

TOLMIROS SKAPANEAS
HOMENAJE AL PROFESOR
KOSTAS A. DIMADIS

ΤΟΛΜΗΡΟΣ ΣΚΑΠΑΝΕΑΣ
ΑΦΙΕΡΩΜΑ ΣΤΟΝ ΚΑΘΗΓΗΤΗ
ΚΩΣΤΑ Α. ΔΗΜΑΔΗ

Edición de
Isabel García Gálvez y Olga Omatos Sáenz



Vitoria-Gasteiz

2012

© DE ESTA EDICIÓN:
Sociedad Hispánica de Estudios Neogriegos
Vitoria-Gasteiz

TÍTULO ORIGINAL:

Isabel García Gálvez-Olga Omatos Sáenz (eds.), *TOLMIROS SKAPANEAS. Homenaje al profesor K. A. Dimadis / ΤΟΛΜΗΡΟΣ ΣΚΑΠΑΝΕΑΣ. Αφιέρωμα στον καθηγητή Κ. Α. Δημάδη*. Vitoria-Gasteiz, Sociedad Hispánica de Estudios Neogriegos, 2012.

COLABORA: *Susana Lugo Mirón*

MAQUETACIÓN: *Isabel García Gálvez y Augusto de Bago*

ISSN: 1137-7003

DEPÓSITO LEGAL: Gr. 82-97

Ninguna parte de esta publicación, incluido el diseño de la portada, puede ser reproducida, almacenada o transmitida por ningún medio, ya sea eléctrico, mecánico, óptico o reprográfico, sin permiso previamente expreso de las editoras.

From Exclusion to Inclusion: The Religious «Other» in Greece of the 1820s and 1830s

Philip Carabott
King's College, London

As with other nineteenth-century successor states in the Balkans, from its inception Greek polity was grounded on the principle of nation-building and the homogenisation of the realm. In a generic sense, homogenisation comprised a series of interconnected processes aiming at reconfiguring political and civil authority along national lines in the name of the Eastern Orthodox Church of Christ and the *genos*. Unsurprisingly, in the early days of the 1820s War of Independence, the exclusion of the religious «other» from the polity and society that the warring factions of the rebels envisaged went hand-in-hand with the victimisation and discrimination of the indigenous Muslim and Jewish element and an innate suspicion and mistrust of the adherents of the Western Church.

As Great Power intervention became pivotal in securing a successful conclusion to the war, the practices associated with the persecution of the heteroreligious «other» came to a halt. In their communication to Governor Kapodistrias of the London Protocol of 3 February 1830, which provided for the establishment of an independent monarchical state and offered the crown to Prince Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, the powers demanded that his government accept, immediately and unconditionally, that henceforth Greek Catholics would worship in full freedom, that their religious and educational establishments would remain intact, and that their

clergymen would enjoy the same «duties, rights, and privileges» as under Ottoman rule. Eager to give Greece fresh evidence of their «sollicitude bienveillance» and shield the nascent state from any mischief arising from the potential rivalry among people of different religious faiths, the powers also decreed that:

152

All subjects of the new State, whatever their religion, will have access to all public institutions, functions and honours, and will be considered equal in all their religious, civil and political relations, regardless of differences in their religious beliefs.¹

Kapodistrias' Senate, however, requested that the powers clarify that the privileges bestowed upon the «Greeks of the Western Church» would not in any way infringe on the status of the Eastern Orthodox Church as the «established religion». Crucially, it also took exception to the principle of equality regardless of creed, specifically with regard to Muslims, and retorted that in such an eventuality «our independence» would be substantially qualified, rhetorically concluding: «And if so, what would the Greek have gained after nine years of bloody strife». With the Turks still holding on to parts of southern Roumeli as well as Athens, the Senate's response evinced a great deal of apprehension lest the sizable Muslim-owned lands that were currently either deserted or taken over by the nascent polity as «national lands» reverted to their previous owners. In response, on 1 July the powers confirmed that the «privileges» granted to Catholics would not «impose» any obligation that «might prejudicially affect the established church», clarifying that «equality of civil and political rights referred specially to [adherents of] the Christian Church».²

Admittedly Christian Europe's alacrity in enshrining the rights of Christian Greek citizens only might be explained by the very small numbers of indigenous Muslims and Jews, mostly in Euboea, who had survived the turmoil of the war and had opted to remain put. Yet, subsequent international treaties pertinent to the session of the Ionian Islands (1864) and Thessaly and part of Epirus (1881), while guaranteeing the religious, political and civil rights of all Christians and Muslims respectively, again failed to

¹ Papers 1835: 186-190, 211-212.

