

**LITERARY CRITICISM AND POLITICS:  
THE CASE OF ARISTOS KAMBANIS  
(1883-1956)**

by  
IOANNIS STAMOS

A thesis submitted to  
the University of Birmingham  
for the degree of  
MASTER OF RESEARCH

Department of Classics, Ancient History and Archaeology  
Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies

The University of Birmingham

November 2013

UNIVERSITY OF  
BIRMINGHAM

**University of Birmingham Research Archive**

**e-theses repository**

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

## **ABSTRACT**

This thesis discusses the case of the interwar Greek critic Aristos Kambanis (1883-1956), focusing on the intertwining of literary criticism and politics. This intertwining is apparent in Kambanis's case, not only because his oeuvre includes both critical and political texts, but also because his political choices seem to have determined his marginalisation as a critic. The approach of this thesis is mostly historical and the chapter breakdown is based on chronological criteria. There are five chapters in the main part and each of them outlines Kambanis's intellectual activities and output during a specific period from 1901 to 1956. Apart from providing biographical and bibliographical data concerning Kambanis, this thesis demonstrates moreover the multifacetedness and the significance of Kambanis's works.

## CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Aristos Kambanis: biography, politics and critical output .....	5
Methodology, aim, outline and contribution of the dissertation .....	12
<b>CHAPTER 1: FORMATIVE YEARS: POLITICS &amp; CULTURE (1901 – 1915) .....</b>	<b>16</b>
Intellectual activities .....	16
Political & historical context .....	20
Literary & artistic context .....	25
Conclusion .....	37
<b>CHAPTER 2: THE CONSOLIDATION OF KAMBANIS'S CONSERVATISM AND THE COURSE TOWARDS HIS INTELLECTUAL ESTABLISHMENT (1916 – 1925) .....</b>	<b>39</b>
Intellectual activities .....	39
<i>Ellinika Chronika</i> .....	41
<i>Kalligas and Zambelios</i> .....	51
<i>History of Modern Greek Literature</i> .....	55
Conclusion .....	59
<b>CHAPTER 3: THE YEARS OF RECOGNITION (1926 – 1936) .....</b>	<b>61</b>
Intellectual activities .....	61
<i>History of Modern Greek Criticism</i> .....	64
<i>History of Modern Greek Literature</i> .....	72
Conclusion .....	74
<b>CHAPTER 4: TO NEON KRATOS AND O EIKOSTOS EON: FROM THE 'THIRD GREEK CIVILISATION' TO THE 'THIRD REICH' (1937 – 1944) .....</b>	<b>75</b>
Intellectual activities .....	75
<i>To Neon Kratos</i> .....	78
<i>O Eikostos Aion</i> .....	88
Conclusion .....	93
<b>CHAPTER 5: A PERIOD OF IDEOLOGICAL RECONSIDERATION: KAMBANIS'S FINAL WORKS (1945-1956) .....</b>	<b>94</b>
<i>Dimitrios Gounaris</i> .....	94
<i>History of Modern Greek Literature</i> .....	98
Conclusion .....	99
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>105</b>



# INTRODUCTION

Literary criticism is acknowledgedly an understudied area of Modern Greek Studies. However, especially during the last few decades, it has caused debates and attracted a good deal of scholarly attention culminating in the publication of collected articles and essays of interwar critics<sup>1</sup> and the creation of an electronic archive of literary critics in the website of the National Book Centre of Greece (EKEBI).<sup>2</sup> And whilst there are relatively a great many histories of Modern Greek literature,<sup>3</sup> paradoxically the history of Modern Greek literary criticism has yet to be written. As a matter of fact, the first and only one who published a book entitled *History of Modern Greek Criticism* was the literary critic to be studied in my dissertation: Aristos Kambanis.<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless, this book does not meet present-day needs, since it does not go beyond 1900 and it focuses on the language question, thus making the title seem like it does not reflect the content of the book.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Agras 1980 & 1981 & 1984 & 1995, Politis 1983, Thrylos 2010, Theotokas 2005, Nikolareizis 2011.

<sup>2</sup> <http://critics.ekebi.gr/>.

<sup>3</sup> Kechayioglou (1980) examines 28 histories, most of which were published in the postwar era. About the histories published during the nineteenth century and the pre-WWII period, see Apostolidou 1992, part 1 (pp. 27-90) and part 4 (pp. 351-420). Beaton 1994a: 51 also mentions three more histories published during the '80s. Finally, the most important histories that were published since 1990 are considered to be the following: Beaton 1994b (it should, however, be stressed that Beaton defines his book as an 'introduction' and not as a 'history'), Argyriou 2002a-2007b. For an overall presentation of the historiography of Modern Greek literature, see <http://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/literature/studies/grammatologies/guide.html>.

<sup>4</sup> Kambanis 1935.

<sup>5</sup> See Tziovas 1987: 324. Cf. Dimaras 1939: 1499.

Why should the study of literary criticism be important? In the case of Greece, it has been claimed that the type of 'purus criticus' was not established.<sup>6</sup> Contrariwise, it could be argued that the critics often approximated the type of a modern 'homo universalis', dealing (or attempting to deal) with almost all the important issues of their society, not only literature, but politics, history, language and education as well. In reality, literary criticism was not so much dealing with texts, as it was a more general reflection on cultural phenomena.<sup>7</sup> Hence, a history of Modern Greek criticism could be seen as a form of a wider intellectual history, since Greek critics usually expanded beyond the literary phenomena. This means that the study of literary criticism could be proven valuable not only for a greater understanding of Modern Greek literature, but of Modern Greek culture as a whole or of various aspects of it separately, which are not necessarily related to literature in a direct manner.

Although the interwar period and predominantly the 1930s have been and remain extraordinarily appealing to the Modern Greek scholars<sup>8</sup> and the great significance of the decades between the Wars as far as criticism is concerned has been repeatedly highlighted,<sup>9</sup> the various manifestations and representatives of

---

<sup>6</sup> Tziovas 1987: 332.

<sup>7</sup> Tziovas 1987; Tziovas also speaks of 'humanist empiricism', a term that could be used to encapsulate both the universality of the critics' interests and their strong attachment to the notions of subjectivity, intuition, receptiveness etc. as opposed to theory.

<sup>8</sup> See for instance Tsakonas 1987 & 1989, Vitti 1995, Dounia 1996, Karaoglou et al. 1996 & 2002 & 2007, Varelas 1997, Kokoris 1999, Kotzia 2006, Kayialis 2007, Tziovas 2011. See also here, p. 1 (footnote 1).

<sup>9</sup> Most of the approaches to Modern Greek literary criticism focus mainly or exclusively on the interwar period: Spandonidis 1963, Argyriou 1981, Dimaras 1981, Steryiopoulos 1981, Yeorgousopoulos 1981, Moullas 1993 & 1994 [=Moullas 2001: 111-122], Pesketzi 2003. What is more,

literary criticism within this time frame have not yet been studied sufficiently. The prevailing connection of the study of Modern Greek criticism to this particular period stems from two basic parameters. On the one hand, the fruitful and varied reception of the contemporary European artistic and intellectual movements and ideas in Greece (from Communism to Surrealism and from Anglo-Saxon Modernism to Freudianism) renders this era perhaps the most important of Modern Greek intellectual history. As a matter of fact, the most renowned group of intellectuals and authors in Modern Greek history consists of the exponents of the so-called 'Generation of the '30s' and both Greek Nobel laureates (Yiorgos Seferis and Odysseas Elytis) were members of this 'Generation'. Even though the term is mostly used for litterateurs, it has been used to define the general cultural context of the period, including artists, critics and historians as well, such as Hatzikyriakos Gikas, Andreas Karandonis and Konstantinos Dimaras. On the other hand, the temporal distance enables nowadays a more comprehensive and impartial scrutiny.

Despite the views that try to detach literary criticism from any theories and regard it as a form of art rather than an activity bearing resemblance to scholarship,<sup>10</sup> the existence of some basic trends during the interwar period is almost commonly accepted. Most of the scholars point to the basic opposition between Marxist and

---

the only somehow consistent schematisations and distinctions between different trends of Greek literary criticism that have been attempted regard the same period: Spandonidis 1959, Moullas 1993, Pesketzi 2003. The infancy of Greek criticism is usually traced around the 1850s with the 'academic criticism' (Moullas 1981 [=Moullas 2001: 53-83]), whereas the Interwar is regarded by several scholars as the period of its maturity.

<sup>10</sup> Agras 1943, Lorentzatos 1980: 329, Arayis 1988: 89, Moullas 2001: 10.

Idealist criticism, which represents in fact a broader ideological and political divide, and could not only be traced in the context of criticism,<sup>11</sup> but some have attempted to provide more refined categorisations that include other trends as well. The most known among these patterns is, of course, the one Moullas furnished in 1992: Idealist, Marxist, Psychoanalytic and Symbolist criticism.<sup>12</sup> In addition, Spandonidis several decades before Moullas<sup>13</sup> and Pesketzi some years after him<sup>14</sup> proposed similar schematisations.

As it becomes obvious from the aforementioned, ideological and political conflicts often fostered the emergence of the various critical trends and controversies. This applies mostly to the two main trends of the period, all the more if one takes into account that the term Idealism is sometimes considered interchangeable with other terms of a far more political essence, such as 'Hellenocentrism' ('Ελληνοκεντρισμός') or 'Nationalism'.<sup>15</sup> As a matter of fact, there are a great many periodicals of this period that explicitly expressed the political or ideological base of their critical approaches to literature.<sup>16</sup>

The problems related to the terminology (opacity, vagueness, generality etc.) and the periodisation perhaps should lead us (at least for now) to abandoning any

---

<sup>11</sup> Tsakonas 1988.

<sup>12</sup> Moullas 1992: 148.

<sup>13</sup> Spandonidis 1959: 7-19.

<sup>14</sup> Pesketzi 2003: 90-102.

<sup>15</sup> See for instance Tsakonas 1965: 99-107, Tsakonas 1972: 192-227, Tsakonas 1973: 75-103, Tsakonas 1987: 400-418. The same author speaks also of 'right-wing' and 'left-wing' criticism (Tsakonas 1987: 421).

<sup>16</sup> See Alisandratos 2001, Dounia 1996.

attempts to further identify or define other trends and instead focus on case studies. Besides, the analysis of individual critics could prepare the ground for a more complex and comprehensive study of Modern Greek criticism. My dissertation clearly abides by such an approach.

### **ARISTOS KAMBANIS: BIOGRAPHY, POLITICS AND CRITICAL OUTPUT**

The main question I will try to address in my dissertation is: why should one engage in the study of this specific critic? Due to his political inclinations, Kambanis was marginalised after the end of WWII and the liberation of Greece,<sup>17</sup> although he attempted to stay on the foreground through a reconsideration of his earlier political beliefs and the fifth reprinting of his ‘classic’ *History of Modern Greek Literature*.<sup>18</sup> Nevertheless, his marginalisation was somehow irreversible at that point, since this last attempt coincided with the publication of a far more influential history of literature, that of K. Th. Dimaras, the same year.<sup>19</sup> Nonetheless, Kambanis’s treatment had not always been so negative; as far as the prewar years are concerned, and especially the last decade of the Interwar, the situation was quite the opposite.

Aristos Kambanis (Άριστος Καμπάνης), who was born in 1883 and studied Philology at the University of Athens, first appeared in the Greek literary field in

---

<sup>17</sup> See Sarandakos 2011.

<sup>18</sup> For a review of this book see Chatzinis 1949.

<sup>19</sup> Dimaras 1948. The significance of Dimaras’s book is generally acknowledged; in Apostolidou 1992: 351, for example, it is characterised a ‘τομή’ in Greek historiography of literature. See also Beaton 1994a: 51 and Apostolidou 1992: 23.

1901 writing articles in the periodical *To Periodikon mas*<sup>20</sup> (1900-1902) and started gaining a remarkable role as a frequent contributor to the periodical *Akritas*<sup>21</sup> (1904-1906) of his friend and fellow citizen from Piraeus, the poet Sotiris Skipis.<sup>22</sup> Kambanis gradually became known among the literary circles of Greece and established himself as an intellectual through his translations of Ancient Greek tragedies and modern European poems, his political journalism, and, mostly, his literary critiques. Nevertheless, his innumerable articles, literary critiques and book reviews remain the most important facet of his authorial work. He delivered a massive production, which for the most part remains still uncollected.

As the observations of some scholars imply, Kambanis began his career with much more progressive political ideas than those he ended up expressing and supporting during the sixth decade of his life.<sup>23</sup> Of course, Kambanis was not the only one among the intellectuals known today as followers of right-wing ideologies - to whichever extent they are known - that became attracted to socialist ideas during the first decades of the twentieth century in Greece. As a matter of fact, for some period this was a general trend that influenced many critics and litterateurs of that time.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> See Bakoyiannis 1994, Karaoglou et al. 1996: 53-57, Antoniou-Tiliou 2007b.

<sup>21</sup> See Karaoglou et al. 1996: 131-135, Grekou 2007, Kordatos 1962: 418, 481.

<sup>22</sup> About Sotiris Skipis (1881-1952) see Ziras 2007d.

<sup>23</sup> Tziouvas 1989: 150, Sarandakos 2011.

<sup>24</sup> See Gounelas 1984. In fact, even the two critics that are thought of as constituting the backbone of Greek Idealist criticism, namely Fotos Politis and Yiannis Apostolakis, were influenced by Socialism or even vigorously supported the leftist ideology during the first years of the twentieth century. See Yeorgousopoulos 1981: 147, Moullas 1993, Gouli 2007: 1845, Ziras 2007a: 155. A similar tendency

No sooner had Kambanis turned twenty five than he became himself the editor of a literary journal, *O Pan*<sup>25</sup>(1908-1909), which attracted the interest (and the contributions) of many already established authors, such as Kostis Palamas and Pavlos Nirvanas. Nonetheless, his ‘apprenticeship’ on progressive ideas did not last long.<sup>26</sup> In 1916 Kambanis had already joined the royalist faction; not only that, but he had developed personal relations with major political figures of the royalist wing<sup>27</sup> and he even published the political journal *Ellinika Chronika*<sup>28</sup> (1916) advocating for the King’s stand in ‘the bitter conflict that developed over Greece’s alignment during the First World War’.<sup>29</sup> In 1921 Kambanis started publishing the newspaper *I Protevousa* (1921-1922), where he also expressed his support for the Conservatives that had formed the coalition government after the elections of 1920 and his opposition to the Liberals.<sup>30</sup>

As a result of his intense involvement in politics, Kambanis was condemned after the so-called ‘Revolution’ of 1922 and his newspaper was closed,<sup>31</sup> but he

---

appeared in Greece after the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 and especially following the Asia Minor Disaster of 1922 (Dounia 1996, especially pp. 29-33). See for example the case of Aimilios Chourmouzios as analysed in Kotzia 2006: 99-117.

<sup>25</sup> Karaoglou et al. 1996: 169-170, Papakyritsis 2007.

<sup>26</sup> Ziras 2007c: 1005.

<sup>27</sup> See Kambanis 1946: 5 about Dimitrios Gounaris, and Kambanis 1946: 200 about Rallis family.

<sup>28</sup> About the periodical *Ελληνικά Χρονικά* (1916) see Antoniou-Tiliou 2007a and Karaoglou et al. 1996: 424.

<sup>29</sup> Clogg 2002: 2. Besides, as Enepikidis revealed (1961), Kambanis was a secret agent of the Germans at that time (cited in Kordatos 1962: 805, footnote 1).

<sup>30</sup> About the elections of 1 November 1920 see Yianoulopoulos 2003: 268-277. About the royalist governments that were formed following these elections see Yianoulopoulos 2003: 277-287.

<sup>31</sup> About the ‘Revolution’ of 1922, which was in fact a coup d’état organised by liberal army officers, see for instance Tsakonas 1987: 65-72. See also Yianoulopoulos 2003: 297-303, and especially 300-302.

managed to escape to Egypt,<sup>32</sup> where he spent the next two years building relations with the intellectual circles of the Greek community, publishing texts in the local journals<sup>33</sup> and writing his *History of Modern Greek Literature* that first appeared in 1925.<sup>34</sup> After his return to Greece, Kambanis achieved to regain his prior position and even to further establish his role as an acknowledged intellectual. In 1929 Kostis Bastias proposed the founding of a separate department of Modern Greek Studies at the University of Athens (until then the department included jointly Modern Greek and Byzantine Studies) and nominated Kambanis as the most eligible for undertaking the role of the professor.<sup>35</sup>

Kambanis became the editor of the newspaper *I Proia* in 1925 and the periodical *Filologykos Neos Kosmos*<sup>36</sup> in 1935 and he had a regular column in several other serial publications of that time, such as the newspaper *Ethnos* and the magazine *Ergasia*. 1935 was also the year that he published his aforementioned book on the history of literary criticism.<sup>37</sup> This book and the one he published a year after that, the *History of Aesthetic Theories*,<sup>38</sup> had educational aspirations and served clearly

---

<sup>32</sup> Kambanis 1946: 5, Ziras 2007c: 1005.

<sup>33</sup> Even before 1923 Kambanis's texts were included in Greek periodicals published in Egypt, for example in *Grammata* (1911-1921) and *Nea Zoi* (1904-1927).

<sup>34</sup> Kambanis 1925.

<sup>35</sup> Bastias 1929: 701.

<sup>36</sup> About *Φιλολογικός Νέος Κόσμος* see Karaoglou et al. 2007: 155-159.

<sup>37</sup> See here, introduction, p. 1 (footnote 4).

<sup>38</sup> Kambanis 1936.

the principles of the demoticist movement (and more specifically, of the demoticist association 'Glossikos Syllogos').<sup>39</sup>

Over the years Kambanis's political views became more and more extreme. In 1936 a dictatorship was established in Greece by Ioannis Metaxas, a former General and a royalist politician. Metaxas, who was an admirer of Mussolini's and Hitler's achievements, attempted unsuccessfully to structure a similar regime. Kambanis was appointed Professor at the Panteios School of Political Sciences<sup>40</sup> and he was the editor of the regime's official (or, to put it better, semi-official)<sup>41</sup> magazine, *To Neon Kratos*,<sup>42</sup> which was issued regularly from 1937 until the spring of 1941, when the Nazi battalions invaded Greece, in order to assist the Italian army that had launched an attack against Greece some six months earlier, but was driven back to Albania by the Greek military forces.

