SVENSKA INSTITUTEN I ATHEN OCH ROM

INSTITUTUM ATHENIENSE ATQUE INSTITUTUM ROMANUM REGNI SUECIAE

OPUSCULA

Annual of the Swedish Institutes
at Athens and Rome

1

2008

STOCKHOLM

Secretary's address: Department of Archaeology and Ancient History, Box 626, SE-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden.

Editor: Dr. Brita Alroth, Uppsala.

Distributor: The Editorial Committee of the Swedish Institutes at Athens and Rome, c/o Dr. Jenni Hjohlman, Department of Archaeology and Ancient History, Stockholm University, SE-106 91 Stockholm. E-mail: Jenni.Hjohlman@antiken.su.se, fax: +46-(0)8-16 13 62.

The English text was revised by Dr. Janet Fairweather, Ely, England.

Published with the aid of a grant from
The Swedish Research Council

Opuscula. Annual of the Swedish Institutes at Athens and Rome is the new combined volume of *Opuscula Atheniensia* and *Opuscula Romana*. Subscriptions can be placed with The Editorial Committee of the Swedish Institutes at Athens and Rome, c/o Dr. Jenni Hjohlman, Department of Archaeology and Ancient History, Stockholm University, SE-106 91 Stockholm. E-mail: Jenni.Hjohlman@antiken.su.se. Fax +46-(0)8-16 13 62.
Price: SEK 800:– incl. VAT.

Contributions to *Opuscula. Annual of the Swedish Institutes at Athens and Rome* should be sent to the Secretary of the Editorial Committee (address above) before 15 September every year. Contributors are requested to include an abstract summarizing the main points and principal conclusions of their article. Manuscripts, including photocopies of illustrations, should be submitted in duplicate. For style of references to be adopted see 'Guide for contributors' *Opuscula Atheniensia* 25–26, 2000–2001, 137–140 or *Opuscula Romana* 25–26, 2000–2001, 135–138. All articles are sent to referees for peer review.

Books for review should be sent to the Secretary of the Editorial Committee, address above. All books, whether reviewed or not, will be listed under the heading Books received.

ISSN 2000-0898
ISBN 978-91-977798-0-7

Printed in Sweden 2008
Textgruppen i Uppsala AB

studies in Berlin, Oxford, Chicago, and at the University of California, he spent most of his time from 1946 onwards at the Metropolitan Museum in New York guiding, teaching and helping innumerable persons in the quest for knowledge about ancient vases. 50 of these people have contributed to the volume, almost without exception writing about their gratitude for all the help and guidance they have received from the eighty-year-old honorand.

A biographical note sketches von Bothmer's career as curator, scholar, teacher, and friend, declaring among many other things: "Fragments are the building-blocks of Dietrich's scholarship; nothing pleases him more than joining together fragments separated by the caprice of time and circumstances", the truth of which I know from personal experience, Dietrich von Bothmer having once most graciously exchanged a sherd with a Gorgon's eye on it for another sherd, in order to allow a one-eyed gorgon on a skyphos in the Museum of Antiquities of the University at Lund to look upon the world again with both her eyes. The biographical note is followed by a list of publications containing almost 300 items.

The 48 essays are placed alphabetically after authors' names. Most common are, not surprisingly, essays about Attic red figure, which, together with Attic black figure, Athenian white ground, Chalcidian, East Greek, place the essays about vases in an absolute majority. Most of them are about individual vase painters, shapes or motifs, but others deal, for instance, with very unsuitable uses of vases or the meaning of a group of vases in an Etruscan tomb. There are, in addition, essays on a gold object (decoration for a Scythian relief for a sword-sheath), the famous silver cups by Cherisophos in Copenhagen, bronze vases from Argos, and other metal objects. There are also essays on stone sculptures, *inter alia* sculpture from the Parthenon and the Erechtheion, as well as a carving on an amber pendant. The remaining essays deal with the collecting of antiquities, an early excavation on Cyprus, a painting by Rubens, weights, a letter from Beazley to Ernst Langlotz about attributing vases, and an interesting suggestion that the myth of Romulus and Remus is about attachment and separation, and how early experiences in the lives of young children will rebound unexpectedly in later life. All in all, this is a volume full of interesting ideas and well worth reading and, as such, worthy of its dedicatee, who has in the course of many years given so much to research and researchers concerned with ancient vases.

Charlotte Scheffer
Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies
Stockholm University
SE-106 91 STOCKHOLM

THE COMPLEXITIES OF HELLENISM—A REVIEW ARTICLE

Constanze Güthenke, *Placing modern Greece: the dynamics of Romantic Hellenism, 1770–1840*, Oxford: OUP: Classical Presences 2008. x + 276 pp. ISBN 978-0-19-923185-0.

Yannis Hamilakis, *The nation and its ruins: antiquity, archaeology, and national imagination in Greece*, Oxford: OUP: Classical Presences 2007. xxii + 352 pp., 51 figs. ISBN 978-0-19-923038-9.