² Protocols 1832: 104, 112.

refer to the Jewish element by name, sizable communities of which resided in the ceded regions. Whereas the 1881 treaty provided that all inhabitants of the ceded territories would «enjoy the same civil and political rights as Hellenic subjects of origin», that of 1864 decreed that the «principle of entire civil and political equality between subjects belonging to different creeds», established by the London Protocol of 1830, «shall be likewise in force in the Ionian Islands». And yet, this principle related «specially» to adherents of the Christian Church. This omission squares well with the powers' unwillingness throughout the long nineteenth century to either issue «universal pronouncements [on] Jewish emancipation [or] elaborate specific minority rights», other than in instances of blatant discrimination against the Jewish element, as for example in Romania.³

153

The conceptual precursors of the politics of exclusion from within are to be found in the provisional constitutions of the revolutionary period. Crucially, all four documents avoided using the term *ιθαγένεια* (citizenship) prior to the conclusion of the war, decreeing that «all indigenous inhabitants of the Realm, who believe in Christ, are Greeks»; and, while «tolerating every other religion» before guaranteeing that «all can practise their religious faith without hindrance», declared as the *επικρατούσα θρησκεία* (established religion) of the realm that of the Eastern Orthodox Church.⁴

The exclusion of the non-Christian indigenous was criticised by the embodiment of the Neohellenic Enlightenment, Adamantios Korais. In his *Notes on the Provisional Constitution of Greece of 1822*, written in 1822-23, he opined thus:

Περί των Ιουδαίων και Τούρκων, ότι και αυτοί είναι Έλληνες το γένος, ως και οι πιστεύοντες εις Χριστόν, ουδεμία αμφιβολία. Αν οι Χριστιανοί τους αποκλείσωσιν από τα πολιτικά δίκαια, έχουν να συγκατοικώσι με δύο έθνη ολόκληρα εχθρά και της θρησκείας και της πολιτείας των. [...] Δια να αποφύγη τον μέγαν τούτον κίνδυνον η πολιτεία, τι έχει να κάμη; Να διώξη μέγα πλήθος ανθρωπών από τον τόπον της γενέσεως και της πολυχρονίου κατοικίας των, εις

³ Wagstaff 2002: 194, 271; Fink 2004: 37.

⁴ Daskalakis 1966-67: I/283, 294, 309-310, 401-402.

ένα λόγον, να εξορίση Έλληνας από την Ελλάδα; Τοιαύτης φρικτής αδικίας εν μόνον παράδειγμα έδωκεν η Ισπανία εις τους χρόνους της κατεχούσης όλην την Ευρώπην βαρβαρότητος.

Instead he suggested that a revised constitution should decree that:

154

Οι γεννημένοι και κατοικούντες την Ελλάδα είναι πολίται, και απολαούν, δίχως καμμίαν διαφοράν, όλα τα πολιτικά δικαία, [...] περί δε Ιουδαίων και Τούρκων, η Πολιτεία θέλει φροντίσειν να εκδώση νόμον ιδιαίτερον.

And this despite the fact that:

Των Ιουδαίων [...] το προς ημάς μίσος [...] ομοιάζει, ή μάλλον υπερβαίνει και αυτό το Τουρκικόν μίσος. Η θρησκεία των [...] μετεμορφώθη από τους Ραββίνους των εις θρησκείαν δεισιδαίμονα, εχθράν άσπονδον όλων των θρησκείων, και εξαιρέτως της χριστιανικής [...] Τον αρχηγόν της ημών θρησκείας οι Τούρκοι σέβονται καν ως προφήτην· οι Ιουδαίοι τον βλασφημούν ως πλάνον.

Of course, like a true child of the Enlightenment, he was quick to add that:

Όταν συλλογισθή τις ότι το τόσον μίσος ηυξήθη έτι πλέον από την προς αυτούς διαγωγήν των χριστιανών, έρχετ' εις πειρασμόν να δικαιολογήση τους Ιουδαίους.⁵

What one observes here is an archetypal example of a narrative wherein the anti-Jewish stereotyping is explained in the context of an enlightened philosemitism. As Robespierre had put it at the French National Assembly in September 1791 on the occasion of the debate on the Jews' enfranchisement, their «vices derive from the degradation in which you have plunged them; they will be good when they can find some advantage in being good». And naturally, Korais the secularist and anticlerical, took exception to both the «established» and the «toleration» clauses of the provisional constitutions, arguing that «we face no danger of becoming either Jews or Turks».⁶

⁵ Korais 1964: 378-379, 380-381.