---

<sup>39</sup> About this association, whose founding member was, among others, Kambanis himself, see Tzartanos 1935 and Nakas 2011: 509-515.

<sup>40</sup> See Kambanis 1940b (footnote 1) & 1940c (footnote 1). See also here, chapter 4, p. 78 (footnote 10).

<sup>41</sup> Usually, the magazine is considered as the official ideological instrument of the regime. However, some scholars argue that, since *To Neon Kratos* was not solely defending the official doctrine and there is no explicit statement on behalf of the regime that this was its official periodical, the characterisation 'semi-official' is preferable (see Andreiomenos 2010: 38-39; especially 39 (footnote 38), where this debate is delineated). On the contrary, Kordatos claimed that 'the scholarly-theoretical instrument of the dictatorial regime of the "4th of August" was the periodical "Neon Kratos" (1937-1939) [sic], that Aristos Kambanis was publishing with state funding' (Kordatos 1962: 644 (footnote 1)).

<sup>42</sup> The periodical was named after the title that the dictatorial regime was using for itself: 'Το Νέον Κράτος', meaning 'The New State'. Although Metaxas's dictatorship used to be described as (or, to be more accurate, accused of) being a fascist regime, following blindly the examples of Mussolini's Italy and Hitler's Germany, modern historians prefer more general terms, such as 'totalitarian' or 'autocratic' regime. As such, even the characterisation 'Το Νέον Κράτος' bears resemblance to other authoritarian, but not fascist regimes, such as the Portuguese 'Estado Novo' (see Angelis 2006: 37; cf. Sarandis 2009: 71). About the periodical *To Neon Kratos* see Kokkinos n.d., Panaretou 1993, Alisandratos 2001: 320-325, Argyriou 2002b: 1049-1051 & 2003: 19, Lyssari & Papakyritsis 2007, Andreiomenos 2010.

Until the summer of that same year, all of Greece was occupied by the Axis troops. Less than a year had passed, and Kambanis published a pro-German periodical (*O Eikostos Aion*), which soon ceased publication, due to the public's indifference.<sup>43</sup> It could be argued that his decision to become the editor of this pro-Nazi publication signalled the beginning of his marginalisation.

After the liberation of Greece in autumn 1944, and especially after the Treaty of Varkiza on 12 February 1945, many Greeks that were accused of having collaborated with the occupation forces were brought to justice. Several trials were held that sentenced people accused of being traitors to various penalties;<sup>44</sup> Kambanis was amongst them. As Sifis Kollias notes, 'Aristos Kambanis spent his last days at Dromokaiteion mental hospital following the ordeal of his political court case'.<sup>45</sup> The available data indicate that Kambanis was hospitalised in this mental institution from the summer of 1955 until late December 1956;<sup>46</sup> however, the details of his trial still remain unclear.<sup>47</sup>

Something that corroborates the fact that Greek scholars tend to overlook the case of Kambanis and disregard his contribution, while at the same time it renders the present thesis useful, is that there are so many false data (mostly of bibliographic

---

<sup>43</sup> Argyriou 2003: 59-60, Kastrinaki 2005: 107, Demiri 2007.

<sup>44</sup> See for instance Haidia, E. 2000.

<sup>45</sup> Kollias 1973: 1001.

<sup>46</sup> Fafaliou 1995: 239.

<sup>47</sup> Kordatos (1962: 805) claims that 'Aristos Kambanis, who, when the Germans left, should have been brought to justice, managed to get away with it, like so many other collaborators and traitors'. This statement does not clarify whether Kambanis stood trial for his treacherous stance and was vindicated or the trial did not take place at all.

or biographic nature) about him. For instance, 1957 is sometimes noted as the year of his passing, but in reality Kambanis passed away the last days of 1956.<sup>48</sup> Even one of the most industrious Modern Greek scholars, Yiorgos Veloudis, makes a mistake by noting Athens as the place where the first edition of Kambanis's *History of Modern Greek Literature* was published,<sup>49</sup> whereas this book was first published in Egypt.<sup>50</sup>

Furthermore, a close examination reveals that Kambanis's role in the Greek intellectual life is often understated or ignored in most of the subsequent histories of Modern Greek literature. In Vitti's history<sup>51</sup> and Beaton's introduction<sup>52</sup> Kambanis is not mentioned at all. Nonetheless, those two scholars' stance can easily be explained, as they concentrate on literature and not on criticism. Contrarily, Dimaras's choice is more difficult and complex to explain. For Dimaras had conversed with Kambanis on various occasions<sup>53</sup> and he was really active during the years that Kambanis was an established critic and intellectual (i.e. mostly the 1930s). In fact, he was a member of 'Glossikos Syllogos' too<sup>54</sup> and had contributed to periodicals whose editor was Kambanis, such as *To Neon Kratos*.<sup>55</sup> Consequently, the practically total absence of

---

<sup>48</sup> See Chatz. 1957 and Fafaliou 1995.

<sup>49</sup> Veloudis 1983: 707. Of course, this is not the only case; for instance, most of the entries concerning Kambanis in encyclopedias abound with mistakes.

<sup>50</sup> The first two editions were correspondingly published in Cairo and Alexandria and they deliver an identical text; however, a note of some typographical errors, an index and a contents table were added in the second edition.

<sup>51</sup> Vitti 2001.

<sup>52</sup> Beaton 1994b.

<sup>53</sup> One of the most characteristic and well-known texts that falls into this category is Dimaras 1933.

<sup>54</sup> See Tzartzanos 1935: 9.

<sup>55</sup> See Andreiomenos 2010: 48 and especially footnote 58. Andreiomenos opposes Kokkinos's view (Kokkinos n.d.: 49.), according to which Dimaras was one of the three scholars (the other two being Nikos Svoronos and Michail Sakellariou) whose articles appearing in *To Neon Kratos* were actually unauthorised reproductions from other publications. Andreiomenos seems to imply that Dimaras and

Kambanis from his History cannot but be considered as a deliberate act.<sup>56</sup> Whether his motives were personal or more general, Dimaras's stance implies that it is Kambanis's political choices that lurk in the background of this decision and not the value of his work or the breadth of his contribution.

Quite surprisingly, two historians of Modern Greek literature, whose political backdrop is leftist, have devoted many more lines to Kambanis and have recognised his critical contribution as well as his personal value and intellectual qualities. Namely, Kordatos mentions that Kambanis was 'educated, talented and intelligent and in many of his reviews he makes correct and notable remarks',<sup>57</sup> while Argyriou, apart from recognising Kambanis's critical skills, even attempts to exonerate him of the guilt stemming from his involvement in a pro-Nazi periodical, by maintaining that he was probably forced to undertake the role of the editor.<sup>58</sup>

#### **METHODOLOGY, AIM, OUTLINE AND CONTRIBUTION OF THE DISSERTATION**

Given the aforementioned, the lack of studies on Kambanis appears a natural consequence. This is actually one of the greatest difficulties that someone has to face in their endeavour to study this critic: the almost complete absence of precedent

---

Sakellariou were in a way promoted by the periodical, since one can also find reviews for some of their texts in *To Neon Kratos*.

<sup>56</sup> There is only one reference to Kambanis as the author of the *History of Modern Greek Literature* (Dimaras 1948: 564). However, Dimaras seems to acknowledge Kambanis's importance in one of his later texts: Dimaras 1981. This change could be probably attributed to the time that had passed in the meanwhile.

<sup>57</sup> Kordatos 1962: 493. Moreover, in many cases Kordatos indirectly affirms Kambanis's merits by agreeing with his observations and even regularly quoting him (see for example pp. 472 and 508).

<sup>58</sup> Argyriou 2003: 60. I would also like to mention here that another leftist intellectual very recently referred to Kambanis acknowledging his value; see Sarandakos 2011.

studies upon which they could draw. As a result, my research had to rely mostly on primary sources, which in turn posed another problem, due to the fact that Kambanis's work remains for the biggest part scattered in various periodicals and newspapers, some of which are hardly accessible today. Thus, collecting the material was a necessary preparatory task, which included visiting libraries and accessing digitalised sources.

The primary aim of my dissertation is to demonstrate how literary criticism and politics were intertwined in interwar Greece. It could be claimed that this interconnection has two main aspects: Firstly, a critic's political beliefs are often reflected in his work. Secondly, politics play a crucial role, as far as either the promotion or the marginalisation of a critic and his work is concerned. Should one take into account the maxim that politics is the history of the future and history is the politics of the past, and, also, that ideologies and political theories constitute the foundation of political practice, the necessity for such a study to take into consideration historical data and ideological movements or conflicts emerges as a logical requisite. As it has already been mentioned, certain ideologies often underlay the critical trends of the prewar era; not only that, but the intellectual debates of that time conduced to the development of conflicting worldviews in Greece, which in turn led to significant historical events, such as the Civil War.

Moreover, I will attempt to demonstrate the value of Kambanis's work that, to my mind, would have placed him among the critics of the canon, were it not for his

political choices and, as Chatzinis and Tsakonas put it, for 'his pétainist stance during the Occupation'.<sup>59</sup> In addition, I will venture to explain the reasons why from a certain period onwards he was marginalised by his contemporaries and mostly by the later scholars and critics.

My dissertation is divided into five chapters entitled as follows: (1) 'Formative years: politics and culture (1901-1915)', (2) 'The consolidation of Kambanis's Conservatism and the course towards his intellectual establishment (1916-1925)', (3) 'The years of recognition' (1926-1936), (4) 'From the "Third Greek Civilisation" to the "Third Reich" (1937-1944)', (5) 'A period of ideological reconsideration: Kambanis's final works (1945-1956)'. In the appendix to the thesis I have listed all the serial publications with which Kambanis had collaborated, as well as his own publications. Such a record can function as a base for further research, since it includes all the newspapers and periodicals in which Kambanis's original texts were traced, although most of those texts (due to their massive number) were not used for the purposes of this dissertation.

Finally, the contribution of my dissertation, as evinced from the aforementioned, is focused on demonstrating the interrelation between literary criticism and politics, but it also encompasses the following: (1) presentation of accurate information regarding Kambanis's life and work; (2) demonstration of the import of his work (critical and historical); (3) effort to set aside the ideological biases that often weigh

---

<sup>59</sup> Chatz. 1957 & Tsakonas 1989: 345.

upon the judgement of scholars and approach his oeuvre through a non-ideological perspective; (4) contribution (albeit a minor one) to the study of the history of Modern Greek criticism; (5) compilation of Kambanis's bibliography.

## **FORMATIVE YEARS: POLITICS & CULTURE (1901 – 1915)**

The aim of this chapter is to give a comprehensive picture of Kambanis's multifaceted activities, his political engagement, his ideological stances and his development as a critic during his formative years (1901-1915). The chapter is arranged in three main sections and a fourth one which contains some concluding remarks. The first one of these three sections outlines Kambanis's activities and publications, while the other two attempt to profile Kambanis as an intellectual by presenting his main interests through the discussion of some of his most significant texts of that period.

### **INTELLECTUAL ACTIVITIES**

Though Aristos Kambanis was born in Athens (1883), he moved with his mother to Piraeus when he was four years old, following his father's death, and that had a decisive effect on his career.<sup>1</sup> Before he had even finished high school he published some verses in a calendar of Piraeus, which attracted Yerasimos Vokos's interest.<sup>2</sup> As publisher of *To Periodikon mas*, the latter asked Kambanis to contribute

---

<sup>1</sup> Bastias 1999: 67.

<sup>2</sup> About Yerasimos Vokos (1868-1927) see Meraklis 2007.

to his periodical, by publishing his poetic and critical efforts.<sup>3</sup> Apart from that, having grown up in Piraeus led Kambanis to develop a certain liking for some authors who were from the same city. What is more, he joined a group of intellectuals and litterateurs based on Piraeus, or, as Valetas defines it, he became a member of the 'Circle of Piraeus'.<sup>4</sup>

It should be noted that during these first years of his critical career Kambanis contributed to many periodicals, such as *Fyllis* (1901-1904), *Kritiki* (1903), *Neos Rythmos* (1908) et al.,<sup>5</sup> but only the ones to which he was a 'regular contributor' or which he edited himself are to be extensively discussed here.<sup>6</sup>

The second periodical to which Kambanis contributed frequently was *Akritas*, whose editor, Sotiris Skipis, was also from Piraeus. In addition, Kambanis, who had very good personal relations with Skipis at that time, was the one who suggested that the periodical be named *Akritas*.<sup>7</sup> His first contribution to *Akritas* appeared in the very first issue and was placed in a prominent position. Kambanis published several articles in this periodical until a disagreement with Skipis about the content of one of the former's contributions resulted in the ending of his collaboration.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Bastias 1999: 68. *To Periodikon mas* was not the only serial publication from Piraeus that Kambanis contributed to; there were more, such as *Kambana* (1908) (see Karaoglou et al. 1996: 168) and *Rythmos* (1932-1934) (see Karaoglou et al. 2002: 370-381).

<sup>4</sup> Valetas 1966: 129. See also here, chapter 1, pp. 31-32.

<sup>5</sup> About *Fyllis* see Karaoglou et al. 1996: 99-102, about *Kritiki* see Karaoglou et al. 1996: 115-119 and about *Neos Rythmos* see Karaoglou et al. 1996: 167.

<sup>6</sup> I adopt the term 'τακτικός συνεργάτης' the way it is defined in Karaoglou et al. 1996: 29.

<sup>7</sup> Skipis 1935 & Karaoglou et al. 1996: 133.

<sup>8</sup> Kambanis expressed in such a negative way about the situation in Greece at his time and especially about his contemporary literature that Skipis affixed the following note to his article: 'Η γνώμη είναι ατομική του γράφοντος' (Kambanis 1905c). Kambanis reacted to that sending a letter to the periodical, which was published in a later issue (Kambanis 1905d) along with Skipis's response

In 1906 Kambanis edited along with Pavlos Nirvanas and Yeoryios S. Zoufres the periodical *Illysia* that contained only literary translations and in 1911 he was, for some months, the editor of the magazine *Attiki Iris* (1898-1915).<sup>9</sup> However, *O Pan* (*Miniaion Organon tis eleftheras skepseos*) is the first periodical whose editorship was undertaken exclusively by Kambanis. He would not only write the editorial and a column regarding the current artistic and literary activity, but he was also managing, advertising and promoting the periodical, as well as attempting to attract potential contributors by personally sending them beforehand the announcement of its forthcoming publication.<sup>10</sup> The periodical's subtitle, meaning 'Monthly instrument of free thought', clearly indicates young Kambanis's tolerance towards different ideas and perspectives, something that arguably was not the case during his later years.<sup>11</sup>

During this period Kambanis published many translations of ancient Greek texts (Hellenistic poetry,<sup>12</sup> classical tragedies<sup>13</sup> and philosophical books<sup>14</sup>) and

---

(Skipis 1905). After that point, Kambanis did not contribute to *Akritas* any more. Some aspects of Kambanis's negative criticism that caused Skipis's reaction are discussed here, chapter 1, pp. 30, 36.

<sup>9</sup> About *Illysia* see Karaoglou et al. 1996: 148-149. In Bastias 1999: 69 (footnote 4) it is noted that *Illysia* was cooperating with *Panathinaia* and *Akritas*. However, not only the way of cooperation is not clarified, but, at least in the case of the latter periodical, this was not possible, since *Akritas*'s last issue was published in 1904. About Nirvanas, whose real name was Petros K. Apostolidis (1866-1937), see Anagnostopoulos & Paradeisi 2007a and about Zoufres (?-1908) see Anon. 1908. About *Attiki Iris* see Karaoglou et al. 1996: 45-52.

<sup>10</sup> Some of the response letters were published on the verso and recto of the first issue's front and back cover respectively.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. also Palamas's letter on the front cover's verso of the first issue: 'Γνωρίζω πως βρεσκόμαστε [sic], και πως θα βρεθούμε ίσως, αντίθετοι και πολέμιοι σε ζητήματα σημαντικά'. About Kambanis's ambivalent relation with Palamas, see for example here, chapter 1, p. 27, especially footnote 59.

<sup>12</sup> See for example Theocritus 1903 & 1904.

<sup>13</sup> See for example Euripides 1911 & 1912a & 1912b and Sophocles 1911 & 1913.

<sup>14</sup> See for example Plato 1911a & 1911b.

modern European authors (Heine,<sup>15</sup> Gorky,<sup>16</sup> Leopardi<sup>17</sup> et al.). What is more, most of Kambanis's own literary texts were published during the first two decades of the twentieth century. As a matter of fact, his very first text that appeared in a periodical was a poem published in the 26th issue of *To Periodikon mas*.<sup>18</sup> In addition, he published several poems (mostly sonnets) in *Akritas*,<sup>19</sup> as well as in other serial publications of his time, such as *Fyllis* and *Iyiso*.<sup>20</sup> Besides, in 1914 his sole poetry collection *Προσφορά στον Ήφαιστο* was published.<sup>21</sup> Nevertheless, this could be considered his poetic 'swan song', since the author more or less retired from literature after that.<sup>22</sup>

Finally, in 1915 Kambanis wrote a text in *O Noumas* about Gounaris,<sup>23</sup> wherein he gave an account of Gounaris's political career up to date, which contained all the basic information Kambanis included in the first three chapters of his book on the same politician several years later.<sup>24</sup> Nonetheless, the support he provided to

---

<sup>15</sup> See for example Heine 1904a & 1904b.

<sup>16</sup> See Gorky 1904a & 1904b & 1904c. However, it seems that after some point the translation of Gorky's short story was taken over by the then Skipis's fiancée: the translation of Gorky 1904d is anonymous, whereas Gorky 1904e is signed by A.I.K., Emilia Kourteli's initials used as a signature for other texts in *Akritas* as well. About Kourteli (1881-1941), who later got married to another poet, Thrasyvoulos Zoiopoulos (Stefanos Dafnis), and used the same penname as him (Emilia Dafni), see Ziras 2007b.

<sup>17</sup> See for example Leopardi 1912.

<sup>18</sup> Kambanis 1901a. He published poems in two more issues of the same periodical; see Kambanis 1901b and Kambanis 1901g.