Introduction

The relation between modern and ancient Hellenism has been complex ever since the emergence of a Neo-Hellenic identity in the late 18th century, and the subsequent establishment of the modern Greek state. A conceptual scheme that has become traditional, is based on two analytical pairings: Neo-Hellenism as distinct from Western Hellenism, and Neo-Hellenism as distinct from *Romiossini*. Hellenism denotes a discourse which casts classical Greek culture as the cultural origin of Western civilization, including modern Greece, and admires the achievements of the ancient Greeks. The discourse of Hellenism was formulated in Western Europe but, because it became foundational for modern Greeks, a distinction is made between Western Hellenism and Neo-Hellenism. Neo-Hellenism was largely formulated by a well-educated élite of Greeks in close contact with the European cultural settings in which Hellenism flourished. Neo-Hellenism is marked by an intrinsic ambivalence towards Western Hellenism. On the one hand, there is a recognition that Neo-Hellenism benefits from the western veneration of the ancient Greek past. On the other hand, in Western Hellenism modern Greeks are perpetually being compared with the ancient Greeks, and, in this comparison, the modern Greeks usually draw the short straw.

Neo-Hellenism was adopted as the official national ideology of the modern Greek state. The obvious external roots of this ideology subsequently created a divide between Neo-Hellenism and *Romiossini*. The terms *Romiossini* and *Romii* derive from the Ottoman designation of the Orthodox Christian population as *Rum millet*. The *Romii* identity is based on Greek-Orthodox Christianity and an affinity with the Byzantine Empire. Classical antiquity has a minor position in this ideology. The official adoption of Neo-Hellenism did not result in the wholesale abandonment of the *Romiossini* ideology by the population of the Greek state. Accordingly, modern Greek culture is often conceptualized as dual.

Two recent publications in the 'Classical Presences' series of the Oxford University Press, Constanze Güthenke's

Placing modern Greece and Yannis Hamilakis' *The nation and its ruins*, elaborate on appropriations of the classical legacy in modern Greece. Although differing in character, both books illustrate that Hellenisms are more complex notions than has been suggested above.

Placing modern Greece

The book by Constanze Güthenke (hereafter CG) entitled, *Placing modern Greece: the dynamics of Romantic Hellenism, 1770–1840* (hereafter *PMG*), is an account of how Greece, as a place, was portrayed in the discourse of Romantic Hellenism. The Romantic Hellenist movement was promoted by two groups: first, by the German idealists such as Friedrich Hölderlin, Friedrich Schiller and other German authors, and, second, by lettered Greeks such as Andreas Kalvos and Dionysios Solomos. CG's main argument is that literary representations of Greece are permeated with imagery from nature. Modern Greece was not yet a state with fixed boundaries and representations of Greece refer often to an ideal place. The tension between a real and an ideal Greece runs through *PMG*. CG stresses that the idealization of Greece is not an attitude in direct opposition to a fascination with the real materiality of Greece. On the contrary, these two *topoi* mutually enforce each other (p. 3). The Romantic fascination with Greece had a philosophical and aesthetic foundation, too. A fundamental topic of philosophy at the time was the gradual estrangement of man from nature. Modernity, and modern life, was seen as opposed to nature and the past. In other words, at a time when the past was being demarcated from the present (because of the spread of modernity), men of letters turned to an imaginary Greece in order to bridge this increasing divide. Greece was therefore a central construction in Romantic aesthetics since it held a promise of counteracting the estrangement of man from nature (5, 19). CG situates *PMG* in a theoretical framework of constructivist landscape-studies (6–9). This framework, which stresses that our perceptions of landscapes are culturally constructed, is appropriate, given the topic of her analysis.

Greece had figured in western imagination well before the foundation of the modern Greek state. However, it was only with the advent of modernity—a result of the cultural wars between the ancients and the moderns in late 18th-century France—and only with the conceptual separation between past and present, that Greece emerged as a modern, contemporary place as well. The European concern with classical Greece secured a primary position for Greece in Romantic aesthetics. Aesthetic and philosophical concerns with freedom, individuality, nature, and landscape, were tenets that converged with particular distinctness in relation to Greece (21). CG turns to J.J. Winckelmann, J.G. Herder, and F. Schiller, in order to identify the characteristics of 18th-century Hellenism. Winckelmann associated artistic production with freedom and favourable political conditions (25–28). In his writings, Greece is a metaphor responding to the Romantic concern with freedom and nature. CG notes that Winckelmann often used images from nature to convey freedom. Herder prefers Greece because it is a notable example of a nation that has gone through a complete evolutionary cycle from birth, growth, acme, to decline. Schiller, in turn, established a conceptual link between nature and the ancient Greeks. According to his scheme, we have naïve emotions towards antiquity and nature. Naïve emotions, as opposed to sentimental emotions, are characterized by a feeling of desire and objectification. In Schiller's scheme, the experience of Greek nature epitomized the Romantic search for the sublime. Further, CG points to I. Kant's philosophy as foundational for Romantic Hellenism. His ontological dualism made it possible to regard experienced reality as symbolic, that is, as standing for something else. This facilitated a perspective in which the notion of Greece symbolized the distance between man and nature, an aesthetic landscape, and a place with authentic ruins and a past. Greece was constructed as a marginal place precariously situated on the boundary between culture and nature and between past and present.