⁶ Lewis 1986: 86; Korais 1964: 376.

His *Notes* were not published at the time, probably because of their «anti-monarchical bent». Yet it would not be too far-fetched to argue that Korais' censure of the politics of exclusion from within was communicated to law-makers in insurgent Greece, given that he was in correspondence with Alexandros Mavrokordatos, the chief architect of the Epidaurus constitution. Either way, he repeated his reservations on the exclusion of the Muslims and the Jews from civil and political rights in 1824, in his published at the time *Dialogue on Greek Interests*.⁷

Korais' misgivings, as well as those of Jeremy Bentham, were not heeded. The unmistakably religious dimension of the *agonas* was too strong to overcome; the inherent value of Ottoman «tyranny» as a source of unity, in what was otherwise a divided society, too tempting to resist; the juxtaposition of a regenerated «civilization» with age-old «barbarism» too compelling to allow for enlightened and rational views. That in his proclamation on «Fight for Faith and Motherland» (February 1821) Alexandros Yspilantis spoke of the «motherland» whereas in his «Appeal to the European Courts» (April 1821) Petrobey Mavromichalis confined himself to the plight of «unhappy» kin in his backyard might be seen as an early sign of the civil strife that was to dominate the struggle for independence, as evidence of an as yet disparate national community. Yet, it should not belie the fact that for both men the overthrow of the «insufferable» and «insupportable» yoke was contingent upon the «purge» of indigenous Muslims.⁸

The potential exclusion of the Jewish element from the would-be new polity was grounded on a number of age-old perceptions, religious practices, socio-economic stereotypes and folkloric prejudices, not dissimilar to those found in «the civilised nations of Europe». These were articulated and circulated by a gamut of individuals of the pre-revolutionary period. For example, the monk and preacher Kosmas the Aetolian (c.1714–79), who was canonized by the Greek Orthodox Church in 1961, is recorded as having commonly referred to them in his sermons as the «devil's offspring»; to have castigated their alleged avarice as a constant; and to have urged his audiences to avoid any contact with them, because:

⁷ Kitromilides 1985: 47; Korais 1839: 254-259 ; Korais 1964: 599-600.

⁸ Daskalakis 1966-67: I/142-144, 147-148.

Εκείνος οπού συναναστρέφεται με τους Εβραίους, αγοράζει και πουλεί, τί φανερώνει; Φανερώνει και λέγει, πως καλά έκαμαν οι Εβραίοι και εθανάτωσαν τους προφήτας και όλους τους διδασκάλους και όλους τους καλούς. Καλά έκαμαν και κάνουν να υβρίζουν τον Χριστόν μας και την Παναγίαν μας, καλά κάνουν και μας μαγαρίζουν και πίνουν το αίμα μας [...] Τούτα διατί σας τα είπα, χριστιανοί μου; Όχι δια να φονεύετε τους Εβραίους και να τους κατατρέχετε, αλλά να τους κλαίετε, πως άφησαν τον Θεόν και επήγαν με τον διάβολον.

Lest I am accused of a «methodological flaw» here, let me argue that the fact that no manuscript penned by Kosmas himself has survived and that most of his recorded sermons date from after his death does not undermine the significance of this anti-Jewish discourse. The point here is not whether it can be veritably attributed to Kosmas but that it *has been* both by his generation and subsequent ones. For example, in a brief work on his life, edited by an archimandrite, Kosmas' anti-Jewish discourse is reproduced and his murder on the orders of the Ottoman authorities in southern Albania in 1779 is attributed to that «most cunning and most sacrilegious *genos* of the Christ-hating Jews»⁹.

A more modern, albeit by default, depiction of the Jews, which did not centre on the archaic and superstitious notions of deicide and blood-libel, was put forward in the *Greek Nomarchy* (1806). In the course of his detailed censure of the «filthy and vulgar people of the Phanar», the anonymous author of this polemic tract maintained that their alleged subservience to the Ottomans denoted «their spineless and indeed Jewish heart», whereas in his equally vitriolic attack on the Greek Orthodox priesthood noted that the stance of *εθελουλεία* (submission to the powers that be) that it had adopted and had been promoting was turning the faithful into a people without a *patrida*, «like the Jews» –a people whose religion had made them into «misanthropes»¹⁰.

The portrayal of the Jews as a people with no motherland, so common and diachronic an image in Christian discourse, is insinuated in the discourse of Rigas Velestinlis. Whereas in his projected Greek Republic he provided for the free exercise of «every kind of

⁹ Menounos N.d.: 243, 244; Martinos 1894: 25.

