greek”. It is said to have emerged after the classical period and language used by the Greek Orthodox Church.

**Krifo Scholio:** Refers to hidden or secret schools that were supposedly housed in churches and monasteries during the Ottoman Greek period. Greek language and Christian doctrine was taught at the schools to young Greek children.

**Lebensraum:** German for “natural living space”. Originally used as a slogan in Germany referring to the unification of Germany and the acquisition of land by Germany to accommodate its growing population.

*l'histoire événementielle:* “eventual history” a type of historical method that refers the short term study of history that is usually by the historical chronicle or journalist.
*Longue durée:* the “long term” first used by the French Annales School of historical writing to describe a methodological approach in history that gives priority to long term historical structures.

*Megali Idea:* the “Grand Idea” or “Grand Idea”. Was an iridescent concept in Greece expressed in Greek foreign policy for most of the 19th and 20th century that advocated for the expansion of Greek territory into areas occupied by Greek speakers.

*Neo-Hellenes:* Greek term that refers to people in the 14th and 15th century who were interested in reviving ancient Greek culture.

*Oikogenia:* Greek word for “family”.

*Paidomazoma:* The rounding up of Greek children towards the end of the Greek Civil War by Greek communists. Families gave some of the children away while the communists had kidnapped other children to take with them. The children were sent to communist nations such as Albania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Poland, Czechoslovakia and the Ukraine.

*Palingenesia:* Its literal translation is “rebirth”. It is often used to refer to Greek independence.

*Patriognosis:* Literally translates from Greek as “knowledge about the nation”. I argue that in this project that for most of the nineteenth and early twentieth century as one of its main objectives schools intended to make students aware of the nation. This was reflected within the school curriculum with the teaching of history, geography and Greek language.

*Patriotis:* In Greek means “From the same nation” or “from the same community.”
Periodization: Historical term that refers the categorization of time into historical blocks or segments. The Modern Greek historian Constantine Paparrigopoulos to help categorize Greek history used the approach of periodization.

Perivalon: Greek term that means “physical environment”. It was also an important component in the teaching of physical geography in the Greek school system.

Phanatiotes: Greek term that refers to members of prominent Greek families residing in the Phanar district of Constantinople. Several historians argue that the phanariotes were actively involved in Greece’s struggle for independence from the Ottoman Empire.

Philiki Eteria: Translates to “Society of Friends” and was a secret 19th century organization, who sought to overthrow the Ottoman Empire and establish a free state of Greece.

Philotimo: Greek term that translates to “love of honor”. Philotimo was often taught in the Greek school system as a proper way of behaving in one’s community.

Philoxenia: Greek for “hospitality”.

Politismos: Greek for “civilization”.

Porte: Means “Gate”. The term was used in the context of diplomacy by western nations when their diplomats were received at the “porte” in Constantinople.

Progonoplixia: Literally translate from Greek to “obsession with the past”. It is often used my Michael Hertzfeld to explain Modern Greeks obsession with the ancient Greek past.
Prosimiotes: (see also Berbatiotes) Name given to those from the town of Prosymni in Greece.

Rum (Turkish) or Romoe (Greek): Means “Roman”. During Ottoman times it was an inclusive term used to identify anyone that was a Greek Orthodox Christian.

Sklavomeni Ellada: “Greece Under Slavery”. Often used to describe Greece’s occupation by the Ottoman Empire.

Souliotes: A warlike Albanian speaking and Christian Orthodox group that inhabited the region of Thresprotia in Western Epirus in Greece. They are remembered for their resistance against the local Ottoman ruler Ali Pasha.

Tosk: A dialect of Albanian spoken mostly in southern Albania.

Ypourgio Paideas kai Thriskias: Greek Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs.

Varvaroi: Greek word for “barbarians”. In ancient times the term applied to all those who did not speak Greek.

Vlachs: Also referred to Aromanians and Walachians is a Latin speaking peoples whose language most resembles modern day Romanian. They are found to live in several parts of Greece.
APPENDIX I

CHRONOLOGY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1204</td>
<td>Capture of Constantinople During Fourth Crusade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1204-1261</td>
<td>Latin Byzantine Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1261-1453</td>
<td>Plaleologos Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355</td>
<td>Gemistos Plethon born, died in 1452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1453</td>
<td>Fall of Constantinople</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1454</td>
<td>Gennadios Scholarius appointed Patriarch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>Kirillos II Loukaris begins major education reforms at the Great School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Adamandios Koraes is born, died in 1833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td>Rigas Velenstinlis born, died in 1798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>Orlov Revolt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802</td>
<td>Lord Elgin removes friezes from the Parthenon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>Constantine Paparrigopoulos born, died in 1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Beginning of the Greek War of Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Dionysios Solomos write the <em>Hymn to Liberty</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>Ioannis Kapodistrias becomes fist president of Greece fledgling Greek state, assassinated in 1833.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>Otto of Bavaria arrives as the first king of Greece. First Greek schools opened in a free state of Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>Ioannis Koletis proclaims the Grand Idea. First constitution established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Ottoman Empire cedes Thessaly and parts of Epirus to Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912-1913</td>
<td>Balkan Wars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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