Chapter two begins by recalling a long-forgotten Greek revolt against Ottoman rule in the 1770s. At the time, it received considerable attention and placed Greece on the European map of consciousness. The number of western travellers to Greece increased after 1770. It was common to publish travel-narratives which included vivid descriptions of nature and relate these to the contemporary philosophical concern with freedom and liberty. According to CG, travellers often articulate the notion that geographic conditions determine national characteristics (47–49). Greece also figured in fictional, or semi-fictional, narratives. For instance, Abbé Barthélemy's influential *Voyage du jeune Anacharsis en Grèce* is a fictive travel account set in the Hellenistic period. CG concludes that Greece in Barthélemy's narrative is a place characterized by its physical beauty, but also that Greece is portrayed as an extension of French culture (58–59). Another example is Comte de Choisseul-Gouffier's *Voyage pittoresque de la Grèce*, which is concerned with the description of ancient remains. CG continues with Gerhard von Halem's anthology *Blüthen aus Trümmern*, where Greece emerges as an idealized place holding the promise for freedom. In this and other works, CG observes frequent references to the Maniots. Maniotic wilderness, independence and fierce desire for freedom attracted German authors such as G. von Halem, F. von Stolberg, and W. Heinse (60–71). Next, CG investigates F. Hölderlin's works, particularly *Hyperion oder der Eremit in Griechenland* (71–92). CG's focuses on the representation of the ideal. Hölderlin portrays the natural landscape of Greece in great detail. He

is thus not imposing an ideal on a generalized view of a material reality. Hölderlin situates modern Greece between antiquity and the modern west. We can only approach antiquity, therefore, by way of modern Greece, and its landscape with ruins. Images of nature do not merely propel the narrative: they are also constructed as the opposite to modernity.

In chapter three CG investigates German Philhellenism, that is, support for the Greek struggle for independence, after the turn of the century. For a while, German Philhellenism hijacked the Romantic movement. Romanticism moved into a second phase, which had an aesthetic agenda of a more eclectic sort. *Biedermeier*, or "tamed Romanticism", is characterized by its attention to local realism, religious symbolism, and a higher transcendental order. CG argues that representations of Greek landscape evolved from general, reflexive images to specific, more concrete, images (94). This conceptual shift is particularly noticeable around 1821. Another process was that Greek nature was politicized. Romantic Hellenism contributed to a double process of "nationalizing nature and naturalizing the nation" (102). According to this view of things, distinctive national characteristics are reflected in the natural environment of the nation, while, simultaneously, nature shapes a people's moral and spiritual qualities. A nation is not only legitimized by a sense of historical continuity, it needs also a sense of naturalness. German political pamphlets from the 1820s portray Greek nature as violent and destructive. This portrayal mirrors, and legitimizes, the violent events of the Greek struggle for independence. Next CG turns to the popular genre of Greek folk-songs (111–115). Natural images feature prominently in them. Folk songs were preferred in the Romantic movement because Herder viewed them as authentic expressions of a people's creativity. Another expression of the support for the Greek cause was the so-called *Griechendichtung* of, for instance, W. Müller. He deploys violent images of nature when he portrays the Maniots, who are cast as the descendants of the ancient Spartans. In Müller's poetry, continuity between antiquity and modernity is often manifested. Another example is the Battle of Peta, 1822, which he likens to the Battle of Thermopylae.

In chapter four, CG shifts focus to the Greek literary scene. *PMG* has a meta-poetic level which I have not mentioned yet. CG interprets the texts, additionally, as expressions of a self-consciousness. The authors are seen as constructing their agency through them and situating themselves in a cultural and political setting. It is the Romantic concern with the estrangement of man from nature that resurfaces here. Western Hellenism conceptualized Greece from a distance: it constructed a discursive distance to Greece. This generated a problematic ambivalence for the Greek authors of Romantic Hellenism (142). The first-generation authors of the Greek state, the so-called Old Athenian School, were western-oriented and well-connected Phanariots. In the work of Alexander Rizos Rangavis, CG traces influences from German Romantic Hellenism. CG investigates how Rangavis understands and constructs the poet's position in Greek society and concludes that he "undermines any easy identification of the Greek character with his natural (and national) environment" (154). In Rangavis' poetry, space is confined and restricted. This reflects a fundamental, contemporary, Greek concern with the many Greeks who lived outside the borders of the Greek state. Rangavis portrays the natural environment of Greece as threatening. Furthermore, he is primarily concerned with Greece as an ideal space (173–190). Panagiotis Soutsos, also a member of the Old Athenian School, refers often to ruins and classical antiquity in his work. The past comes through as a burden in Soutsos' texts. Archaeological remains have negative obstructive connotations. Greek nature is desolate. Also in Soutsos' work, an ideal Greece is given precedence (185). This generation of Greek authors relate to themes of Western Hellenism. However, in their work, they exhibit ambivalence towards it. The emphasis on an 'otherworld', as opposed to a problematic reality, can be seen as a Greek response to the concerns of Western Hellenism. CG concludes that this conforms with the characterization of modern Greek literature as having been late to respond to modernity.