¹⁰ Anonymous 2006: 139, 140, 117, 149.

religion, Christianity, Islam, Judaism, etc.», his revolutionary call, so powerfully articulated in his *Thourios* (1797), was not addressed to the Jewish element of the empire. Was this simply an oversight on his part? Can it be construed as an implicit admission that the age-old stateless Jews had forfeited their right to a free existence because of their alleged collaboration with –and acceptance of– the Ottoman status quo? Or was it the case that, lacking in bravery, they were hardly potential allies-in-revolt? In Rigas' Greek Republic religious tolerance was a given; but Jewish emancipation was probably not.¹¹

In the event, Kosmas' admonition not to kill but to pity the Jews went unheeded. What undoubtedly led to their indiscriminate massacre in Vrachori and Tripoli in the early days of the War of Independence was the overt and voluntary siding of their co-religionists with the Ottoman authorities in Salonika against the Greek Orthodox rebels and, primarily, the treatment meted out to the corpse of the hanged Ecumenical Patriarch Grigorios V on Easter Day 1821. Irrespective of whether poignant contemporary accounts can be taken at face value, the parallelism between the martyrdom of Grigorios and that of Christ was not lost on the Greeks. As Reverend Thomas Smart Hughes put it, the desecration of the patriarch's body by the Jews was but the «consummation of ignominy [...] in the eyes of Christians». The narrative of evoking the image of the Jew as an «enemy» of the *genos* survived the test of time and has been explicitly articulated in various public fora: from the «fabricated» folk song of the 1860s, which equates the Jews with the Janissaries, to the proclamation of the National Student Union on the eve of the torching of the Jewish neighbourhood of Campbell in Salonika in 1931, wherein the desecration of the patriarch's body appears top of the long list of the alleged defamation of Greek ideals and of the Greek *fyli* by the Jews¹².

Religious factors apart, what made the Jewish element dispensable was not only concrete daily bread-and-butter issues of a socio-economic nature, as was the case in much of Europe, but also the absence of any long-lasting tradition of intermingling with Greeks in areas where much of the War of Independence was fought out. Their persecution by what in effect were undisciplined armed bands of peasants laying siege on fortified towns in the Peloponnese and

¹¹ Rigas 2000: 37, 33, 74-75.

¹² Walsh 1836: 316-317; Efthymiou 2002: 42, note 25; Pierron 1996: 18; Hughes 1830: 294; Papatheodorou 2009: 254; *Makedonia* (24 June 1931: 1).

southern Roumeli was fed as much by superstitious ignorance and the populist sermons of Kosmas and his like as it was by fear of the unknown and a generic predilection for the scapegoating of the «other» – a constant in the homogenisation of the realm.

Indeed, the war-cry «in the Morea shall no Turk be left // nor in the whole wide world» could equally apply in the case of the Jews, those «mythical evildoers». Following the fall of the Peloponnesian capital to the revolutionaries in early autumn 1821, a Greek from near-by Kalamata rejoiced at the fact that:

Τους εχθρούς [...] τους έφαγε σχεδόν όλους το σπαθί [...] Όσοι Τούρκοι επέμειναν στην αντίσταση από τα σπίτια, κάηκαν μαζί με αυτά. Η εκδικήτρια Νέμεση βρήκε, επιτέλους, και τους άθεους Εβραίους, που εδώ στην Πελοπόννησο διέπραξαν τα αίσχιστα εναντίον των Χριστιανών σ' αυτό τον ιερό αγώνα.

It seems that blanket massacres of Jewish civilians were the norm each time a besieged town fell to the rebels; similar was the plight of Muslims – combatants and civilians alike. As Reverend John Hartley noted, «the sons of Isaac, and the sons of Ishmael, on [...] every occasion during the Greek Revolution, met with a common fate. [...] It may be remarked in general, that the Greek Revolution has not left a single descendant of Abraham within the liberated territory».¹³

The «wasteland and levelling» of Tripoli, according to Aristotelis Valaoritis' 1872 composition, constitutes an instructive case in point: Principally because of the sheer volume of slaughter and pillage, but also because of the explanations advanced by eminent figures of the War of Independence when accounting for such carnage. The passage below, by no means either random or atypical, epitomizes the revolutionaries' *raison d'être*:

Οι Έλληνες εις την έφοδον της Τριπολιτσάς εφόνευσαν πλήθος Τούρκων [...] Εφόνευσαν δε και έκαυσαν χωρίς διάκρισιν ηλικίας και γένους [...] και όλους τους Εβραίους, [...] και όπου αν περιήρχετό τις καθ' όλην την Πελοπόννησον, άλλο τι δεν έβλεπεν καθ' οδόν ειμή Τούρκων πτώματα. [...] Κατηγορήθησαν δε οι Έλληνες δια τας τοιαύτας ωμότητας· αλλ' εν ω προέκειτο να ελευθερωθώσιν ή να αποτελεσθώσι κατά κράτος, η σωτηρία των υπηγόρευε να

¹³ Phillips 1897: 48; Efthymiou 2002: 41; Laios 1958: 248-249; Hartley 1831: 207-208.

βάψωσιν ὅλοι τας χείρας των εις τα αίματα των τυράννων των, δια να συνεθισθώσιν εις το να φονεύωσι τους εχθρούς. [...] Ηδύνατο μόνον οι Έλληνες να φεισθώσι των γυναικών, των παιδίων και των γερόντων. [...] τοιουτοτρόπως ήθελον δείξει [...] φιλανθρωπίαν [...] Αλλά και τίς ηδύνατο να εμποδίση τους Έλληνας από το να λάβωσιν εκδίκησιν δι' όσα κακά υπέστησαν και από αυτάς τας γυναικάς και απ' αυτά τα παιδία εις διάστημα αιώνων κατά διαδοχήν γενεών;¹⁴

Elpida Vogli has recently argued that the proposals and practices pertinent to the inclusion or exclusion of certain population groups from the would-be polity were conditioned by the overbearing needs of a society in war – specifically, I hasten to add, in response to the massacres of thousands of Greek Orthodox civilians by the Ottomans and their Egyptian allies. As a surgeon attached to the Greek forces put it, «whatever judgement may be pronounced on the conduct of the Greeks towards the Turks, one good consequence arose from their cruelties. A line of demarcation was [...] established between the two nations; a barrier of blood, which rendered all future approximation impossible». In fact, the Third National Assembly in spring 1826 was quite explicit when passing a secret resolution on the morrow of Ibrahim Pasha's barbarisation project, which provided that the «Turks should neither [own] property nor [enjoy] permanent residence in Greece»; while six months later, the gazette of the provisional government implied that the Jews of the Ottoman Empire (and hence the Jews of the insurgent lands) were not worthy of enjoying the fruits of an enlightened polity partly because of the callousness of their religion. Of course, the exclusivity of such perceptions was not always manifested on the ground. In a small number of instances, the contribution of native Muslims (and Jews?) to the *agonas*, and/or their conversion to the «established religion» as *neofytoi* not only offered them membership of the new polity but also pecuniary compensation, principally in the form of land, in later decades.¹⁵

It would, however, be amiss not to consider that such perceptions have a historicity of their own, which cannot be merely ex-

¹⁴ Valaoritis 1981: 183-191; Spiliadis 1851: 246-247.

¹⁵ Vogli 2007: 56; Millingen 1831: 166; Daskalakis 1966-67: II/505; *Geniki Efimeris* (25 August 1826: 543); *Efimeris tis Kyverniseos* 20 (1836: 81-83); Nikolopoulos & Kakoulidis 1859-62: II/886.

plained in the context of an *ephemeral* «society in war». That much is also evident in the case of Greek Catholics. Six months after the promulgation of the Epidaurus constitution, the insurgents' eparch in Tinos noted that, as «brothers in Christ, we consider them Greeks [...] born of the same mother, breathing the same air [...], possessing the same rights and privileges», and called upon them to participate in the «sacred struggle» against the «barbarous tyrant». Yet, five and a half years later, Kapodistrias seemingly did not perceive them as a constituent part of the «Greek nation, which comprises those who since the fall of Constantinople have not stopped professing the Orthodox faith».¹⁶

The fact that very few of the eighteen thousand or so Greek Catholics responded to the sirens of ethno-religious nationalism emanating from the mainland was not lost on the insurgents. At the time, Dimitrios Ypsilantis called it an «unpardonable sin», a view that permeates much of the subsequent historical narrative. For example, Spyridon Trikoupis, politician, diplomat and official historiographer of the War of Independence, maintained that they had chosen the Crescent instead of the Cross, slavery instead of freedom; and in a summative maxim, concluded thus:

Μακάριον το έθνος το πρεσβεύον όλον εν και το αυτό
δόγμα. Κάτοχοι, χάρις τω Θεώ, είμεθα τοιούτου ευτυχίμα-
τος, και εθνοκατάρατος έστω όστις δι' οποιανδήποτε αιτίαν
θελήσει δι' ετεροδιδασκαλίας ή δι' άλλου τινός τρόπου να
επιβουλευθή την ενότητα της πίστεως των Ελλήνων.