<sup>19</sup> Kambanis 1904f & 1904g & 1904h & 1904j.

<sup>20</sup> See for example Kambanis 1904k & 1907.

<sup>21</sup> Kambanis 1914.

<sup>22</sup> Kambanis said in an interview that he gave to Kostis Bastias in 1931: 'εξέδωκα [...] την πρώτη ποιητική μου συλλογή *Προσφορά στον Ήφαιστο*, με τη διάθεση να μην ξαναγράψω πια στίχους. Έγραψα όμως, παρ' όλ' αυτά, ένα ακόμη ποίημα, "Το Τρόπαιο", που το μετέφρασε γερμανικά ο Κάρολος Ντίτριχ' (Bastias 1999: 69)

<sup>23</sup> Kambanis 1915.

<sup>24</sup> Kambanis 1946: 11-37.

Gounaris during the time of his Premiership in 1915 was even more active, since he toured Peloponnese giving speeches in favour of the 'leader', as he called him.<sup>25</sup>

## POLITICAL & HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Kambanis's interest in politics remained constant throughout the years, although there were fluctuations as far as his active engagement in the country's political life is concerned. Nevertheless, his output abounds with articles that are either entirely politically oriented or contain references to political and historical events or figures. In the same category one could additionally group texts dealing with the language question, whose political implications have repeatedly been discussed by Modern Greek scholars and which had 'officially' entered its political phase in the first years of the twentieth century.<sup>26</sup>

Kambanis's first publication that to some extent touched upon political matters is amongst the first texts he ever published. In the 1 May 1901 issue of *To Periodikon mas* he was responsible for a 'survey' on the matter of patriotism and national ideals.<sup>27</sup> He expressed the opinion that these notions are interrelated with art and infused into the common people by the artists, so he considered it logical to report the views of some of his contemporary authors. It is also interesting that all the participating writers were demoticists and, in fact, the 'survey' was resumed in

---

<sup>25</sup> Kambanis 1946: 132-133.

<sup>26</sup> The social and political implications of the language question have been acknowledged to some extent as early as the middle of the nineteenth century (Stavridi-Patrikiou 1976: ζ'); nonetheless, the question was politicised 'officially' after 1907 (Stavridi-Patrikiou 1976: ιβ').

<sup>27</sup> Kambanis 1901d.

the next issue with the opinions of three of the most active supporters of the demotic cause: Kostis Palamas, Alexandros Pallis and Argyris Eftaliotis.<sup>28</sup>

Moreover, Kambanis's first contribution to *Akritas* is a political text with anthropological elements which, at the beginning of the twentieth century, delineated a phenomenon which has mostly started emerging at the beginning of the twenty-first century: the political and economic decadence of the West and the rise of the Asian powers.<sup>29</sup> Indeed, after the American and European financial crisis started in 2007-2008 it has become quite apparent that Asia is bound to overthrow the West continuing a course that was obviously in progress even one century ago.<sup>30</sup>

In this article Kambanis followed a train of thought that was to become commonplace in many critiques against modern(ist) art. What is probably the most recurring word in these critiques made an appearance here as well: 'décadence'.<sup>31</sup> But Kambanis's main point remained the rejection of some chauvinistic 'ethnological' theories of his time regarding the 'superiority' of the white race or as he argues 'οι ανθρωπολόγοι, όταν θέσουν επί του τάπητος άλλην μίαν φοράν το ζήτημα της κατωτέρας κατασκευής ανθρωπικής των κιτρίνων θα έχουν να σκεφθούν πολύ'.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Kambanis 1901f. About Palamas's engagement in demoticism see Kriaras 1997 and Patsis 2008. About Eftaliotis and Pallis see Mitsakis & Paradeisi 2007 and Anagnostopoulos & Paradeisi 2007b respectively.

<sup>29</sup> Kambanis 1904a.

<sup>30</sup> See for example <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2011/11/22/west-urged-adapt-rising-power-east.html>.

<sup>31</sup> Kambanis 1904a: 4. Cf. Kambanis 1904a: 5: 'Ένας άρρωστος Επικούρειος πεσσιμισμός'.

<sup>32</sup> Kambanis 1904a: 7. In addition, the article touches upon issues that could be associated not only with the Great War and WWII, but also with the post-war status quo: Pan-Slavism, Pan-Teutonicism,

Furthermore, Kambanis published another political article in *Akritas* in the column bearing the eloquent title ‘Το πολιτικόν δελτίον’.<sup>33</sup> Despite the fact that the article is entitled ‘Υστερ’ από τον Τρικούπην’, the critic concentrated on this politician and presented him as an unselfish visionary, who was, however, overambitious and turned out to become so authoritative in some cases, that Kambanis did not even hesitate to call him, and indeed more than once, a ‘dictator’.<sup>34</sup> Nonetheless, Kambanis seemed to consider Trikoupis and Kapodistrias as the two greatest Modern Greek politicians.<sup>35</sup> The article draws to a close with a reversal of one of Trikoupis’s most known phrases: ‘Η Ελλάς δε θα ζήση αν πέπρωται να ζουν αυτοί που τη διοικούν σήμερ’.<sup>36</sup>

In his own periodical, *O Pan*, Kambanis’s editorials under the general title ‘Klepsydra’ are concerned with current events of cultural (artistic, literary, theatrical) and predominantly of political essence.<sup>37</sup> The political element is present even in the beginning of the first editorial which is in fact the periodical’s programmatic declaration:

---

Germany’s desire for domination over Europe, Japan’s military and political strengthening, the vision for a unified Europe et. al.

<sup>33</sup> Kambanis 1904c.

<sup>34</sup> Kambanis 1904c: 34, 35, 36.

<sup>35</sup> Kambanis 1904c: 36.

<sup>36</sup> Kambanis 1904c: 36. The original phrase is also quoted in Kambanis 1904c: 33.

<sup>37</sup> The topical quality of the editorial is even quite apparent from its title, which means ‘hourglass’, but also indirectly from its subtitle, which appears only on the first issue: ‘Σκέψεις γεννώμεναι από τα πράγματα’ (the word ‘πράγματα’ here is used in the sense of ‘γεγονότα’ or ‘καταστάσεις’). What is more, Kambanis states it explicitly on the editorial of the first issue: ‘Το διαμέρισμα υπό το όνομα *Κλεψύδρα* [sic] του περιοδικού, φέρον την υπογραφήν της διευθύνσεως, θα είναι μια τρόπον τινά γενική κριτική των παντοίων γεγονότων του μηνός’ (Kambanis 1908: 1).

Το περιοδικόν τούτο δεν ήλθε να εγκαθιδρύση την λογοκρισίαν.  
Τουναντίον: ήλθε να προαγάγη την ελευθερίαν των συζητήσεων. Οι  
συνεργάται του δεν ανήκουν εις ωρισμένον κόμμα.<sup>38</sup>

Kambanis's political comments in his editorials are quite noteworthy, since they manifest his ken of both internal and international politics, his historical background, his political insight and his effort to be objective. In his first editorial he criticised the constitution of 1864,<sup>39</sup> he presented the solution of the Cretan Question as relatively imminent,<sup>40</sup> he indirectly foresaw that the Young Turk Movement's leaders were not going to substantiate the liberalisation of the Ottoman Empire,<sup>41</sup> he even referred to the Bulgarian people in a very positive manner just a few months after the ceasing of the Macedonian Struggle.<sup>42</sup>

Kambanis's second editorial is divided into two parts, one about internal and one about external politics. In the first part he referred in a negative way to the 1909 budget that the newly appointed Minister of Finance, Dimitrios Gounaris, had submitted to the Parliament.<sup>43</sup> Despite his unfavourable comments about Gounaris, Kambanis added the following:

---

<sup>38</sup> Kambanis 1908: 1 (emphasis added). This could be hardly argued about the next periodical that Kambanis edited, *Ellinika Chronika* (see here, chapter 2, pp. 41-51).

<sup>39</sup> Kambanis 1908: 3. This constitution was in the end revised by Venizelos just a few years after that article, in 1911. It is also very interesting that Kambanis claims that the Cretans must and can lead to the revision of the constitution and, as it is known, Venizelos was from Crete, indeed the leader of the Theriso revolt (about this revolt see Maris 1985). On the 1864/1911 constitution, see Anastasiadis 2001: 118-122.

<sup>40</sup> Kambanis 1908: 2. Indeed, Crete was annexed to Greece a few years later, during the Balkan wars (see Divani 2000: 411-412).

<sup>41</sup> Kambanis 1908: 2. The retraction of the Young Turks' professions led a few years later to the First Balkan War (see Veremis & Koliopoulos 2006: 493).

<sup>42</sup> Kambanis 1908: 2

<sup>43</sup> Kambanis 1909: 33. Kambanis had not joined yet the conservative faction, whose main leading figure after the 1909 coup was Gounaris.

Δεν απελπιζόμεθα. [...] [Ε]ἰς τον προϋπολογισμόν του κ. Γούναρη βλέπομεν περισσότεράν εὐλικρίνειαν παρὰ εἰς τους προϋπολογισμούς των αδόξων προκατόχων του.<sup>44</sup>

In that same part he criticised Trikoupi's financial policy for not having taken into account the country's capabilities,<sup>45</sup> as he had done some years ago in an article in *Akritas* as well.<sup>46</sup>

As for the second part, the editor focused on the polity change in Turkey following the Young Turk Revolution and predicted that the consequences of this change might not be as propitious as initially envisaged.<sup>47</sup> The rest of the text dealt with issues concerning Hellenism outside the Greek borders, such as the Cretan Question<sup>48</sup> or the 'Archbishop Question of Cyprus'.<sup>49</sup>

As mentioned above, in the editorial of the first issue of *O Pan* Kambanis touched upon politics. Quite unsurprisingly the second topic that Kambanis stressed in his programmatic declaration was language:

---

<sup>44</sup> Kambanis 1909: 34.

<sup>45</sup> Kambanis 1909: 33.

<sup>46</sup> Kambanis 1904c: 35.

<sup>47</sup> Kambanis 1909: 34.

<sup>48</sup> Kambanis 1909: 34.

<sup>49</sup> Kambanis 1909: 35. The issue started as early as 1900, after the previous Archbishop's death (9 May 1900). The two candidates for the archbishop's throne were Kyrillos Papadopoulos, metropolitan of Citium, and Kyrillos Vasiliadis, metropolitan of Kyrenia. An avowed rivalry associated with political and ideological differences commenced and split the greatest part of the island's population into two opposing groups. In February 1908 the Ecumenical Patriarch Joachim III elected Vasiliadis as the Archbishop of Cyprus, a decision that led to an escalation of the preexisting conflict since the majority of the Cypriots were supporting Papadopoulos (whose political direction was more nationalistic and he was a fervent advocate of the *Enosis*, whilst his stance towards the British colonial forces was not so amenable as that of Vasiliadis). The problem was resolved in 8 April 1909, after the intervention of the British, with the enthronement of Kyrillos Papadopoulos who henceforth took on the name Kyrillos II. On the 'ἀρχιεπισκοπικόν ζήτημα της Κύπρου' see: Englezakis 1995, Papayeyoryiou 1996 and Kranidiotis 2010: 23.

Ως προς την γλώσσαν «ο Παν» [sic] είναι υπέρ της απλοποιήσεως και αναπλάσεως της γραπτώς παραδοθείσης γλώσσης. Μολαταύτα αφίνει πάσαν ελευθερίαν εις τους συνεργάτας του. Αποκλείει μόνον εκ των σελίδων του τους σχολαστικούς, διότι θεωρεί τούτους εχθρούς προς την ζωήν.<sup>50</sup>

The intertwinement of the language question with politics is evident in some of Kambanis's comments. For instance, in this same editorial he discussed Karl Krumbacher's complaint leaflet against the controversial professor at the University of Athens, Mistriotis.<sup>51</sup> Kambanis underscored the political implications of Mistriotis's known linguistic obsession by calling him 'όργαν[ο] των διαφόρων πολιτικών [...] κατά τα Ευαγγελιακά[,] κατά τα Ορεσσειακά και εις συχνάς άλλας περιπτώσεις'.<sup>52</sup>

#### LITERARY & ARTISTIC CONTEXT

Kambanis's very first critical text begins with a critique of Aristomenis Provelengios and proceeds with a broader picture of the contemporary demotic poetry and rave remarks about Kostis Palamas as well as Stefanos Martzokis.<sup>53</sup> Something similar happened in his text bearing the same title ('Σημειώσεις') in the next issue of *To Periodikon mas*: the critic began by pointing out his negative

---

<sup>50</sup> Kambanis 1908: 1.

<sup>51</sup> Kambanis 1908: 3-4.

<sup>52</sup> Kambanis 1908: 4. Kambanis's dislike of Mistriotis is expressed in various instances; see for example Kambanis 1904e: 66& 1905c. About the two notorious incidents mentioned here, see Iordanidou 2007: 419 and Anastasiadi-Symeonidi 2011.

<sup>53</sup> Kambanis 1901c.

impressions created by Vlachoyiannis's latest work only to go on to laud Palamas's oeuvre.<sup>54</sup>

In the thirtieth issue of *To Periodikon mas* one finds the last of Kambanis's contributions to this periodical in the regular column 'Σημειώσεις'. There Kambanis commented on an article written by Karl Dieterich with respect to Modern Greek short stories production. He disagreed with Dieterich's suggestion that Nirvanas was the best Greek short story writer, arguing that Nirvanas's greatest contribution to Modern Greek literature was not the 'δύγημα', but the 'χρονογράφημα', as well as that Palamas, Papadiamandis, Mitsakis and Karkavitsas were much more competent short story authors.<sup>55</sup>

In the column 'Επιθεώρησις' (= 'Review') of *Akritas* Kambanis wrote about the literary periodicals of his time and actually launched an attack against the most known of them (*Rambagas*, *Kritiki*, *Noumas*, *Panathinaia*) and many of their contributors,<sup>56</sup> whereas in a later issue of the same periodical he devoted an obituary to Roidis, wherein he stressed first of all his work's ironic quality and praised his writing style.<sup>57</sup> However, he claimed that, according to the criteria of his time, Roidis could not be named either a critic or a novelist. Yet he rightly stated: 'Από τα

---

<sup>54</sup> Kambanis 1901e.

<sup>55</sup> Kambanis 1901h: 160. Kambanis's observations here are rather accurate, but it should be noted that the focus is on living authors, which explains the absence of names such as Vizyinos.

<sup>56</sup> Kambanis 1904b.

<sup>57</sup> K. A. 1904.

γραψίματα του Ροΐδη η 'Πάπισσα' γραφείσα προ 40 χρόνων, θα είνε χωρίς άλλο και το μακροβιώτερον'.<sup>58</sup>

Kambanis's references to the two greatest Modern Greek poets until his time, Dionysios Solomos (1798-1858) and Kostis Palamas (1859-1942) are frequent and it could be argued that they constitute a distinct area of his critical output. The national poet of Greece is a recurring figure in Kambanis's work and especially during his early years the critic presents him as a model of the poet per se and his work as the culmination of Greek poetry. Kambanis had expressed himself in a similarly positive manner about the poetic work of Palamas, but in a negative way about his critical output.<sup>59</sup>

In what is probably his first extensive text about Solomos, Kambanis deals with the Heptanesian poet from an aesthetic point of view, employing for example Schiller's and Hegel's aesthetic philosophy.<sup>60</sup> This thus suggests, first of all, that he was not a critic merely relying on his own impressions about the text, nor did he tend to correlate the author's biography with his oeuvre. Kambanis was primarily a learned critic that tried to approach the text based on some principles. Moreover, he showed awareness of the positions, the arguments and the categorisations expressed

---

<sup>58</sup> K.A. 1904: 110. It should be noted that Kambanis wrote also the introduction of an edition of *Πάπισσα Ιωάννα* (Roidis n.d.).

<sup>59</sup> See for example Kambanis 1905a: 447. About Kambanis's rejection of Palamas's criticism during his formative years see Apostolidou 1992: 382, 387. Nonetheless, Kambanis's *History of Modern Greek Literature* is heavily influenced by Palamas's critical work (see here, chapter 2, p. 59).

<sup>60</sup> Kambanis 1904e. Kambanis's influence from Aesthetics was quite significant and his interest in it culminated in the publication of his *History of Aesthetic Theories*. After all, as Tziovas claimed, 'η Αισθητική, ακόμη και στον εικοστό αιώνα, αποτελεί το μόνο θεωρητικό προβληματισμό γύρω από την τέχνη, που αναπτύχθηκε και δημιουργήσε ιθαγενή παράδοση στην Ελλάδα' (Tziovas 1987: 11). It should, moreover, be noted that the subtitle of the article in question is 'Σημειώματα δια τους αισθητικούς της αύριον'.

by earlier criticism and he actually conversed in his critique not just with Solomos's poetry, but with other critics' texts on Solomos as well, such as Kalosgouros. This dialogue with earlier criticism could be seen as endowing his criticism with a scholarly aura, especially since his contemporary criticism was mostly impressionistic. In addition, he provided a pattern of his own: he divided poets into four categories (sensualist, sentimentalist, formalist and spiritual poets) claiming that a poet can fit into more than one of these categories and implying that Solomos had all these characteristics, apart from those of a sensualist poet.

In this article Kambanis treated Solomos's poetry from a standpoint that could be related to Greek idealist criticism.<sup>61</sup> He discussed his work outside the social and historical circumstances of the time it was written and designated at the same time the poet's influence by western European philosophy and poetry, and mostly authors that have been associated with Idealism, a topic that has very much concerned later scholars.<sup>62</sup> So he touched upon the Greek poet's affinity with Kant, Hegel, Goethe, Schiller, Byron and concluded that *Οι Ελεύθεροι Πολιορκημένοι* (=The Free Besieged) is Solomos's masterpiece that summarises his whole oeuvre:

Ο ίδιος ο ποιητής ενθυμείται κάπου ότι ο Άγιος Αυγουστίνος είπε περί του Χριστού: 'όσα ο Ιησούς εις τρεις χρόνους edίδαξε με το Ευαγγέλιον,

---

<sup>61</sup> According to Moullas, there are certain linchpins unifying the representatives of Greek Idealist Criticism, and Kambanis's text corresponds to all of them: 'βασικός συγγενικός δεσμός είναι η ιδεοκρατία. [...] Συμπληρωματικά συνδετικά στοιχεία [...]: α. το σολωμικό έργο, προνομιακό και, πολλές φορές, αποκλειστικό αντικείμενο μελέτης ή δικαίωσης, και β. [η] γερμανική παιδεία, στην αισθητική και φιλοσοφική της κυρίως διάσταση (Schiller, Hegel, Schelling, Fichte, Kant κ.λπ.), καθοριστικό[ς] παράγοντα[ς] κριτικών μεθοδεύσεων' (Moullas 1994: 60).