In the last chapter, CG considers the poetry of Andreas Kalvos and Dionysios Solomos, both from the Ionian Islands. The political history of the Ionian Islands differs from the history of mainland Greece, since they were under Venetian rule for a long period. Ionian culture exhibits strong influences from Italy. From 1797, until they became Greek in 1864, the islands passed through the hands of France, Russia, the Ottoman Empire, and Britain. The Ionians viewed mainland Greece from the middle distance. Andreas Kalvos' poetry is influenced by European literary trends and it was written for Philhellenic circles in Europe (197). CG characterizes his poetry as "aesthetics of distance" (195), in which Greece is primarily a *topos* of freedom. The last author considered in *PMG* is Dionysios Solomos. German influences, particularly from Schiller, were identified in Solomos' poetry already in the influential introduction to his collected works, published in 1859. CG expands on this theme and emphasizes Hegel's influence on Solomos (214). In his poems, nature is shaped by a theory of transcendentalism. There is a correspondence between subject/ideal and object/reality, where the latter pair is an extension and sublimination of the first pair (216–217). Solomos' nature-images are of a fragmentary prismatic kind (221). In his poem *Free Besieged*, which deals with the siege of Missolonghi in 1826, nature is not a concrete space but an a-topian condensed symbol. In his *Hymn to Freedom*, the national anthem of Greece, nature is threatening. CG de-

tects allusions to the Bible in some poems, whereas Solomos seems to have avoided Homeric references (234–235). Thematically, his representation of Greek nature is in line with Western Hellenism. However, he re-formulated this theme in accordance with his agenda (238–239). In Solomos' poetry, Greece emerges as an elusive entity that escapes fixation.

In the concluding Epilogue, CG associates *PMG* to other important publications concerning the emergence of Neo-Hellenism. CG argues that we need to move beyond the binary pairs mentioned above in the introduction. Whereas a distant perspective to Greek 'placeness', that is a constructed sense of a place, suits Western Hellenism, Greeks appropriating this discourse constructed a 'placeness' that undermined and complicated its western original.

Critique of PMG

PMG investigates how German and Greek authors in the Romantic Hellenist movement constructed Greece. Greece is not merely a real place. CG's interest lies in the construction of an ideal Greece. The ideal is not in polar opposition to the real. On the contrary, they nourish each other. I cannot claim expertise in Modern Greek Studies, and comments from me about neglected works, authors, or discourses would have little weight. My engagement with *PMG* stems from a general interest in the question of how classical antiquity has been appropriated in various settings. This is not a major theme for CG, although it surfaces occasionally. *PMG* opens up a literary panorama with Greece as its focal point. CG demonstrates that philosophical and aesthetic concerns other than an interest in antiquity have contributed to the high level of attention that Greece has received. Ancient temples did not dictate interest in Greece as much as the association of Greece with a struggle for independence and with the notion of freedom. Greece was constructed as a particularly natural place that had not been destroyed by modernity, and cast as a symbol for the Romantic concern with the estrangement of man from nature. The deployment of nature-images corresponds to the need to demonstrate the naturalness of an emerging nation. Whereas antiquity is used in order to establish historical continuity, nature is needed in order to establish naturalness, that is, a self-evident relation between a people and its natural environment. In a sense, the major theme of *PMG* complements an understanding of Neo-Hellenic ethnogenesis. Neo-Hellenism was not only legitimized by references to an ancient past, but also by references to a conceptual naturalness.

CG delimitation of her analytical focus to the use of nature-images in Romantic Hellenism serves her purposes well. The charting of the changing representations of Greek nature during the period of seventy years which she investigates illustrates the complexities of Hellenism. CG's reading of texts is sensitive and she points to the individual traits of each author. Accordingly, she avoids the temptation to re-enforce a schematic difference between external and internal Hellenism. The Greek authors were influenced by themes, topics, and notions from Western Hellenism but they did not merely import them. Rather, as CG convincingly demonstrates, they re-formulated these themes in order to express their concerns with contemporary Greek national discourse.