Admittedly, such a narrative also drew recourse from the age-old ingrained mistrust that existed between Orthodox and Catholic Greeks in the eastern Mediterranean, «an example of enduring hatred in human history», according to Braudel, and one which prompted Reverend Josiah Brewer to write, somewhat overoptimistically, that «so strong is the hatred which the Greeks bear to the Catholics, that they almost love the Protestants in comparison».¹⁷

In demographic terms, the outcome of what the Greeks' «salvation dictated» was staggering: from some 90,000 Muslims, 5,000 Jews and 18,000 Catholics on the eve of the War of Independence to

¹⁶ AEP 1973: 566, 565; Kapodistrias 1841: 190.

¹⁷ Papadopoulos 1971a: 182; Trikoupis 1853: 185-186; Efthymiou 2003: 7; Missionary 1829: 359.

198, 354 and 9,358, respectively, in 1862. Naturally, one cannot draw a distinction between heteroreligious who perished and heteroreligious and heterodox who migrated. And although these figures are neither complete nor should be taken at face value, in absolute terms they demonstrate a near-complete «homogenisation» of the regions that by the end of the War of Independence came to comprise the Greek state.¹⁸

By appearing to make *jus soli* into the main attribute of Greek citizenship as early as 1835, it could be argued that the nascent state promoted the emancipation of the few indigenous Muslims and Jews in as much as it did not distinguish its citizens along ethno-religious lines. Yet what the 1835 Law on Citizenship and the 1856 Civil Law did was to guarantee would-be citizenship through the adoption of *jus sanguinis*. As the British Minister in Athens put it, «the principle embodied in these Laws with respect to Greek nationality [citizenship] is that it is derived from hereditary transmission and not as a rule from the fact of birth in the country»; a principle attested in article 3 of the constitutions of 1844 and 1864 («citizens are those who have acquired or shall acquire the rights of citizenship according to the Laws of the State».¹⁹

In one of his first royal degrees as King of Greece, by Grace of God, Catholic Otto had promised to his Muslim subjects, who would opt to reside in «Our kingdom», due protection and «utmost liberty in performing their religious services», similar to that provided to all «Our subjects» irrespective of creed. Analogous pledges he had extended to Jewish notables who visited him in early 1833, assuring them that he considered his kingdom to be blessed and honoured to contain in its bosom the Biblical race of Israel. Such official assurances were manifested in the appointment of a Greek Jew from Chalcis, Markos Vitalis, as royal tax collector in May 1833. But they seem to have had no perceptible effect on age-old superstitions around which collective beliefs on the religious «other» evolved. The US consul at Athens from late 1837 to 1842, while rejoicing «in the triumphs of the Greeks», could not «but sympathise» with the few remaining Muslim inhabitants of Chalcis, who were subjected

¹⁸ Carabott 2011.

¹⁹ Nikolopoulos & Kakoulidis 1859-62: I/364-366, III/316-325; Command Paper 1893: 62; Axelos 1972: 112, 128.

to «humiliating insults to their nation and their religion», noting that Muslim «historical relics [...] have been most shockingly injured» at the hands of Christian bigots and spoilers. Roughly at the same time, a former member of the French Scientific Expedition to the Peloponnese opined that the «Greeks have a great dislike of the Jews». In Thebes such «dislike», underpinned by economic considerations, led in early 1833 the town's *demogerontia* to move the day of the local market from Sunday to Saturday as a means of driving out Jewish traders. Likewise, the predilection not to openly differentiate between Greek Orthodox and heteroreligious «subjects», overtly demonstrated by the fact that until 1846 the oath of allegiance to Otto was taken in the name of the Holy Trinity and the Bible, does not seem to have hindered a wide gamut of public expressions of anti-Jewish sentiments. These ranged from the bewilderment and concern that a local Greek expressed in late 1834 when finding out that the custom officer in Chalcis had appointed a Jew as guardsman of the custom house, wondering how was it that a Greek possessing the same qualities as the Jew could not be found for such a mundane post among the «impoverished and honourable Greeks in our city»; to the raising to the ground by malicious elements of the richly-endowed with manuscripts and books age-old synagogue of Chalcis in 1846; and, of course, to the Judas-effigy practice –at best a favourite pastime for «children of the rabble» at worst the focal point of the «annual persecution of the Jews by the Greeks».²⁰