<sup>62</sup> Perhaps the most significant study of this kind is Veloudis 1989.

όλα τα ανακεφαλαίωσε εις τρεις ώρας επάνω στον Σταυρόν'. Ο Σταυρός – και τι σταυρός και μαρτύριον! – δια τον Σολωμόν υπήρξαν 'οι Ελεύθεροι πολιορκημένοι'.

The article about Solomos resumed in the following issue and is centred mainly on the poet's notes.<sup>63</sup> Kambanis began by listing various titles that were given to the poem *The Free Besieged* in different stages of its writing process and subsequently referred to the poem's fragmentary character, expressing a conviction that was prevalent mostly during the 19th century: 'Το ποίημα [...] χωρίς άλλο εγράφη ολόκληρον κ' εχάθη ίσως δια παντός'.<sup>64</sup>

One of Kambanis's main standpoints on Solomos's notes is that the scholars publishing Solomos's work after Polylas should have intervened in the original texts in order to structure the notes in such a way that would not only make them more understandable and rule out any self-contradictions included in them, but would also produce a text that could be advertised abroad and render Solomos's work a respected part of *Weltliteratur*.<sup>65</sup> Following this, Kambanis lashed out against the improper presence of nationalism in literature and its study and rather predictably quoted Solomos's proverbial phrase 'το έθνος πρέπει να μάθη να θεωρή εθνικόν, ό,τι είνε αληθές'.<sup>66</sup> Moreover, the critic projected some of his own period's aesthetic

---

<sup>63</sup> Kambanis 1904i. On the topic of Solomos's notes, see Veloudis 1989: 431 (endnote 79).

<sup>64</sup> Kambanis 1904i: 129. On different approaches to Solomos's fragments during the nineteenth century and up to the 1960s see Kriaras 1969: 110-118. Some more recent views on the issue can be found in Veloudis 1989: 374-395, Veloudis 2000: 58-135 and Dimiroulis 2003: 201-244.

<sup>65</sup> Kambanis 1904i: 129.

<sup>66</sup> Kambanis 1904i: 130. To be more precise, this is not Solomos's original phrase, but Polylas's translation, since the prototype is in Italian.

values to Solomos's work, the most prevalent of which is the request for subjective literature.<sup>67</sup>

In general, during his formative years Kambanis used Solomos as the yardstick against which the literature of his time was measured. The comparison resulted, of course, in the condemnation of his contemporary literary context, but like Apostolakis some years later, Kambanis often used Solomos as the starting point in order to express his negative, almost nihilistic, criticism against almost every aspect of Greek society.<sup>68</sup>

As for Palamas, Kambanis considered his work the epitome of Greek poetry,<sup>69</sup> viewed him as the only poet that reached outside the Greek borders<sup>70</sup> and he often called him a 'teacher'.<sup>71</sup> What is more, Kambanis claimed that Palamas managed to revitalise Greek poetry while utilising and renewing the language of the folk tradition.<sup>72</sup> Moreover, Palamas had a prominent position amongst those that Kambanis invited to contribute to his periodical *O Pan*.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> Kambanis 1904i: 131-132. On the aforementioned request see for example Gounelas 1984: 11, 12, 16 et al.

<sup>68</sup> See for example Kambanis 1905c. About Apostolakis's 'negative criticism' see Tziouvas 1994 (about the issue in question here see more specifically pp. 41 & 52)

<sup>69</sup> See for example Kambanis 1905a: 453.

<sup>70</sup> Kambanis 1905a: 446.

<sup>71</sup> Kambanis 1905a: 446 & 1905b: 26 et al. See also here, chapter 2, p. 50 (footnote 43).

<sup>72</sup> Kambanis 1905a: 453.

<sup>73</sup> See Palamas's response letter on the front cover's verso of the first issue.

His first extensive review on Palamas is found in *Akritas* and concerns the 1903 drama *Τρισεύγενη*.<sup>74</sup> Kambanis raved about the virtues of Palamas's latest book:

Σταθμός δια την ιστορίαν της νεοελληνικής δραματικής τέχνης. Η Ρουμελιώτικη αυτή τραγωδία έχει όλον το κάλλος και όλην την αλήθειαν μιας τραγωδίας Ευριπιδικής.<sup>75</sup>

Despite the fact that such enthusiastic remarks could be viewed as premature and exaggerated, Kambanis's view remains valid up to date, since Palamas's sole play is still regarded one of the major manifestations of Modern Greek dramatics and continues to be staged from time to time, more than a century after its composition.<sup>76</sup>

What is more, it is rather thought-provoking that in this text it becomes clear that Kambanis contacted Palamas before writing this review in order to get some information about his work.<sup>77</sup> This could be associated with the fact that at that time it was quite normal for a critic to seek after such things as 'authorial intent', which is nowadays considered an objectionable critical method to say the least.<sup>78</sup>

Apart from Solomos and Palamas, Kambanis was rather favourable towards many members of the so-called 'Piraeus Circle', a term furnished by Valetas in his

---

<sup>74</sup> Kambanis 1905a.

<sup>75</sup> Kambanis 1905a: 446.

<sup>76</sup> See for example <http://www.critique.gr/index.php?&page=article&id=907>.

<sup>77</sup> Kambanis 1905a: 448.

<sup>78</sup> The whole debate concerning 'intentional fallacy' was initiated by proponents of New Criticism and survived well into Post-structuralism. One of the first texts written on this topic is Wimsatt & Beardsley 1946. For more modern approaches, see for instance Burke 2010.

*Brief History of Modern Greek Literature*.<sup>79</sup> The emergence of this group of intellectuals and writers is associated with the industrial and commercial growth of Piraeus' harbour at the beginning of the twentieth century. Amongst the members of the Circle were, apart from Kambanis, the following: Pavlos Nirvanas, Yerasimos Vokos, Lambros Porfyas, Dimosthenis Voutyras, Spyros Melas, Romos Fillyras and Yiorgos Zoufres.<sup>80</sup>

In addition to Greek literature, Kambanis dealt with Western works, authors and literary debates. It should be stated from the beginning that he demonstrated a close acquaintance with the western cultural context, especially the French and the German one, however, this familiarity seems to be drawn in both cases from French sources. Apart from the regular use of French words, the frequent reference to French print media and the manifestation of a rather deeper knowledge of the French cultural *milieu*, Kambanis's constant misspellings of German names, which are actually not typographical mistakes, but seem to follow the French orthography of these names, could be regarded evidence for the aforementioned assumption.<sup>81</sup>

Apart from critical notes regarding Greek periodicals,<sup>82</sup> Kambanis also pored over foreign journals. For instance, in another one of his texts he selectively presented some of the contents of two French journals: *L'occident* and *Mercure de*

---

<sup>79</sup> Valetas 1966.

<sup>80</sup> Valetas 1966: 129.

<sup>81</sup> See for instance K. 1904b. Kambanis misspelled Lenbach's name as 'Lembach' not only in the title, but every time he mentioned it in the text. Another example, even more blatant, is the way he wrote Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's name in the second part of his critical note on Solomos that was published in *Akritas*: 'Jean Volfgang von Göthe' (Kambanis 1904i: 131).

<sup>82</sup> See here, chapter 1, p. 26 (footnote 56).

*France*.<sup>83</sup> In another critical note, which is in fact the sequel of a previous one concerning theatre and is part of the same column entitled 'Επιθεώρησις',<sup>84</sup> Kambanis provided some information concerning Goethe's *Faust*,

περί του έργου το οποίον συνώψισε μέσα του όλην την ζωήν του Γκαίτε, εις το οποίον συνεκεντρώθη όλ' η πνευματική δύναμις του Τεύτονος διδασκάλου, περί του έργου εκείνου το οποίον, καθώς είνε η κορυφή της Τευτονικής λογοτεχνίας τοιουτοτρόπως επεκράτησε να θεωρήται και το πάρισον του Αισχυλικού Προμηθέως, του βιβλικού Ιώβ και των δύο Οιδιπόδων του Σοφοκλέους.<sup>85</sup>

Besides giving an account of the work's writing process, Kambanis attempted to sketch out its main attributes and described it as a poetic achievement that combines the characteristics of all three poetic genres: the dramatic, the epic and the lyrical.<sup>86</sup> He also stressed the vividness of the pictures and descriptions contained in it as well as its musicality. In an attempt to translate the German term *Weltepos*, he defined *Faust* as a 'κοσμοέπος', wherein the female figure plays the main role and her moves pull the strings of the plot. In addition, Kambanis paralleled *Faust* to the

---

<sup>83</sup> K. 1904a. The latter periodical's title is noted as *Mercure de Franee* (K. 1904a: 64), but this is obviously a typographical error. The reference is to the historic Parisian literary magazine which was published with this title (previously it was entitled *Mercure galant* (1672-1674) and *Nouveau Mercure galant* (1677-1724)) from 1724 to 1825 (with an interruption between 1811 and 1815) and reappeared in the 1890s first as a magazine (1890) and then as a publishing house (1894). At that time both the magazine and the publishing house were associated with the Symbolist movement. In 1958 *Mercure de France* became part of Éditions Gallimard. It is worth noting that among others, the literary magazine has published poems of Yiorgos Seferis. See <http://www.mercuredefrance.fr/unepage-historique-historique-1-1-0-1.html>.

<sup>84</sup> See here, chapter 1, p. 34 (footnote 89).

<sup>85</sup> Kamb. 1904b: 431.

<sup>86</sup> Kambanis is apparently influenced here by Aristotle and the classical generic classifications.

*Odyssey* and the *Divina Commedia*,<sup>87</sup> in that they all include scenes taking place on earth, in the Netherworld and in Heaven.<sup>88</sup>

Kambanis's profile as a 'criticus universalis' could not be completed without a discussion of his engagement in dramaturgical, sculptural and painting issues. Kambanis mainly focused on the Modern Greek theatrical and artistic context, but there are also texts of his that manifest his knowledge of the respective developments in the West.

He wrote quite a few theatre reviews, and probably his first text of purely that kind is 'Η διδασκαλία του Φάουστ από το Βασιλικόν'.<sup>89</sup> In this review Kambanis disparaged the effort of the Greek Royal Theatre to stage Goethe's *Faust* employing as his chief argument the fact that *Faust* is not a play and was not intended for theatrical performance. Apart from that, he implied that *Faust's* plot is too fictional and supernatural to be presented in front of an audience and he expressed his disagreement with this sum of money being spent for such a performance, while it could have been spent for four or five more appropriate ones. However, he noted that the work's rendering into Greek (done by K. Chatzopoulos)<sup>90</sup> is of good quality, although Gryparis's version was superior, and in addition he remarked that Marika Kotopouli's performance was quite exceptional.<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> He refers to a work supposedly entitled 'αιώνια κωμωδία' (= 'eternal comedy'), but it is to be assumed that this was an unfortunate translation of Dante's poem.

<sup>88</sup> Kamb. 1904b: 432.

<sup>89</sup> Kamb. 1904a.

<sup>90</sup> See Kamb. 1904b: 433.

<sup>91</sup> Kamb. 1904a: 431

What is more, one can trace reference to current theatrical events in the very first editorial of *O Pan*.<sup>92</sup> Therein Kambanis criticised the degradation of Greek theatre (along with literature) and specifically inveighed against the theatrical genre of ‘Επιθεωρήσεις’, whilst castigating the commercialisation of art.<sup>93</sup> He concluded this text with some sarcastic lines about the Royal Theatre:

Το βασιλικόν θέατρον έκλεισε. Βέβαια τούτο δεν εξημίωσε την τέχνην· ούτε και την ωφέλησε. Υπήρξε γεγονός καθ’ ολοκληρίαν αδιάφορον προς την τέχνην. [...] Είχε γίνει πρωτανείο σιτίσεως των ανοήτων και των σχολαστικών [...]. Έχει κάποια σημασίαν, όταν μένη διευθυντής του κλειστώς ερμητικώς θεάτρου ο κ. Άγγελος Βλάχος, ανήρ καλός καγαθός, πρώην υπουργός, πρώην πρεσβευτής, πρώην λεξικογράφος, πρώην καθηγητής της απαγγελίας, πρώην ποιητής, πρώην συγγραφεύς της ‘Κόρης του Παντοπώλου’, πρώην νομάρχης και πόσα άλλα πρώην!

The same editorial contains moreover comments on Greek sculpture and more specifically on a new statue by Fillipotis which was placed in Athens.<sup>94</sup> In keeping with a generally negative predisposition that Kambanis had during his formative years towards the Greek cultural environment, he claimed that ‘η σύγχρονος νεοελληνική γλυπτική δεν ευρίσκεται εις αξιοζήλευτον κατάστασιν’.<sup>95</sup> Although he characterised Fillipotis the most able contemporary Greek sculptor, Kambanis considered his work ‘soulless’ and certainly inferior to some older artists’ (namely Halepas’s and Gyzis’s) craftsmanship.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> Kambanis 1908: 5-6.

<sup>93</sup> Kambanis 1908: 5-6.

<sup>94</sup> Kambanis 1908: 4-5.

<sup>95</sup> Kambanis 1908: 4.

<sup>96</sup> Kambanis 1908: 5.

The praise of Yannoulis Halepas (1851-1938) and Nikolaos Gyzis (1842-1900) falls within the frame of Kambanis's belief that his time was a time of mediocrity if not decadence in cultural terms. This view is expressed several times, on some occasions directly, on other occasions indirectly. The most common way in which it is conveyed indirectly is through the praising of the writers and the artists of the past in contrast to those of the present. As it is the case with Solomos in literature, Kambanis argued that these nineteenth-century artists had set standards that remained unsurpassed.

It is interesting that the contents of *L'occident* which are being presented in Kambanis's aforementioned article in *Akritas* regard the painter Puvis de Chavannes.<sup>97</sup> However, this is not Kambanis's first text that deals with painting. His text about the painter Mihail Sigalas is in fact a general comment on the Greek visual arts of his time.<sup>98</sup> In this article Kambanis seems to be criticising representational and naturalistic art<sup>99</sup> and to be arguing that the *milieu* of Greece does not favour art; quite on the contrary, it suppresses it and wears down those trying to practise it: 'Πόσον κανείς παρηγορείται όταν ένα τάλαντον δεν κουρασθή από την ζωήν εδώ, που έκαμε τον Βιτσάρην φθισικόν, τον Χαλεπών τρελλόν'.<sup>100</sup> Nevertheless, Kambanis praised Sigalas's simplistic technique concluding: 'Sancta Simplicitas! Συ ήσουν και

---

<sup>97</sup> See here, chapter 1, p. 33 (footnote 83).

<sup>98</sup> Kambanis 1904d.

<sup>99</sup> See for example Kambanis 1904d: 62: 'Υπάρχει ένας διαρκής ειλωτισμός προς τους διαφόρους μαστόρους και μαστοράκους της τέχνης, οι οποίοι διότι αποτυπώνουν φωτογραφικώς ένα κοτόπουλον ή έναν διευθυντή ελλ. περιοδικού λ.χ. νομίζονται μεγάλοι καλλιτέχναι'.

<sup>100</sup> Kambanis 1904d: 62. Kambanis made similar remarks elsewhere, e.g. in Kambanis 1905b: 28.

συ είσαι αρχή κάθε τέχνης προ πάντων εις έναν τόπον, που τέχνη δεν υπάρχει σχεδόν και ζωγραφική πολύ ολιγότερον...'.<sup>101</sup>

## CONCLUSION

Kambanis's critical outlook during his formative years manifests his wide range of interests and can be associated with various critical currents. Apart from Idealism and Aesthetics, Kambanis's output seems to have been influenced by Positivism as well, since his critical thought was permeated with the belief that the social and historical conditions in Greece were not appropriate for or, to be more accurate, were hostile to the development of art.

What is more, from the very beginning of Kambanis's critical career one traces his interest in Solomos which steadily recurs throughout his life, while his constant praise of Palamas's poetry has to be examined along with his negative comments about his criticism, as well as the ultimate appropriation of his critical discourse later. One notices, moreover, his predilection for some of his contemporary authors who were, as himself, living in Piraeus, such as Porfyra, Skipis and Nirvanas, as well as that his preoccupation with the language question, which is another recurring issue in Kambanis's oeuvre, appears from the very beginning of his career.

Finally, it is worth noting that the frequent use of foreign words and phrases found in his texts of this period indicates two things: First, that the form of language

---

<sup>101</sup> Kambanis 1904d: 63. Kambanis touched upon painting matters several times during this period. For instance, in another issue of *Akritas* he wrote an obituary devoted to the German painter Franz Seraph Lenbach (K. 1904b).

Kambanis and others of his time were using, despite not being an extreme demotic, still was not sufficient for the description and definition of elevated concepts and sophisticated terms, which rendered the loans from foreign languages (especially from French, which was perhaps more respected by some demoticists than the *katharevousa*) rather necessary; second, that those periodicals in general and Kambanis in particular were aiming at a well-educated public, which was, either on an amateur or on a professional level, specialised in literary issues and thus familiar even with foreign terms.

## -CHAPTER 2-

# THE CONSOLIDATION OF KAMBANIS'S CONSERVATISM AND THE COURSE TOWARDS HIS INTELLECTUAL ESTABLISHMENT (1916 – 1925)

This chapter deals with a phase of Kambanis's critical career that is characterised by the intensification of his involvement in politics. At the same time, during these years one can trace more clearly the beginning of his course towards becoming a member of the Greek critical canon of his time. This process is primarily marked by the publication of his *Ιστορία της Νέας Ελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας* (1000 μ.Χ. – 1900), the first complete History of Greek Literature ever written in the Greek language.<sup>1</sup> This chapter includes three main sections, each focusing on one of Kambanis's major intellectual activities of this period.