It is often assumed that Western Hellenism was wholeheartedly accepted and used also by modern Greeks, at least during the initial phases of the Neo-Hellenism, and that Neo-Hellenism, as a discourse that differs from Western Hellenism, was formulated only later. *PMG* revises this image and CG demonstrates that Greek authors at least reshaped the discourse of Hellenism in order to answer their concerns.

The nation and its ruins

In his book *The nation and its ruins: antiquity, archaeology, and national imagination in Greece* (hereafter *TNR*) Yannis Hamilakis (hereafter YH) elaborates on the complex associations between classical antiquity and national imagination in Greek public discourse. In *TNR,* classical antiquity refers exclusively to the material remains from antiquity. Furthermore, YH does not treat archaeology as an academic or professional practice, but focuses on public appropriations of archaeology. He is not concerned with how archaeology is conducted, but with how the "archaeological" is reproduced. In *TNR,* archaeology is a Greek public discourse. Furthermore, YH never aims to present an exhaustive account of the multi-faceted rôle which archaeology has in Greece, but to present a critique by means of case studies. The prismatic structure of *TNR* mirrors the tensions and contradictions in Greek public discourse. On a theoretical level, YH's concern is with the notion of "Indigenous Hellenism", that is "the appropriation of western Hellenism by local societies in Greece in the mid to late nineteenth century and its recasting as a novel, syncretic, and quasi-religious form of imagining time and place, past and present, of producing and reproducing national identities" (vii–viii).

The most substantial part of chapter one consists of a presentation of the theoretical framework. Initially, YH asserts that *TNR* is neither an anthropology of archaeology, an ethnography of a heritage-space, a social history of Greek archaeology, nor "a book on the nationalist use of archaeology in Greece" (10). YH finds the 1990s' concern with nationalist uses of archaeology shortsighted, since nationalism is conceptualized from a top-down perspective. Rather, YH is interested in "banal nationalism", that is everyday mundane practices by ordinary people that reproduce and reenforce national ideologies. In other words, mundane engagements with archaeology are seen as being part of a

banal nationalism. In a wider perspective, YH views archaeology as a device of modernity which serves "the needs of the most powerful ideology of that modernity (nationalism)" (14). Methodologically, YH prefers "multi-sited ethnography" which views the analytical object as slippery, residing as it does in a wide variety of realms. Multi-sited ethnography aims not to favour one realm, or one kind of sources, but to give equal weight to all contexts. In other words, we can situate *TNR* in the second phase of the cultural turn. Scholars in this phase remain influenced by critical, post-modernist, theories but are more sensitive to local and empirical aspects than in the first phase of the cultural turn.

Chapter two is an account of the agencies providing for archaeology in Greece. The Central Archaeological Council is the supreme institutional body for heritage-management in Greece. It enjoys a high public profile, and advises the Ministry of Culture in all matters that deal with cultural heritage-management. The Greek Archaeological Service, founded as early as 1833, organizes the bulk of archaeological excavations in Greece. Archaeologists in the Greek Archaeological Service decide if, and which, land should be set apart for archaeological investigations. However, the meagreness of economic resources often results in long delays before actual investigations take place. This agency is forced to conduct hasty rescue digs. Resentment against archaeologists in the Greek Archaeological Service is common. In contrast to these archaeologists, who are assigned the ungrateful rôle of guarding the archaeological record, university archaeologists, foreign and Greek, have the means to conduct archaeological excavations which include an analytical, or interpretative, aspect (38). Nevertheless, all archaeologists enjoy a high social status in Greece. Often archaeologists are viewed as performing a national duty. YH regards Greek nationalism as a secular religion worshipping antiquity. In this discourse, archaeologists are the priests (39). There is a brief mention of archaeological activities supporting nationalism, such as the archaeological dimension of the Greek occupation of Western Anatolia, 1920–1922, and the Hellenization of place-names, particularly in northern Greece, in which archaeologists were instrumental. As priests, archaeologists guard antiquity and the purity of the Greek nation. This guardianship also has aesthetic dimensions. Archaeologists have a say about the appearance of the environment surrounding archaeological sites. Museums, which are part of the archaeological establishment in Greece, aestheticize the archaeological record in their exhibitions. The foreign schools in Greece are often viewed as expressions of imperialism and/or colonialism. YH reappraises this one-dimensional dismissal and illustrates how they are integrated in a partnership, albeit in an asymmetrical relation, with Greek archaeology. Finally, YH considers the 2002 archaeological law. He concludes that it does not signal a departure from the nationalist, 19th-century framework, although it has been widened to include concerns of cultural property and cultural tourism.