Subsequently Greek Orthodox perceptions of the religious «other» were conditioned on the one hand by a state that did not distinguish its citizens along ethno-religious lines and on the other by a society wherein the «established religion», to which the Greek nation «owe their political existence, what knowledge they possess, and the language of their ancestors», was inextricably «woven into the fabric of nationality».²¹ The principle of religious tolerance, guaranteed in all revolutionary and post-revolutionary constitutions, held sway at the state level but the victimization and fear of the re-

²⁰ Nikolopoulos & Kakoulidis 1859-62: I/7; Pierron 1996: 23; *Efimeris tis Kyverniseos* 17, 1833: 124; <http://www.elia.org.gr/pages.fds?pagecode=17.04&langid=1>; Perdicaris 1845: 108-11; Papadopoulos 1971b: 144; http://www.cohen.gr/newsite/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=12:2010-01-25-09-39-16&catid=35:jewdaism&Itemid=59; Nikolopoulos & Kakoulidis 1859-62: I/5, II/416; *Athina* (29 December 1834: 4); BFSP 1863: 386; *Elpis* (31 March 1847: 1); PD 1853: column 1776.

²¹ Protocols 1832: 105; *Elpis* (15 July 1846: 1); Tuckerman 1878: 212.

ligious «other» survived the War of Independence at the local level. And among certain circles of society, the religious «other» was perceived as a potential enemy within, as is attested by the following extract from a book penned by Archimandrite Timotheos, the spiritual mentor (πνευματικός) of the «Royal Family of the Hellenes», as late as 1911:

Πας Έλλην μη ων γνήσιος Ορθόδοξος Χριστιανός, μη ων ειλικρινής φίλος των προγονικών παραδόσεων, είναι και πρέπει να θεωρήται προδότης της Ελληνικής Πατρίδος. Διότι πας μη γνήσιος Ορθόδοξος Χριστιανός αδύνατον είναι να διατηρήση εν τη καρδιά αυτού αμετάπτωτον τον ενθουσιασμόν υπέρ του ιδεώδους αγαθού και να ορμήση εις αυτοθυσίαν, προκειμένης της οφειλομένης τηρήσεως των νόμων της Πατρίδος και της ανάγκης της υπερασπίσεως των Ιεροσάτων αυτής. Η γνώμη αύτη είναι της Ιστορίας και της καθ' ημάς πείρας δίδαγμα αναμφισβήτητον.²

163

References cited

- AEP 1973. *Αρχεία της ελληνικής παλιγγενεσίας μέχρι της εγκαταστάσεως της βασιλείας*, vol. I. Athens.
- ANASTASIOU 1911. Τ. Αναστασίου, *Η ζωή*. Athens.
- ANONYMOUS 2006. Ανωνύμου, *Ελληνική νομαρχία, ήτοι λόγος περι ελευθερίας*. Salonika.
- AXELOS 1972. Λ. Αξελός, *Τα ελληνικά συντάγματα 1822-1952*. Athens.
- BFSP 1863. *British and Foreign State Papers 1849-1850 (2)*, vol. xxxix. London.
- CARABOTT, Philip 2011. «State, society and the religious “other” in nineteenth-century Greece». *Κάμπος: Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek* 18 (in press).
- COMMAND PAPER 1893. *Nationality and Naturalization Reports by Her Majesty's Representatives Abroad upon the Laws of Foreign Countries*. London.
- DASKALAKIS 1966-67. Α. Δασκαλάκης, *Κείμενα-πηγαί της ιστορίας της ελληνικής επαναστάσεως*, 2 vols. Athens.
- EFTHYMIΟΥ, Maria 2002. «Official ideology and lay mentality during the Greek revolution: Attitudes towards the Jews» in Minna Rozen (ed.), *The Last Ottoman Century and Beyond: The Jews in Turkey and the Balkans 1808–1945*, vol. II. Tel Aviv, 33-43.

²² Anastasiou 1911: v-vi.