### INTELLECTUAL ACTIVITIES

Apart from the *History of Modern Greek Literature*, whose significance has already been suggested,<sup>2</sup> Kambanis's most notable intellectual activities between 1916 and 1925 are the following: the editorship of the periodical *Ellinika Chronika*

---

<sup>1</sup> Kambanis 1925. Although the first volume of Voutieridis's History was published a year before (Voutieridis 1924), the second volume was published in 1927 and yet again it was not complete (Voutieridis 1927). A complete but more concise version of Voutieridis's work appeared only in 1933 (Voutieridis 1933). According to Apostolidou 'το έργο του Βουτιεριδίου πρέπει να εξεταστεί μαζί με τη [sic] επόμενη ολοκληρωμένη μορφή του, που εκδόθηκε το 1933 και άρα πρέπει να θεωρηθεί ουσιαστικά μεταγενέστερο από το έργο του Καμπάνη' (Apostolidou 1992: 361).

<sup>2</sup> See here, chapter 2, p. 39 and footnote 1.

(1916) and the newspaper *Protevousa* (1921-1922) as well as the publication of the book *Καλλιγάς και Ζαμπέλιος* (1920). The latter is the published form of a lecture delivered by Kambanis under the auspices of the philological society 'Parnassos' and is part of a series of books bearing the same general title: *Διαλέξεις περί Ελλήνων διηγηματογράφων* (=Lectures about Greek short story authors). It should, however, be noted in advance that Kambanis in his lecture did not treat short stories, but almost exclusively novels.

As for the two serial publications he edited in these years, they both demonstrated a considerable preoccupation with political matters and could be regarded as 'engaged' publications. The periodical *Ellinika Chronika* has been rightly labelled a 'πολιτικό (φιλοβασιλικό) περιοδικό που υποστηρίζει την ουδετερότητα της Ελλάδας'.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, the advocacy of the King's position on the question of whether Greece should take part in the Great War or not, along with the reprimand of Venizelos's opinions and tactics, is its principal feature. The newspaper *Protevousa* that started being published after Venizelos's defeat in the 1920 elections and was shut down after the Coup of the Venizelist officers Plastiras and Gonatas in 1922 was supporting the royalist faction and especially the Premier Dimitris Gounaris.<sup>4</sup> However, the format of the newspaper makes it extremely difficult to pinpoint with certainty which texts were written by Kambanis himself and therefore it was deemed prudent not to discuss any specific texts included in it.

---

<sup>3</sup> Karaoglou et al. 1996: 424.

<sup>4</sup> The newspaper published 263 issues under the title *Protevousa* until it was renamed *I Apoyevmatini Protevousa* on 2 October 1921.

Nonetheless, apart from the serial publications he edited himself, Kambanis did not stop contributing to other newspapers or periodicals during those years, such as the newspaper *Skrip* and the periodicals *Avyi* (1917) and *Anthropotis* (1919-1923). Finally, it is worth mentioning that, while being in Egypt, Kambanis published two books about the country's history, civilisation and historic monuments: *Ναοί και Τάφοι* and *Η Αίγυπτος των Φαραώ*. Both were published in 1923 and the latter was co-authored with Dionysis Kytikas.<sup>5</sup>

#### *ELLINIKA CHRONIKA*

The very first text of this political journal is an anonymous programmatic declaration which in all likelihood was written by Kambanis, since he was the editor.<sup>6</sup> As the title itself indicates, the journal's aim was to form or influence public opinion. The author claimed that the outbreak of the Great War occurred at a juncture that the Greeks were not prepared to deal with the problems emanating from it. He characterised the level of Greek public conscience as infantile and criticised the biggest bulk of the daily press for being rather biased, unorganised and inefficient for accomplishing this task.<sup>7</sup>

The text goes on overstating the periodical's intended objectivity:

---

<sup>5</sup> See Kambanis & Kytikas 1923 and Kambanis 1923. More than a decade later Kambanis dedicated to Kytikas his *History of Aesthetic Theories*.

<sup>6</sup> Anon. 1916a.

<sup>7</sup> Anon. 1916a: 1.

Χρειάζεται αντικειμενική, αόργητος, ήρεμος συζήτησις, χρειάζεται ν' αναληφθή το έργον της ερεύνης των απασχολούντων ημάς προβλημάτων από τους ειδικούς. Εις τους ειδικούς αυτούς ανοίγουν τας στήλας των τα 'Ελληνικά Χρονικά', εν τη επιθυμία των όπως καταλύσουν τον φανατισμόν, ευρύνουν την γνώσιν της καταστάσεως, συμπληρούντα δε το έργον της ανεξαρτήτου μερίδος του καθημερινού τύπου...<sup>8</sup>

In this predominantly political periodical intellectual and literary matters were discussed as well, but mostly from a viewpoint that was linking them to the ongoing Great War. It is rather interesting, however, that in spite of Kambanis's supporting the neutrality of Greece, he devoted many pages in order to rebuke Romain Rolland's pacifist views and more specifically his recent book *Au-dessus de la mêlée*.<sup>9</sup> Whilst he depicted Rolland as a pacifist who believed that war in general is not a historical or natural necessity and that the Great War in particular was pointless, Kambanis's point of view was that WWI was inevitable.<sup>10</sup> On top of that, he maintained that:

Ο κόσμος δεν επλάσθη δια την ευτυχίαν και όσοι κηρύττουν την παγκόσμιον ειρήνην εάν δεν είνε ευγενείς ονειροπόλοι και γλυκύθυμοι λυρικοί, άνθρωποι με υπερτερούν εντός των το αίσθημα του οίκτου, είνε κακής ποιότητος αισιόδοξοι, υποβάλλοντες την ζωήν εις άψογα λογικά σχήματα μη δυνάμενα να την περιλάβουν.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Anon. 1916a: 2 (emphasis added).

<sup>9</sup> Kambanis 1916a & 1916b.

<sup>10</sup> Kambanis 1916a: 13, 16.

<sup>11</sup> Kambanis 1916a: 13.

What is more, Kambanis claimed that Rolland's whole book, despite its humanitarian pretensions, is in reality permeated with camouflaged chauvinism.<sup>12</sup> At any rate, the editor of *Ellinika Chronika* used Rolland as an occasion or excuse in order to bring forward his own views on the war that was ravaging Europe at that time. It should be noted that the advocacy of Greece's neutrality was in fact a pro-German act dictated by the country's geostrategic position and its dependence on Great Britain that did not allow active engagement in the war on the side of the Central Powers.<sup>13</sup> So it does not come as a surprise that Kambanis manifested an anti-British stance and a pro-German one in most of his articles in this periodical.

In his first article about Rolland, Kambanis praised the German military organisation and accused Edward VII of having forced the Germans to engage in an arms race and extend their arsenal.<sup>14</sup> Subsequently, he went on to unfold the causal nexus that led to the war and attempted to deconstruct Rolland's admittedly simplistic explanation, according to which the sole reason was Prussian imperialism. Nevertheless, Kambanis criticised the British Empire instead and maintained that the Great War was a defensive struggle for the Germans, indeed adding that even if it was an offensive campaign, it would have been Germany's first one of that kind, in contrast to Britain which had waged many such wars.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Kambanis 1916a: 15.

<sup>13</sup> See for example Veremis & Koliopoulos 2006: 335 and Anastasiadis 2001: 126. Cf. Kambanis 1946: 69 & 101.

<sup>14</sup> Kambanis 1916a: 16.

<sup>15</sup> Kambanis 1916a: 16.

In a much more dispassionate manner, Kambanis ultimately marked that the war is the materialisation of conflicting imperialisms. Furthermore, he presented Rolland's opinion that the two greatest menaces for civilised Europe are Pan-Slavism and Pan-Germanism as rather interesting.<sup>16</sup> Nonetheless, this article drew to a close with a defence of Germany's civilisation and a statement that intended sarcasm against both Rolland and Venizelos: 'Ὡς αν δεν έκρυπτε την διανοητικήν φτώχειαν και την 'Ελβετικήν' αφέλειαν η θερμότης της εκφράσεως, ο Ρ. Ρολλάν θα ενεφανίζετο σκεπτόμενος περίπου όπως και ο κ. Βενιζέλος'.<sup>17</sup>

The beginning of his second article on Rolland's book centres on the politician Jean Jaures (1859-1914) and involves a criticism of his political practices. According to Kambanis, the French socialists obstructed their country's war preparations and thus deteriorated France's defensive capacity and rendered ceasefire and peace an even more remote option.<sup>18</sup>

Subsequently, Kambanis projected some beliefs that seem to contradict the periodical's principal position that Greece should not be involved in the Great War. First of all and in all probability alluding to Heraclitus' beliefs about war, conflict or discord, he maintained war's omnipresence in nature.<sup>19</sup> As a matter of fact, he argued that war is as natural as natural disasters.<sup>20</sup> In addition, he claimed that a

---

<sup>16</sup> Kambanis 1916a: 17.

<sup>17</sup> Kambanis 1916a: 18.

<sup>18</sup> Kambanis 1916b: 110-111.

<sup>19</sup> Kambanis 1916b: 111.

<sup>20</sup> Kambanis 1916b: 112.

carefree and irresponsible state of peace is worse than any war.<sup>21</sup> The latter argument is postulated in a way that could be associated with pre-fascist ideals.<sup>22</sup>

Moreover, Kambanis castigated the concept of ‘civilised war’ contrived by Rolland.<sup>23</sup> In the opinion of Kambanis, such a concept is a mere utopia, since every war involves atrocities and damaging of cultural monuments.<sup>24</sup> Furthermore, he claimed that:

[Ο πόλεμος] δεν υπόκειται εις περιορισμούς, αι δε διεθνείς σχετικαί συμβάσεις, εφ’ όσον δεν υπάρχει (και δεν θα υπάρξη) υπερτέρα δύναμις επιφορτισμένη να καθιστά σεβαστήν την τήρησίν των θα είναι ράκη χάρτου, το οποίον μετεωρίζει και η μάλλον λεπτή και ανεπαίσθητος ανεμορριπή.<sup>25</sup>

Such a statement suggests on the one hand the necessity of an international regulatory authority, which was indeed established after the Great War (League of Nations) and foresees on the other hand its ultimate failure.<sup>26</sup>

Finally, Kambanis supported that Germany, France and the Austro-Hungarian Empire had to survive the war for the sake of the whole continent, whose future (and that of Greece with it) would otherwise be threatened by Russian and Asian expansionism and praised the Germans for their straightforwardness and

---

<sup>21</sup> Kambanis 1916b: 111.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. for example the Mussolini regime’s slogans ‘marciare per non marcire’ and ‘la guerra non ci fa paura’.

<sup>23</sup> Kambanis 1916b: 111-112.

<sup>24</sup> Kambanis 1916b: 111.

<sup>25</sup> Kambanis 1916b: 112.

<sup>26</sup> About the failure of the League of Nations see for example Fenwick 1936.

sincerity: 'Δεν αξιούν ότι μάχονται δια την ελευθερία των λαών, αλλά δια τα ζωτικά των συμφέροντα'.<sup>27</sup> In keeping with Kambanis's general disposition towards Britain, this last comment should be interpreted as an implicit criticism of the British war propaganda.

The last pages of every issue of *Ellinika Chronika* are covered by a column entitled 'Πολιτικά Χρονικά', whose form and content allows the assumption that it was written by Kambanis, although the column is usually not signed by anyone.<sup>28</sup> The column deals with current political matters, the first and foremost of which is the problem caused due to the defeat of the Serbian army in autumn 1915 and its subsequent retreat through Montenegro and Albania to the Greek island of Corfu.<sup>29</sup> After the outbreak of the Great War during the summer of 1914 Greece had remained neutral, in fact breaking thus the defensive treaty that it had formerly signed with Serbia.<sup>30</sup> Nonetheless, following the collapse of the Serbian defence the Greek state was not only obliged by the Allies to accept the evacuation of Serbian troops and civilians to Corfu in early 1916, but a few months later it was further

---

<sup>27</sup> Kambanis 1916b: 112.

<sup>28</sup> Only in the first and the last issue of the periodical the text is signed with a capital A, which is the initial of Kambanis's first name.

<sup>29</sup> See Gordon-Smith 1916 & Mitrović 2007: 149-161.

<sup>30</sup> On the authority of the treaty, in the event that Serbia was attacked, Greece was obliged to send 90.000 troops to Serbia's aid and mobilise its fleet. Despite Venizelos's suggestion that Serbia's obligations be met with the help of allied troops (British and French soldiers would make up for the lack of armed force on the Serbian side, in order for the country to reach the limit of 150.000 units that was anticipated according to the Serbo-Greek treaty), King Constantine ultimately rejected the proposal. The excuses were that Greece should assist Serbia only in case the latter was being attacked by a Balkan state (and more specifically by Bulgaria), and not by Austria-Hungary, which was considered a Central European Empire. On the Serbian-Greek treaty of 1913 see Bataković 2004: 59-60, Veremis & Koliopoulos 2006: 325-326; on Venizelos's attempt to surpass the obstacle of Serbia's inability to mobilise 150.000 soldiers along the Bulgarian front and King Constantine's rejection of the plan see Bataković 2004: 65-66, Veremis & Koliopoulos 2006: 342.

demanded that the rearmed and reorganised Serbian army be transported to Thessaloniki in order to assist in the battles taking place on the Macedonian Front.<sup>31</sup>

Kambanis blamed Venizelos for having prompted or having consented to the situation created in Northern Greece after the de facto occupation of Thessaloniki by allied forces and the positioning there of the headquarters of the Entente army that, under the command of General Sarrail, was directing the war on the Macedonian Front.<sup>32</sup> Following a considerably common practice of the pro-German/royalist press of that time, whose equivalent before the Serbian downfall were the coordinated attempts to nullify the validity and relevance of the 1913 Alliance Treaty,<sup>33</sup> Kambanis tried to deconstruct Venizelos's argument that the Greek railway system should be placed at the disposal of the Serbian army in order to accommodate its transport to Thessaloniki, so that the Greek state makes amends for not having honoured the Greek-Serbian defence treaty . Apart from the recurring counterargument, according to which public health would be placed in jeopardy were such a transit through the Greek mainland to take place, or the fairly common personal attacks against Venizelos, Kambanis posed the rather cynical argument that the Serbian State no longer existed.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> On the stationing of the remaining Serbian troops in Corfu and their subsequent transportation to Thessaloniki see Bataković 2004: 71-74 & Tounda-Fergadi 1991.

<sup>32</sup> A. 1916: 76-77.

<sup>33</sup> See for example Bataković 2004: 70-71. On Constantine's main objections to the activation of the treaty, which constituted the basis for the arguments utilised by the part of the Greek press which was sympathising with the King's stands, see here, chapter 2, p. 46 (footnote 30).

<sup>34</sup> A. 1916: 77.

Kambanis also maintained that the overriding majority of the Greek army (especially the officers) were openly expressing their support to the King and would prevent any attempt on the regime.<sup>35</sup> Nonetheless, he presented it as a constitutional rather than political matter:

Ο στρατός έμεινεν εκεί όπου ετάχθη. Είναι πιστός εις τον όρκον του και δε θα υπακούση παρ' εκείνον όστις εκ του πολιτεύματος έχει το απόλυτον δικαίωμα του κηρύττειν τον πόλεμον και του συνάπτειν ειρήνην.<sup>36</sup>

Even though these statements correspond to the actual contents of the Greek constitution in force then, Kambanis (in all likelihood intentionally) did not touch upon the problem of Constantine's intervening into politics in a way not conforming to the constitution.<sup>37</sup> In other words, he overlooked the fact that King Constantine had become the leader of a political faction, instead of being the leader of the whole nation, something that marked the beginning of a division that would plague Greek society for decades to come, labelled as 'The National Schism' (or 'The Great Division').<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> A. 1916: 77-78.

<sup>36</sup> A. 1916: 78.

<sup>37</sup> Anastasiadis 2001: 127-128 & 132-133 & 135-137. The interventions of the palace in politics and the use of practices that were against or 'beyond' the constitution were common among Constantine's successors as well; for a more comprehensive discussion of the phenomenon see for example Alivizatos 1983: 239-271.

<sup>38</sup> 'Ο Κωνσταντίνος κάθε άλλο παρά άσκησε πολιτική "υπεράνω κομμάτων": [...] επέβαλε ως εξωτερική πολιτική την προσωπική του πολιτική της οποίας εκτελεστικά όργανα υπήρξαν οι κυβερνήσεις "του" (Α. Ζαΐμη, Στ. Σκουλούδη, Ν. Καλογερόπουλου, Σπ. Λάμπρου). Έτσι το στέμμα, γύρω από το οποίο συσπειρώθηκαν τα ολιγαρχικά και συντηρητικά στοιχεία του τόπου και ο παλαιοκομματισμός, έγινε το επίκεντρο της οξύτατης πολιτικής διαμάχης που έφθασε

What is more, Kambanis discussed the question of the protraction of the levy en masse and rejected Venizelos's stance on the matter arguing that the aim of the levy in that case had a defensive and preventive character.<sup>39</sup> After that, he added that:

Η Ελληνική επιστράτευσις δεν προορίζεται δια τον πόλεμον. Αλλ' αν ο πόλεμος είνε αναπόφευκτος, όπως εκήρυξεν επανειλημμένως ο κ. Αρχηγός των Φιλελευθέρων, διατηρούντες αθίκτους και ακεραίας τας δυνάμεις ημών πράττομεν ό,τι υπαγορεύει η στοιχειώδης λογική και η μάλλον λογική επίφυλαξις.<sup>40</sup>

Albeit extremely rare, there are even texts dealing purely with literary issues in *Ellinika Chronika*.<sup>41</sup> The editor wrote one book review of Palamas's poetry collection *Βωμοί* with the pseudonym M. Skeolas, a hellenisation of the Latin name Mucius Scaevola, which was borne by many Roman politicians and jurists.<sup>42</sup> As it

---

μέχρι την διάσπαση της κρατικής ενότητας' (Anastasiadis 2001: 137). About the 'National Schism' see Petsalis-Diomidis 1988, Yianouloupoulos 2003: 225-248 and Close 1995: 3-4.