In chapter three YH traces the gradual re-formulation of Western Hellenism into Indigenous Hellenism. Western Hellenism was adopted as the official national ideology when Greece became independent. However, ancient remains were visible before and local people had always related to them. In Greek nationalistic history, the re-use of antiquities by locals, whether living in medieval Frankish mini-kingdoms, or later in the Ottoman Empire, is presented as conscious practice by "Greeks", aimed to rescue the antiquities (64–65). This interpretation projects contemporary notions backwards. YH presents another explanatory framework, according to which classical remains were seen as remains of a different world, perceived in religious terms, and a different, mythical, time. They represented a peculiar otherness. Ancient temples were often converted into places of worship. We are all familiar with the social history of the Parthenon, which has served both as a Christian church and as a Muslim mosque. The Ottoman traveller Evliya Celebi witnessed in 1660s Christians in Athens celebrating at the Tower of the Winds and Muslims worshipping at the columns of the Temple of Zeus Olympios. Ethnographic accounts confirm that classical remains were perceived as the works of the Hellenes, a race of giants with supernatural powers. Ancient fragments were not incorporated into buildings to be rescued, but to secure their apotropaic and protective properties (67). Another account tells how many blamed the destruction of one of the columns of the Temple of Zeus Olympios for the outbreak of an epidemic in 1759 (68–69). This kind of ethnography, called *laographia*, focuses on collecting folk-memories, and goes hand in hand with archaeology. Both discourses establish a conceptual continuity back to antiquity. However, *laographia* is also crucial because it bridges the divide between Western Hellenism and local indigenous appropriations of classical antiquity. Influences from Western Hellenism are detectable among Greeks even before the independence of Greece. The Philomousos Etaireia, founded in 1813, aimed to discover, collect, and present antiquities in museums. Ancient remains were treated in accordance with the notions of Western Hellenism. The separation of antiquities from everyday life illustrates that Western Hellenism is founded on modernity. During a period, from the late 18th to the early 19th century, a small, influential, urban, social élite of Greeks adopted Western Hellenism. Its members turned away from Christianity to a new enlightened secular world-view which venerated classical antiquity (83). However, the vast majority of people in Greece retained their Christian world-view and continued to view classical remains as sacred. YH argues that a process of a syncretism, which transformed ancient remains into relics of the secular religion of national-

ism, took place later. Archaeology is decisive here, since it is responsible for the transformation of insignificant material remains into national monuments. This process included three strategies; (1) the purification of the landscape through the removal of remains obstructing vestiges from the classical period, (2) the rebuilding or even recreation of symbolically significant buildings, (3) the designation and demarcation of archaeological sites. The purification was justified by aesthetic principles. It also related to a wider public discourse of purity and pollution. The aim was to purify archaeological sites from foreign pollutions. Initially, only Ottoman remains were viewed as polluting, but later Western remains, too, were cleansed (91). The spread of photography, with reproductions of clean monuments devoid of any social life, enhanced the notion of purification (95). Epistemologically, Greek archaeology pursued an empiricism that explicitly refrained from interpretations and explanations. Archaeologists confined their rôle to that of describing finds in order to let them speak for themselves (100). Naïve empiricism is the epistemological foundation of a national archaeology of guardianship. YH notes that national archaeology portrays itself as objective and neutral, yet it creates a past through deliberate procedures (102). One political consequence of Hellenism was that the Greek struggle for independence received support from Europe. Other contemporary rebellions were perceived as threats to a political order, but Hellenism neutralized the radical connotations of the Greek struggle (105). Western Hellenism generated tensions among the Greeks. The exaggerated attention paid to the classical past was perceived by some as an obstacle to the modern development of Greece (107). Furthermore, the Byzantine period and Orthodox Christianity had negative connotations in Western Hellenism, which contradicted a Balkan reality in which religion was a vehicle through which nationalism was channelled. These tensions were solved with the construction of Indigenous Hellenism in the mid-19th century. The influential historian Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos laid the ground for Indigenous Hellenism in his seminal *Istoria tou Ellinikou Ethnous*, published between 1860 and 1874. He argued for a spiritual continuity of Greekness from antiquity via the Byzantine period, and thus via Orthodox Christianity, to modern Greece (115–116). This syncretism was largely accepted and replaced Western Hellenism as the official ideology. The religious facet was not erased in this process of fusion and Indigenous Hellenism bears the marks of a semi-religious dogma.

Manolis Andronikos' career and position in Greek public discourse is investigated in chapter four. He was a celebrity well before his excavations of Vergina. The political tensions between Greece and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, which peaked in 1992, contributed also to Andronikos' fame. The 'sun', or 'star', of Vergina became the prime symbolic weapon in the diplomatic war. Andronikos provided ammunition for the Greek counterattack. In early national narratives, ancient Macedonia was portrayed as a foreign conqueror. Its place in the national ideology was secured only with Indigenous Hellenism. Archaeologically, Macedonia was not incorporated in the national topography until Andronikos' finds (133). Another feature of Indigenous Hellenism that Andronikos articulated was its emphasis on the spiritual continuity of Hellenism. Dreams are a prominent metaphor in conceptualisations of Greek nationality. YH emphasizes Andronikos' frequent inclusion of dreams in his publications. For instance, the finding of the tomb of Philip II in Vergina is foretold by a dream received by a woman, unknown to him, in the USA (139). Andronikos was cunning and used his public standing to enhance his fame. The opening of the tomb of Philip II was carefully staged in order to achieve maximum publicity (142–143). In the end, Andronikos personified the archaeologist in Greece. He was the leading shaman in a secular religion.