- EFTHYMIΟΥ, Maria 2003. «Old challenges put to the test: The Greek Orthodox flock and the Church of Greece in an era of global –and local –change», http://hcc.haifa.ac.il/Departments/greece/events-greek_orthodox_church/pdf/oldchallengesintrialME3.pdf
- HARTLEY, John 1831. *Researches in Greece and the Levant*. London.
- HUGHES, Thomas 1830. *Travels in Greece and Albania*, vol. II. London.
- ΚΑΠΟΔΙΣΤΡΙΑΣ 1841. *Επιστολαί Ι.Α. Καποδίστρια*, vol. I. Athens.
- ΚΙΤΡΟΜΙΛΙΔΗΣ, Paschalis 1985. «Jeremy Bentham and Adamantios Korais». *The Bentham Newsletter* 9, 34-48.
- KORAIΣ 1839. *Απάνθισμα επιστολών Αδαμάντιου Κοραή*. Ed. I. Rotas. Athens.
- KORAIΣ 1964. *Αδαμάντιος Κοραής. Άπαντα τα πρωτότυπα έργα*. Ed. G. Valetas, vol. Ia. Athens.
- LAIOS 1958. Γ. Λάιος, *Ανέκδοτες επιστολές και έγγραφα του 1821*. Athens.
- LEWIS, Bernard 1986. *Semites and Anti-Semites*. London.
- MARTINOS 1894. Ι. Μαρτίνος, *Ακολουθία και βίος του εν αγίοις πατρός ημών Κοσμά του ιερομαρτύρου και ισαποστόλου*. Athens.
- MENOUNOS N.d. Ι. Μενούνος, *Κοσμά του Αιτωλού διδαχές (και βιογραφία)*. Athens.
- MILLINGEN, Julius 1831. *Memoirs of the Affairs of Greece*. London.
- MISSIONARY 1829. *The Missionary Register for 1829*. London.
- ΝΙΚΟΛΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ & ΚΑΚΟΥΛΙΔΗΣ 1859-62. Β. Νικολόπουλος & Α. Κακουλίδης, *Συλλογή απάντων των Νόμων, Διαταγμάτων, Εγκυκλίων, Οδηγιών και Ειδοποπιήσεων των υπουργείων [...]*, 3 vols. Athens.
- ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ 1971a. Α. Παπαδόπουλος, «Η στάσις των Ελλήνων Καθολικών έναντι της Επαναστάσεως του 1821» in *Μνήμη 1821. Αφιέρωμα εις την εθνικὴν παλιγγενεσίαν ἐπὶ τῆ 150ῃ ἐπετειῶ*. Salonika, 171-196.
- ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ 1971b. «Capitaine Peytier: Mémoire sur la Grèce». *Ο Εραμιστής* IX, 121-164.
- ΠΑΡΑΤΗΘΟΔΩΡΟΥ 2009. Γ. Παπαθεοδώρου, *Ρομαντικά πεπρωμένα. Ο Αριστοτέλης Βαλαωρίτης ως «εθνικός ποιητής»*. Athens.
- PAPERS 1835. *Papers Relative to the Affairs of Greece 1826-1832*. London.
- PD 1853. *Parliamentary Debates*, third series, vol. CXXXIX. London.
- PERDICARIS, Gregory 1845. *The Greece of the Greeks*. New York.
- PHILLIPS, W.A. 1897. *The War of Greek Independence*. London.
- PIERRON, Bernard 1996. *Juifs et Chrétiens de la Grèce moderne. Histoire des relations intercommunautaires de 1821 à 1945*. Paris.

- PROTOCOLS 1832. *Protocols of Conferences Held in London Relative to the Affairs of Greece*. London.
- RIGAS 2000. *Ρήγα Βελεστινλή άπαντα τα σωζόμενα*. Ed. P. Kitromilides, vol. v. Athens.
- SPILIADIS 1851. Ν. Σπηλιάδης, *Απομνημονεύματα συνταχθέντα υπό του Ν. Σπηλιάδου δια να χρησιμεύσωσιν εις την νέαν ιστορίαν της Ελλάδος*, vol. I. Athens.
- TRIKOUPIS 1853. Σ. Τρικούπης, *Ιστορία της Ελληνικής Επανάστασεως*, vol. I. London.
- TUCKERMAN, Charles 1878. *The Greeks of To-Day*. New York.
- VALAORITIS 1981. Α. Βαλαωρίτης, *Ποιήματα και πεζά*. Athens.
- VOGLI 2007. Ε. Βόγλη, «Έλληνες το γένος»: *Η ιθαγένεια και η ταυτότητα στο εθνικό κράτος των Ελλήνων (1821–1844)*. Irakleio.
- WAGSTAFF, Malcolm 2002. *Greece: Ethnicity and Sovereignty, 1820-1994*. Slough.
- WALSH, R. 1836. *A Residence at Constantinople, during a Period Including the Commencement, Progress, and Termination of the Greek and Turkish Revolutions*, vol. I. London.