<sup>39</sup> A. 1916: 78. About the levy that started as a response to Bulgaria's levy, see also Kambanis 1946: 142.

<sup>40</sup> A. 1916: 79. Kambanis here seems to follow Gounaris's opinion expressed in the Greek parliament; see Kambanis 1946: 142-143.

<sup>41</sup> Saving Kambanis's article discussed here, the only other critical texts in *Ellinika Chronika* are Spyros Melas's book review on Konstantinos Chatzopoulos's short story collection *Τασώ, Στο σκοτάδι κι άλλα διηγήματα* (Melas 1916) and the translation of Jen Peterfy's study on Dante's *La Divina Commedia* (Peterfy 1916a, 1916b, 1916c).

<sup>42</sup> Skeolas 1916. About the fact that 'Μ. Σκαιόλας' was Kambanis, see Delopoulos 2005: 111 & 230. As a matter of fact, Kambanis had used this pseudonym again before *Ellinika Chronika*, for example in the newspaper *Akropolis*; see Papakostas 1988: 26 (footnote 9). The pseudonym is probably a reference to the first recorded person with that name, the mythical Roman hero Gaius Mucius Scaevola. The hero might have been known to Kambanis, if not directly from the Roman historian Livy, at least from Dante's *Divina Commedia*. 'Muzio' is a notable example in Canto IV of *Paradiso*, where concepts such as free will, resistance to force etc. are discussed (see Dante 1997: 85-86).

has already been mentioned, Kambanis often called Palamas a ‘teacher’ and he also did so in this text.<sup>43</sup> On the whole, however, this collection was harshly critiqued:

Οι ‘Βωμοί’ ημπορούσαν και να λείψουν χωρίς η ποιητική δημιουργία του κ. Παλαμά να πάθῃ τίποτε. [...] Το γνήσιον ποιητικόν ἔργον του διδασκάλου αρχίζει με τα ‘Τραγούδια της Πατρίδος μου’ και τελειώνει – ἡ σχεδόν – εις την ‘Ασάλευτην Ζωήν’.<sup>44</sup>

Through such an approach not only the importance of the collection *Βωμοί*, which contains ‘Οι πατέρες’, one of the poet’s most accredited poems,<sup>45</sup> is diminished, but also every poetic work after 1904, when *Ασάλευτη ζωή* was published, is excluded from the core of Palamas’s poetic oeuvre. Thus some of his best known poetic publications, such as *Ο Δωδεκάλογος του Γύφτου* (1907) and *Η φλογέρα του Βασιλιά* (1910), are also quite surprisingly left out of the ‘Palamic’ canon.

Withal, Kambanis clarified that the part of Palamas’s oeuvre, which was defined by the poet as ‘Sibyllic’, was not beyond his comprehension, but simply did not correspond to his aesthetic values.<sup>46</sup> In conformity with his view that Palamas’s earlier collections represent the real essence of his work, the critic claimed that even within this collection the best poems are the oldest ones.<sup>47</sup> Moreover, the review includes an account of the collection’s drawbacks: allusions to science, which are probably considered as ruining the literariness of the collection, poor structuring and

---

<sup>43</sup> He called him ‘διδάσκαλο’ twice in p. 31 and once in p. 32. See also here, chapter 1, p. 30.

<sup>44</sup> Skeolas 1916: 31.

<sup>45</sup> See Kokoris 2007.

<sup>46</sup> Skeolas 1916: 31.

<sup>47</sup> Skeolas 1916: 31.

exuberant stylistic variety, which seems to be identified by the critic with inconsistency or even disorder.<sup>48</sup> Finally, Kambanis presented some positive facets of the collection, such as Palamas's more sensible linguistic choices in comparison with the past and the poem's lyrical passion and eloquence. In addition, he expressed his disagreement with sarcastic comments on the poem 'Νεοάιδες' found in the press.<sup>49</sup>

#### *KALLIGAS AND ZAMBELIOS*

As most critics of his time, Kambanis would deal predominantly with poetry. The reasons for that are quite complex and not easy to pinpoint, but perhaps a first explication could be that the poetic output during that period was more extensive than that of fiction. It is also highly likely that both the writers and the critics were still influenced by remnants of the nineteenth-century construct which used to hold poetry superior to prose or to deem the former the quintessence of literature, whereas the latter was supposed to be nothing more than a hobby, a trivial free time activity. Nonetheless, Kambanis applied himself to the study of fiction as well, with a distinct preference for short stories. This publication is the fruit of his thorough scrutiny of the work of Kalligas and Zambelios, although, as mentioned above, in this case he discussed some of their novels and not their short stories.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> Skeolas 1916: 31.

<sup>49</sup> Skeolas 1916: 32.

<sup>50</sup> See here, chapter 2, p. 40. It should be noted, however, that often until the beginning of the twentieth century 'οι έλληνες κριτικοί δεν έβλεπαν ουσιώδεις διαφορές ανάμεσα στο διήγημα και το μυθιστόρημα, πέρα από τη διαφορά στην έκταση και τη συνθετότητα της πλοκής. Ο όρος διήγημα εξαλλου χρησιμοποιούνταν επίσης με την έννοια της "αφήγησης", της δημιουργικής πεζογραφίας' (Apostolidou 1992: 229 (footnote 67)).

The lecture was divided, of course, into two parts: one about Kalligas (pp. 3-23) and one about Zambelios (pp. 23-40). Both parts began with some biographical details about the authors (pp. 4-5 & 23-25) and moved on to the discussion of the two books that are in reality the main topic of this lecture, i.e. *Θάνος Βλέκας* and *Κρητικοί Γάμοι*.

Kambanis focused on the plot of the novels, but rather interestingly he sometimes touched upon issues that later scholars have also examined. For example, before providing his synopsis of *Θάνος Βλέκας*, he talked about the stratagem with which the novel begins, a topic which has also been discussed by latter scholars.<sup>51</sup> It seems indeed as if Kambanis had also traced (but did not expose) the pedigree of this technique, which could be defined as a fictional preface and more specifically a disavowing authorial preface.<sup>52</sup> Moreover, Kambanis repeatedly stressed the social character of *Θάνος Βλέκας*, which remains a *locus communus* amongst the posterior references to the novel.<sup>53</sup>

The language Kambanis used in this lecture is much more puristic than the one used in his other texts discussed up to this point. Perhaps this should be connected to the makeup of the target audience which included mostly members of the Athenian bourgeoisie and to the idiosyncrasy of the association hosting the

---

<sup>51</sup> See for example Masson-Vincourt 1997: 300-301.

<sup>52</sup> Genette 1997: 280-284.

<sup>53</sup> See for instance Kambanis 1920: 8, 9, 18 et al. As for the treatment of this subject by modern scholars, see for example Kalligas 1991: 16-30, Vitti 1991: 15 & 29-36, Tonnet 1996: 109-113, Kayialis 1996, Kalligas 2001: xiv-xvi. As a matter of fact, Tonnet defines the novel as 'roman social' and claims that Kalligas 'est le premier à s'occuper de l'organisation, ou plutôt de la désorganisation de l'État grec' (Tonnet 1996 : 109), which is more or less the same that Kambanis argues in this lecture.

event.<sup>54</sup> Nevertheless, Kambanis almost obsessively referred to Zambelios's puristic language and pompous style in an ambivalent manner.<sup>55</sup> However, just before the end of his lecture and while recounting the drawbacks of Zambelios in comparison to some of Kambanis's contemporary authors, the latter became more revealing of his true view of Zambelios's language: he did not have 'καθαράν γλωσσικήν συνείδησιν'.<sup>56</sup>

The political element is present in this lecture as well, although it is scattered throughout it and is not always apparent at first sight. For instance, while presenting Kalligas's life, Kambanis mentioned the 'Anglo-French occupation of 1854'. In 1853-1856 there was an escalation of the Eastern Question. Greece got involved in this crisis, known as the 'Crimean War', but was forced to withdraw its troops and declare its neutrality. The term 'occupation government' has been used with reference to the government formed after King Otto declared the country's neutrality. Its use emanated chiefly from the discontent with the landing of British and French troops in Piraeus and the fact that the government's head was Mavrokordatos, a politician known for his pro-British inclinations (in fact he was the leader of the so-called 'English party').<sup>57</sup> The choice of this term in contrast to the

---

<sup>54</sup> About 'Parnassos' see Zoras 1991.

<sup>55</sup> Kambanis 1920: 28, 32, 33, 35, 37, 38.

<sup>56</sup> Kambanis 1920: 39. Cf. his *History of Modern Greek Literature*, where, from the third edition onwards, his characterisation of the language used by Zambelios in that novel is 'κακόζηλη αρχαϊκή γλώσσα' (Kambanis 1933: 180, Kambanis n.d.: 180, Kambanis 1948: 188). Apart from the language of the novel, the main point of Kambanis's criticism is identical to the one expressed by Thomas Doulis some eighty years later: 'Spyridon Zambelios could not resolve the divergent objectives of novelist and didactic historian in *Cretan Weddings*' (Kalligas 2001: xiii).

<sup>57</sup> See Papayeoryiou 2004: 468-479.

more general terms 'Crimean Crisis' or 'Crimean War' that are commonly used to refer to this period should probably be associated with events of Kambanis's own time. Namely with the *Noemvriana* of 1916, when French troops that had landed in Athens engaged into combat with royalist battalions and the dethronement of Constantine that was organised and demanded by the Great Powers in 1917.<sup>58</sup> Of course, Kambanis and other Royalists would not take these actions too kindly.

A negative attribute of this lecture - as well as of many of Kambanis's reviews or even his *History of Modern Greek Literature* and his *History of Modern Greek Criticism* - is that they focus chiefly on the plot, sometimes reproducing and other times summarising the original text. Although this belittles the quality of the critical texts, one should definitely bear in mind that most of the critics at that time (or, to be more precise, not only then, but especially then) had undertaken the role of the 'mediator' between the authors and the public.<sup>59</sup> This 'mediation' was not only of 'aesthetic' nature, in other words it did not merely intend to refine the reader's (or potential reader's) aesthetic criteria. It was also of an advertising/promotional and generally financial kind, since the critics did not simply seek to inform the public about the

---

<sup>58</sup> Veremis & Koliopoulos 2006: 351.

<sup>59</sup> About the 'mediatory' role of the critics see Tziovas 1987: 323 & Pesketzi 2003: 22. Such conceptions about the role of the critic have been contested and largely rejected in the post-war period, especially in the West. 'Ο "θάνατος" του συγγραφέα , ο οποίος "πιστοποιήθηκε" από τον Roland Barthes, αλλά και η αμφισβήτηση του λογοτεχνικού κανόνα, σήμανε ταυτόχρονα και το "θάνατο" του κριτικού, με την έννοια του "φωτισμένου" καθοδηγητή της κοινής γνώμης' (Pesketzi 2003: 18).

books or authors in question, but to steer them indirectly or sometimes directly towards buying this or that book as well.<sup>60</sup>

Apart from the concept of the critic as a mediator Kambanis followed another standard of his time: the one of the critic as a judge, as the person who knows better than anyone else (even than the author) which are the correct aesthetic criteria, what distinguishes aesthetic failure from aesthetic success. Within that framework Kambanis not only made remarks like 'ο Καλλιγὰς διέπραξεν ἓνα μικρὸν αισθητικὸν λάθος',<sup>61</sup> but he even proceeded to provide advice of narrative nature:

ο μυθιστοριογράφος ἀντιθέτως πρὸς τὸν δραματικόν, δὲν πρέπει νὰ σπεύδῃ πρὸς τὴν λύσιν δι' ὅλων τοῦ τῶν δυνάμεων, ἀλλὰ νὰ διανθίζει τὴν ἀφήγησιν με χαρακτηριστικὰ ἐπεισόδια καὶ ωραίας λεπτομερείας, πρέπει νὰ κάμνῃ δρόμον μετ' ἐμποδίων.<sup>62</sup>

## **HISTORY OF MODERN GREEK LITERATURE**

Since the first two editions of Kambanis's *Ιστορία της Νέας Ελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας* (1000 μ.Χ. – 1900) were almost identical, as mentioned before,<sup>63</sup> I chose to deal solely with the second edition, which is slightly improved as far as the appearance and the orthography are concerned.

---

<sup>60</sup> A relevant issue that has not been properly studied yet is the relationship between critics and publishers and the conditions faced by the critics who had a column in periodicals promoting the production of a certain publishing house.

<sup>61</sup> Kambanis 1920: 21.

<sup>62</sup> Kambanis 1920: 10-11. Kambanis mentioned that these are Goethe's instructions, but he did not give any more details or a more specific reference. What is more, he did not clarify if this name-dropping was merely utilised as a kind of evidence in order to reinforce his argument or if it was also intended as an allusion to *Thanos Vlekas's* eclectic affinities.

<sup>63</sup> See here, introduction, p. 11 (footnote 50).

As it is the case with many other *Histories of Literature*, Kambanis's book begins with an introductory account of the history of Greek language outlining the course from the ancient to its modern form (pp. 5-8). In the introduction the author also discussed the much debated topic of periodisation, basing the chapter breakdown on political/historical events, at least as far as the first three chapters are concerned;<sup>64</sup> the division between the remaining two chapters of the main part seems to rely on other criteria that will be discussed henceforth.<sup>65</sup> Finally, Kambanis expressed his preference for demotic texts and stated explicitly that his book's focus shall be on the literary output written in demotic language.<sup>66</sup>

The book follows a rather standard structural pattern, according to which the following points are provided for most of the books or authors discussed: biographical data of the author, information about (or, when it comes to early texts, speculation on) the time of writing, an outline of the work's plotline or premise (which sometimes covers the greatest part of the presentation), the particulars concerning its manuscripts or editions, comments on the language and versification, passages from the original text itself, details regarding the work's 'sources' or the author's 'influences' and conclusive remarks or evaluative attempts.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> Kambanis 1925: 8-9. On this debate see Politis 1978: 1-4, Mastrodimitris 2005: 39-41 et al.

<sup>65</sup> See here, pp. 57-58.

<sup>66</sup> Kambanis 1925: 9.

<sup>67</sup> Despite the changes from edition to edition, which stem from the reconsideration of some of Kambanis's older views and mostly from the inclusion of more recent periods in the scope of his *History*, the structure remains more or less the same in all subsequent editions. As a matter of fact, the structural pattern becomes even more evident in the third edition, where many of the points mentioned here were actually printed on the page margins as subsection titles.

As in much of the rest of his work, Kambanis touched repeatedly upon the language question in this book. Aside from his preliminary statement mentioned above,<sup>68</sup> in the fourth chapter Kambanis placed the authors of the so-called 'Romantic School of Athens' in a separate section under the title 'Καθαρολόγοι πεζογράφοι', thus actually shelving their contribution to Modern Greek poetry.<sup>69</sup> Moreover, he centred on the linguistic form they used in order to furnish a categorisation rather than expanding on differences regarding the literary movement dominating the Heptanesian and the Athenian literary scene (that is, Romanticism and Classic-Romanticism respectively). What is more, in the third chapter one finds a subsection entitled 'Το γλωσσικό ζήτημα', wherein Kambanis sketched the origin of the language question.<sup>70</sup>

As it was mentioned before, the chronological boundary set between the fourth and the fifth chapter is not based on historical criteria. In fact, the criteria seem to be associated with the language question and the progression of Demoticism. The boundary chosen is 1886 and it could be related to the publication of Palamas's first collection *Τραγούδια της πατρίδος μου*. Even though this collection is still considered as having paved to some extent the way for the

---

<sup>68</sup> See here, p. 56 (footnote 66).

<sup>69</sup> Kambanis 1925: 126-135. The discussion of their poetry, which precedes that section and is placed between the discussion of the authors of the so-called 'Solomic School' and another Heptanesian poet, Valaoritis (his work is often presented in many a History of Modern Greek literature as ambivalent and transitive and therefore, despite his proximity - by descent and by technique - to other poets of the 'Heptanesian School', he is usually examined as a separate case), covers less than two and a half pages (Kambanis 1925: 115-118). In contrast, the part about the 'Heptanesian School' extends over twenty six pages (Kambanis 1925: 89-115) and the one about Valaoritis extends over eight pages (Kambanis 1925: 118-125).

<sup>70</sup> Kambanis 1925: 72-73.

consolidation of the use of the demotic in poetry, it was not entirely written in the demotic. Besides, Kambanis only makes a brief mention of it (p. 149) and not a very positive one. Although the end of the previous chapter was supposed to span until 1886, the year 1888 is indicated as its end date in the headline of the chapter. Moreover, this last chapter begins with a subsection about Psycharis and the impact of his linguistically ground-breaking novel *To Ταξίδι μου* that was published in 1888. This should be considered then as the real criterion for the chapter breakdown in this case.

As it has already been mentioned, Kambanis dealt primarily with poetry in his critical work.<sup>71</sup> The same applies to the first two editions of his *History of Modern Greek Literature*.<sup>72</sup> Nevertheless, the treatment of poetry is quite superficial and descriptive, especially as far as the first centuries of Modern Greek literature are concerned.<sup>73</sup> All in all, Kambanis's *History of Modern Greek Literature* has been criticised as not being scholarly and in fact as not being a proper history, like his

---

<sup>71</sup> See here, chapter 2, p. 51.

<sup>72</sup> The later editions gradually incorporate more material about fiction, something that may chiefly be attributed to the expansion of the chronological limits of the work, since the 20th century witnessed a steadily increasing Greek prose output. Nonetheless, poetry remains dominant even in the fifth edition of the book. Generally, 'οι ιστορίες της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας [...] είναι κυρίως ιστορίες της ποίησης. Η ιστορία της νεοελληνικής πεζογραφίας παραμένει στην πραγματικότητα άγραφη' (Apostolidou 1922: 227 (footnote 61)).

<sup>73</sup> 'Ο Καμπάνης διατρέχει τα έργα των πρώτων περιόδων της λογοτεχνίας μας, χωρίς να τα χαρακτηρίζει ή να τα αξιολογεί, δίνοντας μόνο περιλήψεις και πληροφορίες' (Apostolidou 1992: 362). However, Apostolidou's claim is not exactly accurate: Kambanis evaluated many of these early works, but mostly from a viewpoint associated with the language question, characterising several of them only linguistic - but not literary - monuments, while totally dismissing other works due to the use of a very archaistic and 'formal' language.