In chapter five, YH discusses the use of antiquity by the régime of Metaxas in the 1930s, to all intents and purposes a fascist régime. Sparta and the Battle of Thermopylae were two key themes in Metaxas' propaganda. Spyridon Marinatos' excavations at Thermopylae attracted personal interest on the part of Metaxas. The Third Hellenic Civilization, after classical Greece and the Byzantine Empire, was the ideological foundation for Metaxas' régime. References to classical antiquity, and notably to the aspects of antiquity that mirrored the official policy, were frequent. YH identifies a principle of "selective glorification". Sparta was glorified by a theme in the propaganda according to which ordinary people should make sacrifices for the good of the state (177). Byzantium, on the other hand, legitimized a strong centralized state, a great leader, and the Christian religious foundation of the régime's ideology. Another side of the selective glorification was the active prohibition of, for instance, certain ancient dramas. The youth organization EON, with the Minoan double axe as its symbol, was crucial for the mediation of the propaganda. EON organized public festivals, parades, and visits to archaeological sites. It introduced a performative dimension to the appropriation of antiquity in Greece. The extensive use of photographs in EON's magazines featuring posing EON-youths in front of ancient monuments was effective in spreading the performative agenda. The images monumentalize both the anonymous youths and the remains. They are reminders of the régime's ideological self-portrayal as inheritors of the First Hellenic Civilization. Metaxas' régime was extremely anticommunistic, so left-wingers were outcasts of Greek society. Nonetheless, they too adhered to the ideology that portrayed classical antiquity as the origin of the national culture (191).

Chapter six is devoted to the use of antiquity in the concentration camps on Makronisos during the Civil War, 1945–1949. Left-wing political views were criminalized and left-wingers were often sent into inner exile on a barren island in 20th-century Greece. In the camps, the prisoners were 're-educated' and 'rehabilitated'. The only way out was to sign a "repentance statement" in which the abandonment of communist views was declared (211). In this setting antiquity was an educational tool imbuing the prisoners with politically correct, that is nationalistic, views. Conceptually, parallels were often drawn between Makronisos and classical Athens, both on a general national level and in the material directed to the prisoners. The Acropolis was chosen, for instance, as the symbol of the prisoners' magazine (214–215). Rehabilitation consisted partly of the construction of miniature replicas of ancient monuments. This was seen as a purifying experience (217–220). This aggressive and forceful use of antiquity generated inversions of the official ideology. Prisoners began to refer to the Parthenon ironically and in mocking ways (225). The brutal methods on Makronisos were characterized as foreign and un-Hellenic by the prisoners. In other words, the prisoners did not turn against the classical legacy, but against the official appropriation of it. The moral authority of the classical past was never doubted (229).

In the last chapter, YH elaborates on the Parthenon marbles. YH begins with an account of the social, post-antique, history of the Parthenon and the Parthenon marbles. He emphasizes ideological aspects of this history and the importance of the Parthenon marbles in British ideology. YH mentions, for instance, that in 19th-century racist discourses the Parthenon marbles were said to have proved the Scandinavian/Saxon racial origins of the ancient Greeks (253). YH mentions the British Museum's cleansing of the marbles, and the dinner parties organized in the exhibition rooms of the Parthenon marbles. The severe Greek reactions when these stories became known make sense in the light of Greek discourse concerning purity and pollution. However, YH is primarily interested in how the Parthenon marbles have been appropriated in Greek public discourse. Their importance reached unprecedented heights in the 1980s when Melina Mercouri, at that time Greek minister of culture, made their repatriation a prioritized, national, issue. YH does not shy away from pointing to the shortcomings of the Greek one-eyed emphasis on the repatriation of only the Parthenon marbles (265). The symbolic significance of the Parthenon marbles in Greece can hardly be overestimated. For many they symbolize the national body. The dismemberment of the Parthenon stands for the dismemberment of Greece (268). The strong emotions calling for the repatriation of the Parthenon marbles can thus be seen as a longing for completeness.

In the Conclusion, YH reiterates some of the topics. The sacralisation of antiquity is mentioned. He concludes that all Greeks, regardless of political conviction, subscribe to an overarching national discourse which casts classical antiquity as the origin of Greece. Lastly, he emphasizes that modernity, as a discourse framing our understanding of the past, has not replaced older discourses. Indigenous Hellenism thus incorporates notions that pre-date modernity.

Critique of TNR

TNR is a rich, well-argued, and thought-provoking book. Those of us who have taken an interest in YH's earlier publications about archaeology in Greece will recognize that parts of *TNR* have been published earlier in the form of articles. YH's engagement with the topics at issue stretches back for over a decade now, and *TNR* can be read as its conclusion. The narrative-theme that runs through *TNR* is the notion that classical antiquity is sacralised in modern Greece. The Greek appropriation of Western Hellenism gave birth to Indigenous Hellenism. This discourse merges a veneration of classical antiquity from Western Hellenism with Byzantine and Orthodox Christian notions. Within this discourse archaeologists function as priests of a secular religion. The concept of Indigenous Hellenism is presented in the second chapter, and then gradually explicated in the following chapters. This is the intellectual thrust of *TNR*.

However, *TNR* has some aspects that I find problematic. Indigenous Hellenism comes into view, brick by brick, through the presentation of examples that are not explicitly associated with it. *TNR* has a meandering narrative style, partly attributable to his 'multi-sited' ethnographic method. This adds to the impression of a rich book. However, some diversions, for instance about photography (94–98), and museums (46–48), are too short to add anything to the argument.

One of the major benefits of *TNR* is that YH demonstrates the connections between archaeology, nationalism, and modernity. He shows several times how archaeology and nationalism rest on modernity. Sometimes, however, I think that YH credits Greek nationalism with too much influence. That is, YH has a tendency to present phenomena which I regard as generic to western modernity, as problematic consequences of Greek nationalism. One of several examples is YH's characterization of (Greek) nationalistic archaeology as disguising itself in a cloak of objectivity while it fails to openly discuss the constructed discursive and methodological techniques which are its foundations and through which it constructs a past (102). Although this certainly is a feature present in Greek archaeology, I fail to see it as a shortcoming specific to Greek archaeology and nationalism. The reluctance to discuss openly the conditions of the production of a discourse is generic to western normative sciences. In fact, it resembles Roland Barthes "reality effect", which is applicable not only to literary texts but also to western normative science.

YH differentiates between archaeologists in the Greek Archaeological Service who have the rôle of custodians of the remains, and university and foreign archaeologists who conduct archaeology in a more analytical and interpretative fashion. The institutional landscape of Greek archaeology that YH paints is nuanced. However, I find it regrettable that he omits to elaborate on the effects of the institutional setting on the development of Greek archaeology. We can all appreciate that the meagre resources of the Greek Archaeological Service have forced its employees to conduct hasty rescue digs and publish them in descriptive accounts that let the finds speak for themselves (37, 100). It is quite understandable that the Greek Archaeological Service produces a naïve empiristic archaeology. However, YH does not elaborate to the same extent on how other institutions, such as universities and foreign schools, contribute to the preservation of a disciplinary discourse that is largely oblivious to other perspectives. Given the insight and capability that YH demonstrates in *TNR* it is unfortunate that he has omitted consideration of this matter.

One more topic is omitted from *TNR*. I think that *TNR* would have benefited from a discussion about illicit excavations and illicit trade of antiquities (mentioned only very briefly on 54). Illicit trade has plagued Greece from time immemorial and is, despite the nausea it causes us, a concrete and bodily appropriation of classical antiquity. The private illicit exploitation of classical antiquity contradicts the public sacralisation of classical antiquity. Illicit trade complicates Indigenous Hellenism since these practices invert the public sacralisation of the classical remains. It is an unfortunate fact that Indigenous Hellenism, which accommodates many, seemingly contradictory, public appropriations of classical antiquity, does not include certain private attitudes that contradict it. I find it hard to accept that agents participating in illicit trade view ancient remains as relics.

Summary

Both *PMG* and *TNR* contribute to complicate our understanding of the dynamics of Hellenism. CG's investigation of Romantic Hellenism illustrates how the construction of an ideal Greece is related to the concrete landscape of Greece. *PMG* undermines thereby a conceptual divide between an imagined Greece and a different, real-world, Greek landscape. YH casts his net wider and investigates archaeology in Greece. By examining Indigenous Hellenism, YH develops a framework that makes Greek actions, reactions, and attitudes towards classical antiquity intelligible.

Although there are methodological differences, *PMG* and *TNR* are guided by a similar theoretical perspective. Both have a constructivist perspective guided by scepticism with regard to rigid structures. Dynamism and fluidity are essential principles for both authors. Furthermore, both publications have illustrated that we need to revise the analytical pairs mentioned in the introduction of this review. As so often, it is more fruitful to view analytical notions as extremes on a continuum and focus on the space in-between them. Last, but not least, both publications emphasize how the modern Greeks have appropriated and re-formulated a discourse concerning Hellenism in which they used to feature as second-rate extras.

Johannes Siapkas
Uppsala University
Dept. of Archaeology and Ancient History
Box 626
SE-751 26 UPPSALA
E-mail: Johannes.Siapkas@antiken.uu.se