*History of Modern Greek Criticism* has been considered as not dealing with criticism so much as with the language question.<sup>74</sup> As Yiannis Papatheodorou argues:

Ο συντάκτης της, στην πραγματικότητα, επεξεργάζεται ένα υλικό που έχει προέλθει από άρθρα και κριτικές επιφυλλίδες, το οποίο οργανώνει στην προοπτική μιας ιστορίας της λογοτεχνίας. [...]Ο Καμπάνης έρχεται περισσότερο να οργανώσει τα δεδομένα της κεκτημένης γνώσης και της δοκιμασμένης αισθητικής παρά να γράψει μια ιστορία της λογοτεχνίας.<sup>75</sup>

All in all, Kambanis's history relies largely on the literary canon formulated by Palamas and on the latter's historiographical schematisations. Despite Kambanis's frequent objections to Palamas as a critic, especially during his formative years,<sup>76</sup> but even in this very book,<sup>77</sup> Kambanis's *History of Modern Greek Literature* could be seen as a 'Palamic' history.<sup>78</sup>

## CONCLUSION

The above analysis presents Kambanis's multifaceted activities during the years of the National Schism as well as the Asia Minor Catastrophe and its aftermath. At such a turbulent time, Kambanis remained really active as a critic and intellectual, while intensifying his involvement in politics, mainly through

---

<sup>74</sup> Apostolidou 1992: 362, 364. About the critique of his *History of Modern Greek Criticism* see here, introduction, p. 1 (especially footnote 5), as well as chapter 3, p. 64.

<sup>75</sup> <http://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/literature/studies/grammatologies/guide.html>.

<sup>76</sup> See here, chapter 1, p. 27 (especially footnote 59).

<sup>77</sup> Kambanis 1925: 156.

<sup>78</sup> See Apostolidou 1992: 360-364. Nonetheless, her argument that Kambanis 'χρησιμοποιεί το παλαμικό έργο συνεχώς και ουσιαστικά χτίζει ένα βιβλίο πάνω στο διασκορπισμένο αυτό έργο, χωρίς να προσθέτει τίποτε δικό του' (Apostolidou 1992: 363) is rather exaggerative and not based neither on the book itself nor on Kambanis's previous critical output.

journalism. In fact, he undertook to a great extent the role of a political agitator, becoming an advocate of the royalist faction and the King himself. The beginning of his wider recognition as a critic can also be traced in this period, since Kambanis had started being invited by various associations to give speeches on literary issues, such as the one which later took the form of the book discussed in this chapter (*Καλλιγὰς καὶ Ζαμπέλιος*). Finally, his *History of Modern Greek Literature*, the first complete book of that kind ever written in Greek, was the culmination and systematisation of his critical work thus far and paved the way for his further establishment as one of the main specialists on literary matters in the Interwar.

### -CHAPTER 3-

## THE YEARS OF RECOGNITION (1926 – 1936)

The aim of this chapter is to analyse Kambanis's work during the period that his establishment as an intellectual was completed. In reality, the first important sign for Kambanis's recognition is found in 1929 when it was recommended by Bastias that he be appointed a professor of Modern Greek Studies at the University of Athens.<sup>1</sup> The chapter is divided in three parts: The first one contains an overall presentation of Kambanis's intellectual activities during that period, whilst the other ones deal with two of his most significant books, the *History of Modern Greek Literature*, which was supplemented and republished in the 1930s, and the *History of Modern Greek Criticism*.

### INTELLECTUAL ACTIVITIES

The interwar years and especially the 1930s constitute the period of Kambanis's most significant activity. Apart from the publication of his *History of Modern Greek Literature*, which was discussed in the previous chapter, and his activity associated with the periodical *To Neon Kratos*, which shall be analysed in the following one, Kambanis published his most important books during this time.

---

<sup>1</sup> See here, introduction, p. 8 (footnote 35).

In 1930 he wrote the introduction to Kondylakis's short story collection *Όταν ήμουν δάσκαλος κι ' άλλα διηγήματα* (1930), which he called 'Κριτική βιογραφία', whereas four years later two 1919 articles of his from the newspaper *Valkanikos Tahydromos* were reprinted in the book *Τα παράκαιρα του Κωστή Παλαμά* (1934), along with texts by Rigas Golfis, Yangos Iliadis and Louis Roussel.<sup>2</sup>

In 1933 the third edition of the *History of Modern Greek Literature* was published as an appendix to the periodical *Nea Estia*. This edition was a revised and supplemented version of the first two editions and it was soon followed by a supplement, the *History of Modern Greek Criticism* (1935), while it was reprinted as a fourth edition just a few years later.

As it was the case with the first and second editions of his *History of Modern Greek Literature*, the third and the fourth editions are almost identical to each other. The only differences of the fourth edition compared to the third edition are the following ones: First, the introduction has been reedited and became somewhat more succinct, without, however, any major alterations in the meaning; second, there is no preface; third, it contained a twenty-page index (pp. 353-372); finally, it is dedicated to Nikos Veis. It is interesting that even the table of typographical errors appended to the book is the same in both editions, which constitutes a clear indication that the fourth 'edition' is nothing but a reprinting of the third one. As a

---

<sup>2</sup> Kondylakis 1930: 5-11; Kambanis 1934.

matter of fact, probably the only difference in the main text is merely an omission of the initial of Zambelios's first name.<sup>3</sup>

In 1936 he edited the *Anthology of Thracian Poets* and published the *History of Aesthetic Theories*. In the latter, one can notice Kambanis's preoccupation with the didactic character of literature and the pedagogic aim of his own book.<sup>4</sup> Despite its significance, however, the *History of Aesthetic Theories* shall not be discussed here, since it deals with philosophy, and for the biggest part ancient philosophy, which does not fall under the scope of this thesis. Nonetheless, it should be noted that this book does not only demonstrate Kambanis's erudition and wide range of intellectual interests, but it can also be associated with his critical approach, which, as that of many other Greek critics of his time, was influenced by aesthetic philosophy.<sup>5</sup>

At the same time, he was contributing to various serial publications, such as the magazine *Ergasia* (1930-1941) and the newspaper *Ethnos*, while in 1935 he edited the periodical *Filologyikos Neos Kosmos*.

Finally, Kambanis's engagement in the demoticist cause becomes even more apparent in this period with his involvement in the founding of Glossikos Syllogos in 1934.<sup>6</sup> What is more, the Histories he published in the 1930s have a distinctly demoticist character. Nonetheless, the same cause of promoting the demotic is

---

<sup>3</sup> Compare Kambanis 1933: 13 with Kambanis n.d.: 13.

<sup>4</sup> It is indicative of this 'obsession' that four such examples are found in just one page: 'εκείνο που θα μπορούσαμε να διδάξουμε στα παιδιά μας', 'ή θα μπορούσαμε να διδάξουμε στα παιδιά μας', 'αντιπαιδαγωγικά παραμύθια', 'ολέθριες διηγήσεις, ικανές να διαφθείρουν τα παιδιά' (Kambanis 1936: 15).

<sup>5</sup> See here, chapter 1, p. 27 (footnote 60).

<sup>6</sup> About 'Glossikos Syllogos' see here introduction, p. 9 (footnote 39).

served by many of his earlier works, such as the first edition of his *History of Modern Greek Literature* or his translations of ancient Greek authors.<sup>7</sup>

### **HISTORY OF MODERN GREEK CRITICISM**

The *History of Modern Greek Criticism* was published as an appendix of *Nea Estia* and was presented by Kambanis as a supplement to his *History of Modern Greek Literature*:

Από την 'Ιστορία της Νέας Ελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας', Τρίτη και τέταρτη έκδοσι, έλειψαν δυο απαραίτητα για την ολοκλήρωσί της κεφάλαια. Το πρώτο, που ιστορεί τις περιπέτειες της κριτικής μας στο 19<sup>ο</sup> και τον 20<sup>ο</sup> αιώνα, δίνω σήμερα.

Θα δώσω, ίσως, αργότερα το κεφάλαιο για τα δημοτικά τραγούδια.<sup>8</sup>

Kambanis, however, never published a book on Greek folk poetry, as he preluded here.<sup>9</sup> As for this book, its content does not really meet the standards ostensibly posed by the title. The text is essentially a linguistic and metalinguistic one, not so much a critical or metacritical one.<sup>10</sup>

What is more, it is rather manifest that the book consists primarily of passages from and quotations to other authors' works. This could be explained in the

---

<sup>7</sup> About the language-oriented aspirations of Kambanis's books see also Tsakonas 1989: 346.

<sup>8</sup> Kambanis 1935: 5

<sup>9</sup> Something similar happened with the *History of Aesthetic Histories*, where it was announced that the aesthetic debates during the twentieth century will be the topic of another book, which in the end was never published (Kambanis 1936: 7).

<sup>10</sup> At some points Kambanis even used a 'meta-metalanguage' or a 'meta-meta-metalanguage' (in other words, metalinguistic analyses of a second or third degree), e.g. when he discussed the views Kodrikas had about Katartzis's linguistic views (Kambanis 1935: 37).

following two ways: First, it might be an indication of Kambanis's poor synthetic ability. Second, it is highly likely that Kambanis went to all lengths in order to provide the public with as many original texts as possible. Besides, this last conjecture can be associated with the pedagogic and popularising/simplifying character of the book, something that seemed to be Kambanis's aim with all the books he published during the Interwar.

The book is structured in two parts, one about the nineteenth century and one about the twentieth century. The first part, which is naturally much bigger than the second one, is divided into three chapters, one about the cultural phenomenon and the historical period that Kambanis terms 'Greek renaissance', one about the Phanariotes and one about 'Kontism' and 'Psycharism', viz. the theories formulated by Kontos and Psycharis respectively. Apart from the chronological arrangement of the material, the structure of the book revolves mainly around some major figures associated with the language question, so it could be seen as 'person-oriented'. This applies to the whole book, i.e. to the second part as well, which is divided into two chapters, the first one being about the 'Psycharian' period, ceteris verbis the first decade of the 20th century, and the second one about the Great War and the interwar years until Kambanis's own time.

The first chapter commences with an attempt to delineate the lineage of European literary criticism. In turn Kambanis maintains: 'Η νέα λογοτεχνική μας

κριτική πηγάζει απ' τη φιλολογική κριτική'.<sup>11</sup> The term 'philological criticism' is used here in the sense of *Textkritik* and so Kambanis goes on to discuss the case of the most able pre-Revolution Greek critic of that kind, Korais.<sup>12</sup> His presentation of Korais covers several pages (pp. 7-32), but only in the last few pages (26-32) Kambanis actually engages critically with him. Most of the text until this point is comprised of Korais's own passages or summaries of his texts made by Kambanis.

The section of the chapter where Kambanis presents his own view on Korais begins with a reference to another book of his, the *History of Modern Greek Literature*: 'Στην "Ιστορία της Νέας Ελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας" γράψαμε τη γνώμη μας για τη γλώσσα του Κοραή'.<sup>13</sup> Initially his approach contains mainly elements of biographical criticism and positivism, but it could also be associated with viewpoints pertaining to sociolinguistics or even psychoanalysis, as he explains Korais's work as a result of his personal experiences, his social and linguistic environment and of a self-imposed 'exile'.<sup>14</sup> Nonetheless, the critic soon deviates from Korais's presentation in favour of a preaching of his own linguistic vantage, wherein he utilises the arguments and views of linguists known and acknowledged at his time.<sup>15</sup> He writes from an openly demoticist point of view, which in the final analysis

---

<sup>11</sup> Kambanis 1935:7.

<sup>12</sup> The choice to start his analysis with Korais could moreover be associated with the fact that it has been sometimes considered that the language question began with Korais's attempts to rectify the Modern Greek language (see for example Kambanis 1935: 109-110)

<sup>13</sup> Kambanis 1935: 26

<sup>14</sup> Kambanis 1935: 27

<sup>15</sup> From today's point of view these linguists would not be reckoned as the most dependable sources on the subject; nonetheless, one has to bear in mind the time of writing and the level and diffusion of linguistics in Greece at that time. The most significant of these linguists are mentioned here, in p. 72, footnote 38.

practically abolishes Korais's contribution to the Modern Greek civilisation and projects as the latter's sole positive asset the fact that he proclaimed the rights of the 'Modern Greek' (=demotic) language.<sup>16</sup>

After Korais, Kambanis engaged in the discussion of some other major participants of the debate over the language question until the years of Greece's independence: Panayotis Kodrikas (pp. 33-41), Yiannis Vilaras (pp. 42-51), Dionysios Solomos (pp. 51-72).<sup>17</sup> All three of them were in favour of the people's language and Kambanis used their examples along with others in his attempt to formulate a genealogy of the demotic movement. For instance, he characterised Katartzis as one 'απ' τους πιο παλιούς θεωρητικούς του δημοτικισμού'.<sup>18</sup> However, the use of the term 'demoticism' here could actually be regarded as anachronistic, since Kambanis suggested the existence of a theory of demoticism even before the emergence of demoticism itself; in reality the term demotic can only be seen in juxtaposition to *katharevousa* and it would probably be imprudent to use these terms for periods before the second half of the nineteenth century.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Kambanis 1935: 27. 'Στο ενεργητικό το Κοραή είναι, [sic] πώς [sic] διακήρυξε χωρίς φόβο και οργή τα δικαιώματα της νέας Ελληνικής, πώς [sic] έκανε προπαγάνδα για τη συναγωγή του γλωσσικού της πλούτου, πώς [sic] εγκαινίασε ο ίδιος τη μελέτη των μεσαιωνικών κειμένων, και πώς [sic] είχε τη διανοητική χρηστότητα να εξομολογηθή τις αμφιβολίες του όσον αφορά στην αλήθεια του γλωσσικού του κηρύγματος' (emphasis added). Kambanis, however, did not seem to follow Korais's example in being doubtful about the verity of his own linguistic beliefs. As for the significance of Korais's contribution to Modern Greek culture, see for example <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/322120/Adamantios-Korais>, where it is mentioned that 'his influence on the modern Greek language, and on Greek culture more broadly, has been compared to that of Dante on Italian and Martin Luther on German'.

<sup>17</sup> In the analysis of Solomos's contribution to the language question, Polyas and Zambelios are also discussed.

<sup>18</sup> Kambanis 1935: 35.

<sup>19</sup> See also Kambanis 1935: 41, where the term *katharevousa* is anachronistically used.

In this book one additionally notices Kambanis's preference over certain authors, a preference that is also manifest in some of his reviews or in the *History of Modern Greek Literature*. Apart from the recurring laud of Solomos<sup>20</sup> or the emphasis on Palamas's importance,<sup>21</sup> another significant example is that of Vilaras. Kambanis was explicitly in favour of this poet's linguistic stance and he even juxtaposed him with other major figures in the history of the language question, such as Christopoulos, Korais and Psycharis.<sup>22</sup> What is more, he presented him as the precursor or the main source of Solomos's linguistic views.<sup>23</sup>

At some points he also expressed in a positive way with regard to linguistic views that were deemed quite extreme and which he reconsidered later, such as the 'absolute logic of phonetic orthography';<sup>24</sup> in *To Neon Kratos*, however, he attacked harshly those in favour of such views, presenting them as ignorant enemies of the Greek tradition.<sup>25</sup> Elsewhere he exclaimed: 'Ο φετιχισμός των τόνων και των πνευμάτων πρέπει να καταλυθή. Πρέπει να ελευθερωθή το Γένος από τη διπλή τυραννία'.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> For instance, in Kambanis 1935: 56 he called Solomos a 'great linguistic prophet'. Nonetheless, he did not hesitate to rightly criticise some of Solomos's linguistic views that were wrong. However, he attributed them mainly to the fact that the poet was of a rather young age when he expressed them (Kambanis 1935: 55).

<sup>21</sup> In reality the first chapter of the book's second part (Kambanis 1935: 145-152) treats mainly Palamas as a critic. It is worth mentioning that in this case Kambanis did not centre so much on Palamas's linguistic views, but gave a more comprehensive picture of his critical output and method.

<sup>22</sup> Kambanis 1935: 47.

<sup>23</sup> See for example his comment about Solomos's *Διάλογος* in Kambanis 1935: 54.

<sup>24</sup> Kambanis 1935: 46.

<sup>25</sup> Kambanis 1938c: 379.

<sup>26</sup> Kambanis 1935: 54.

What is more, Kambanis also discussed some literary matters that have preoccupied Greek critics, one of the most significant ones being that associated with the fragmentary character of Solomos's poetry.<sup>27</sup> Kambanis dealt with this issue on several other occasions in some of his articles or books, however, his views did not remain unchanged over the course of time.<sup>28</sup> In addition to specialised questions, such as the one about Solomos's fragmentary poetry, Kambanis also treated more general literary issues, such as the reception of Western literary movements in Greece. For instance, after presenting Vlachos's study *Η φυσιολογική σχολή και ο Ζολά* (1880),<sup>29</sup> he condemned Naturalism per se, but argued that it constituted a fertilising precursor for latter Greek fiction.<sup>30</sup>

Dealing with the language question naturally led to the discussion of some heated debates and disputes that various intellectuals were engaged in. It is interesting that the analysis of these controversies through the prism of Kambanis's Demoticism led to the deconstruction of the very grounds for dispute in some cases. For the 'adversaries' who were not conforming to the Neodemoticist standards were often considered as having more or less the same linguistic practices:

Μπορεί [...] να υποστηρίξει κανείς πως ο αγώνας μεταξύ Σούτσου και Ασώπιου δεν είχε βαθύτερο νόημα, γιατί και οι δύο είχαν παραμερίσει

---

<sup>27</sup> See Kambanis 1935: 63-65, where mainly Zambelios's arguments are presented.

<sup>28</sup> Kambanis's view during that period is implied by the expression 'Solomos's poetic "failure"' which is used in order to describe his work's 'fragmentariness'. Kambanis's earlier view that Solomos's poems had been completed, but some of the manuscripts were stolen, lost or destroyed has already been abandoned (see here, chapter 1, p. 29, especially footnote 64).

<sup>29</sup> Kambanis 1935: 93-95.

<sup>30</sup> Kambanis 1935: 96.

ουσιαστικά την Κοραϊκή διδασκαλία και ο Σούτσος, που κατηγορούσε τον Κοραή και ο Ασώπιος, που ισχυριζόταν πως ακολουθούσε 'την μέσην οδόν'.<sup>31</sup>

Kambanis moreover discussed known critical disputes, such as the one between Emmanouil Roidis and Angelos Vlachos.<sup>32</sup> However, he criticised harshly the way this debate was conducted:

Όλη αυτή η συζήτηση, όλες αυτές οι αναδρομές στον Έγελο, στο Σοπενάουερ, στον Καρριέρ, στο Λεβέκ, σε Γερμανούς και Γάλλους πρώτης και δεύτερης σειράς αισθητικούς και φιλοσόφους φαίνονται σήμερα σαν επίδειξις πτωχαλαζόνων δικηγόρων επαρχιακού ποινικού δικαστηρίου, οι οποίοι θέλουν να εκπλήξουν τους ενόρκους. Αλλ' αυτό ήταν το σύστημα της εποχής. Και για πολλές ακόμη δεκαετίες οι Έλληνες κριτικοί – οι Έλληνες λόγιοι θάλεγες [sic] πως σκεπτόνταν με αναμνήσεις διαβασμάτων – με παραπομπές.<sup>33</sup>

Be that as it may, the practice described above could be seen as an indication of theoretical self-consciousness of Greek criticism and as an attempt to endow critical discourse with scholarly attributes.

Despite the book's focus on the language question, it contains also a sufficient presentation of some authors' critical views and methods as well as demonstrates to some extent Kambanis's own critical skill.<sup>34</sup> Finally, it includes metacritical

---

<sup>31</sup> Kambanis 1935: 74.

<sup>32</sup> Kambanis 1935: 84-89.

<sup>33</sup> Kambanis 1935: 88.

<sup>34</sup> Kambanis actually approached the preoccupation of criticism with the language question from a rather deterministic perspective. See for example the following passage: 'Οι κριτικές δυνάμεις των λογίων μας, στο 19<sup>ο</sup> αιώνα, εξαντλήθηκαν [...] στην έρευνα του γλωσσικού προβλήματος. Κανένα σοβαρό πνεύμα δε γλύτωσε απ' αυτή τη μοίρα – δεν μπορούσε να γλυτώσει. Ακόμη και σήμερα εκατό-τόσα χρόνια ύστερ' απ' [sic] το θάνατο του Κοραή, το γλωσσικό ζήτημα απασχολεί

comments pointing to Kambanis's theoretical opinions about the methodology of criticism and the role of critics, such as the following ones:

Πρώτο καθήκον του κριτικού [...] όταν αντιμετωπίζει την ποίησι είναι να μπορή να θαυμάζη. Δεύτερο να βάζη σύνορα στο θαυμασμό του. Η κριτική δεν είναι ανατομία – ή τουλάχιστον μόνο ανατομία και αναλύσεις τεχνολογικές.<sup>35</sup>

In general, the book combines theoretical and practical, educational and propagandistic aims. Kambanis's desire was not just to inform about or provide an analysis of the language question up to date, but also to propagate his own linguistic views and to influence the public in favour of the positions of the 'Neodemoticist' circle. Thus, even opinions expressed in previous centuries by intellectuals that Kambanis tried to 'enlist' in the demoticist genealogy are sometimes associated with the present and with his own views or with those of other members of his circle, such as Tzartzanos.<sup>36</sup> Nonetheless, in some cases this linking is less explicit and can only be deduced from the author's stylistic choices.<sup>37</sup>

All in all, Kambanis's profundity of knowledge and awareness of the theoretical discussions taking place in the West (especially in the field of linguistics)

---

την Ελληνική διάνοηση, λογοτέχνες, φιλόλογους, εκπαιδευτικούς, πολιτευομένους' (Kambanis 1935: 145).

<sup>35</sup> Kambanis 1935: 57.

<sup>36</sup> See for example Kambanis 1935: 36. About the attempt to formulate a 'neodemoticist genealogy', see for instance the following passage: 'Ο νεοδημοτικισμός, ως θεωρία, πηγάζει από τον Πολυλά και τον Καλοσγούρο, ως πράξις αρχίζει από το Σολωμό του *Carmen Seculare*' (Kambanis 1935: 139).

<sup>37</sup> For instance, the bold letters used by Kambanis in the following passage suggest that, apart from being Vendryès's opinion about the French language, this is also Kambanis's own opinion with regard to the Greek language: 'Χρειάζεται μια **προοδευτική** μεταρρύθμιση. Μια κλιμακωτή αλλαγή της ορθογραφίας' (Kambanis 1935: 46).

becomes quite apparent in this book, in spite of some exaggerations and some hypothetical arguments that degrade the level of his work.<sup>38</sup>

### *HISTORY OF MODERN GREEK LITERATURE*

Kambanis considered the literary historiographical attempts, such as Rangabé's *Histoire littéraire de la Grèce moderne* (1877), as part of criticism.<sup>39</sup> In his preface in the third edition he wrote something about the previous editions of his own *History of Modern Greek Literature* that applies to the later editions as well: 'Ταξινόμησα τις παλιές και τις καινούργιες εντυπώσεις μου για τα προϊόντα του νέου Ελληνικού έντεχνου λόγου σ' ένα πολύ σύντομο εγχειρίδιο'.<sup>40</sup> As the word 'εντυπώσεις' indicates, the author employed in this work impressionist criticism, whilst the word 'ταξινόμησα' suggests that this is a collage or pastiche of critical reviews. Therefore, Apostolidou's claim that this work is not a proper historiographical one seems to be reinforced by Kambanis's own statements.<sup>41</sup>

Despite being a 'collection of impressions', as were the previous editions, and despite following the same more or less structural patterns,<sup>42</sup> the third edition possesses some more 'academic' attributes, especially should one take into account

---

<sup>38</sup> See for example the citations to Bopp, Vendryès (Kambanis 1935: 28), Jespersen (p. 29) or his mention of morphological and phonological developments (p. 30), which shows knowledge not only of theoretical, but of historical linguistics as well, or even his reference to the artificial languages Esperanto and Volapük (p. 31). Furthermore, it is quite interesting that Kambanis incidentally formulates a research proposal: 'κάποτε βέβαια θα μελετηθούν ακριβέστερα οι συντακτικές επιδράσεις των ξένων απ' τον καιρό των Εβδομήκοντα έως τώρα'; this, of course, is an indication that he is aware not only of the literature of linguistics, but also of its voids and deficiencies.

<sup>39</sup> See for example Kambanis 1935: 145.

<sup>40</sup> Kambanis 1933: 5.

<sup>41</sup> See here, chapter 2, p. 59 (footnote 74).

<sup>42</sup> See Kambanis 1933: 5 and here, chapter 2, p. 56 (footnote 67).

the period it was written in. For example, in the preface Kambanis argued that his book aspires to be an ‘epitome’, a concise history of Modern Greek literature, since the time for a more comprehensive work had not come yet. According to Kambanis, such a study would require the preliminary work of many a scholar of distinct specialisations.<sup>43</sup> What is more, ‘η σύντομη αυτή ιστορία δεν παρουσιάζεται ως έργο “οριστικό”, και γράφεται με τα στοιχεία που διαθέτουμε σήμερα, και τα οποία μπορούν αύριο ν’ αυξηθούν ή να τροποποιηθούν’.<sup>44</sup>

The aforementioned and some other reservations he expressed in this preface with regard to the requirement of chronological distance from the literary output in question and the need for reconsideration of previously formulated arguments (since there is no ‘absolute aesthetic truth’), are indications of a rather scholarly approach. In any case, some of the book’s drawbacks, such as the excessive focus on the plot of the works under consideration as far as the earlier periods are concerned and the resemblance to a list of names as far as the recent periods are concerned, are found in latter histories of Modern Greek literature as well, e.g. in those of Dimaras or Linos Politis.<sup>45</sup>

However, the preoccupation with the language question remains. As a matter of fact, even Bruno Lavagnini who wrote a review of the fourth edition so positive that was republished in *To Neon Kratos*, pointed out that: ‘Ίσως είναι δυσανάλογη προς το πλαίσιο του βιβλίου η ιστορική έκθεσις του γλωσσικού ζητήματος –

---

<sup>43</sup> Kambanis 1933: 5.

<sup>44</sup> Kambanis 1933: 5-6.

<sup>45</sup> Dimaras 1948, Politis 1978.

έκθεσις που απλώνεται σε πολλές δεκάδες σελίδων'.<sup>46</sup> Nonetheless, as Papatheodorou argues, 'οι ιστοριογραφικές απόπειρες του μεσοπολέμου καθορίζονται από τη δικαίωση του αφηγήματος του δημοτικισμού, και άρα την πρόδρομη γενεαλογία του και προβολή του στο λογοτεχνικό παρελθόν'.<sup>47</sup>

## CONCLUSION

This chapter outlined the consolidation of Kambanis's recognition as one of the main intellectuals of his time. Though his contribution to serial publications did not cease, this was the time of synthetic work for Kambanis and most of his books appear during this period. What is more, his constant interest in the language question and his support to Demoticism take on a more official character with the founding of the association 'Glossikos Syllogos'.

---

<sup>46</sup> Lavagnini 1937: 302.

<sup>47</sup> <http://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/literature/studies/grammatologies/guide.html>.

**TO NEON KRATOS AND O EIKOSTOS EON:  
FROM THE 'THIRD GREEK CIVILISATION' TO THE  
'THIRD REICH'  
(1937 – 1944)**

The aim of this chapter is to analyse Kambanis's contributions to the periodicals *To Neon Kratos* (1937-1941) and *O Eikostos Eon* (1942). Although both these periodicals, edited by Kambanis, could be termed political, strictly speaking the political element is absent from his own texts in the latter one.<sup>1</sup> The chapter is arranged in three main sections, the first of which presents Kambanis's major intellectual activities during the period spanning from 1936 to 1944 and the other two deal with Kambanis's contributions to the periodicals *To Neon Kratos* and *O Eikostos Eon* respectively.

**INTELLECTUAL ACTIVITIES**

The publication of *To Neon Kratos* is aligned with the efforts of the 4th-August regime to reach towards the public in various ways and propagate its political positions and ideology. However and despite the fact that *To Neon Kratos* often included Metaxas's speeches or texts written by other officeholders of the regime, it

---

<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, Kambanis's articles in *O Eikostos Eon* regard the language question, an issue whose political implications have already been mentioned (see here, chapter 1, p. 25 and especially p. 20 (footnote 26); see moreover below, p. 79, especially footnote 13). Cf. also here pp. 77 and 88-93, where the articles in question are discussed.

would be more appropriate to consider it as the semi-official instrument of the dictatorship.<sup>2</sup>

After Fascist Italy declared war against Greece on 28 October 1940, *To Neon Kratos*, along with the other serial publications of the country, partook in the ‘intellectual levy’ that was initiated by the government.<sup>3</sup> What is more, Kambanis was among the intellectuals that signed the protest against the Italian invasion that was issued on 10 November 1940 in *Nea Ellas*.<sup>4</sup> Even though that protest is presented as being against Fascism, Kambanis was not only supporting the fascist facets of Metaxas’s regime, but also collaborated in his own way with the Germans after the country’s occupation by the Axis troops.

The periodical *O Eikostos Eon*, which was published at the beginning of the second year of the German Occupation (1942), was explicitly pro-Nazi. Since the Tsolakoglou collaborationist government, which was in power at that time, was a mere puppet government appointed by the Nazis, it could be argued that this periodical too was a politically engaged one supporting the authorities. However, as

---

<sup>2</sup> See here, introduction, p. 9 (footnote 41). As for the contributions by state officials, see for example Nikoloudis 1937, Mantzoufas 1937, Maniadaakis 1939, Metaxas 1939.

<sup>3</sup> After the war with Italy broke out, Metaxas called on a ‘πνευματική επιστράτευση’, asking the intellectuals to participate in their own way in the struggle. Some of the activities resulting from this ‘intellectual levy’ were the writing of poems extolling the Greek army’s efforts, tours in the Greek countryside (especially the regions near the war front), speeches throughout the country and the publication of texts praising the government, the army or the common people and encouraging them to keep on their fight. For Kambanis’s own contribution to the ‘levy’, see for example Kambanis 1940d.

<sup>4</sup> On the following website one can find also the text of the protest (note 8): [http://www.livepedia.gr/index.php/%CE%9A%CE%B1%CE%BC%CF%80%CE%AC%CE%BD%CE%B7%CF%82\\_%CE%86%CF%81%CE%B9%CF%83%CF%84%CE%BF%CF%82](http://www.livepedia.gr/index.php/%CE%9A%CE%B1%CE%BC%CF%80%CE%AC%CE%BD%CE%B7%CF%82_%CE%86%CF%81%CE%B9%CF%83%CF%84%CE%BF%CF%82).

it will be demonstrated below, unlike most of Kambanis's articles in *To Neon Kratos*, his texts in *O Eikostos Eon* are not of an explicitly political nature.<sup>5</sup>

Despite backing and being backed by the Nazis, this periodical did not manage to survive long and it only published two double issues. Kambanis appears as its editor, but its 'mastermind' seems to have been Evangelos Kyriakis, the person responsible for the political orientation of the periodical. As a matter of fact, even though the first text of the periodical is presented as an 'editorial', it has been argued (and even the style of the text suggests this) that it was written by Kyriakis and not by Kambanis.<sup>6</sup> By that time Kambanis had already been established as a respected intellectual and it is probable that his involvement in this project was requested by Kyriakis for advertising reasons.

It was perhaps against this backdrop that Argyriou claimed, albeit in a somewhat exaggerated way, that Kambanis was forced to undertake the role of the editor or, to put it better, that he did not undertake this role willingly. Argyriou's claim is largely based on the fact that Kambanis only published critical texts in this journal, which seems peculiar, especially should one take his past habits into account.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> See here, chapter 4, pp. 88-93; cf. p. 75 (footnote 1).

<sup>6</sup> This editorial has been considered as depicting the very essence of *O Eikostos Eon* and is quoted in full or in part in most of the few works that refer to the periodical. See Argyriou 2003: 59 and Boufea 2006: 510. The latter refers to it, however, as if it is granted that it has been written by Kambanis.

<sup>7</sup> Argyriou 2003: 59-60

All in all, both these periodicals align themselves to the extreme right ideologies of their time. This is indicated even from their titles which are associated with the aspiration for a New World Order and the belief that Fascism, Nazism and the like were the paths to modernisation and the dawn of a new Civilisation, either on a national or on a universal scale.<sup>8</sup>

In spite of the fact that this chapter is centred on Kambanis's texts in these two periodicals, it should be noted that during Metaxas's dictatorship he contributed to other serial publications as well.<sup>9</sup> Nonetheless, it should be mentioned that during that time Kambanis published neither literary translations nor original literary work.

### *TO NEON KRATOS*

In *To Neon Kratos* there is no text written by Kambanis that does not deal with (and praise) his contemporary political status quo.<sup>10</sup> As a matter of fact, his sole

---

<sup>8</sup> About Germany's *Neuordnung* see for instance Mazower 1996. Another example of New Order aspirations is that of Japan (see Duus 1996 & Coble 2003: 33-48). Nonetheless, the New Order that Metaxas's dictatorship desired to establish had an important difference from the plans of the Axis Powers, inasmuch as it did not encompass expansionist ideals, in contrast to Germany's Pan-Teutonicism and Japan's Pan-Asianism or Italy's aspiration to create a New Roman Empire (about the abandonment of irredentism and the focus on the country's 'cultural mission' see Angelis 2006: 176-178; cf. Veremis 2009: 16).

<sup>9</sup> Such as the newspaper *Ethnos* and the periodical *Nea Estia*.

<sup>10</sup> Andreiomenos classified Kambanis's thirteen contributions to *To Neon Kratos* as follows: eight are placed in the category of 'Politics', two in the category of 'Social philosophy – Propaganda', two in the category 'History – Archaeology – Laography' and one is considered as pertaining to two categories, 'Politics' and 'Civilisation' (see Andreiomenos 2010: 217, 219, 222, 228, 232, 233, 236, 237, 240). Nevertheless, Andreiomenos's distinction between propaganda and politics seems rather unjustified, since on the one hand propaganda is part of politics and on the other hand all of Kambanis's political texts in *To Neon Kratos* do not just treat political topics, but contain propagandistic elements as well. As for Kambanis's two texts that Andreiomenos classified as historical, they are not merely historical essays. These two texts are actually the written form of two of Kambanis's lectures at Panteios and their propagandistic (and thus political) character is evident. For instance, the first one (Kambanis

contribution that was announced and presumably would have been closer to his role as a critic rather than a political propagator was never published.<sup>11</sup> Nevertheless, that article was going to revolve around the figure of Adamantios Korais, which allows the assumption that, in all likelihood, it would have to do with the language question. Against this backdrop, even this unpublished text could probably be deemed as a politically inclined one. As it has already been mentioned on more than one occasion, the language question was an issue with political implications.<sup>12</sup> What is more, in the same year that the publication of Kambanis's article on Korais was advertised (1939), Metaxas, who had taken charge of the Ministry of Education, proceeded to an educational reform in favour of the demotic. This reform demonstrated clearly the regime's decision to adopt the demotic as its official language in order to attract the public, which seemed to remain fairly indifferent towards its rhetoric (despite the assurances for the opposite provided by advocates of the dictatorship, such as Kambanis).<sup>13</sup>

---

1940b) is about Kapodistrias, whose exploitation in the regime's rhetoric will be discussed here below (see pp. 80 (footnote 17) and 84-85), and the parallelism between him and Metaxas is constant.

<sup>11</sup> It was announced on the front cover verso of the issues 24 (August 1939), 25 (September 1939), 26 (October 1939) and 28 (30 December 1939).

<sup>12</sup> See here, chapter 1, p. 20 (footnote 26) & p. 25 and chapter 4, p. 75 (footnote 1).

<sup>13</sup> In accordance to that reform, the demotic was to be taught in all the stages of the 12-year-long compulsory education. About 'Metaxas's demoticism' in general and the reform in question in particular see <http://metaxas-project.com/%CE%B4%CE%B7%CE%BC%CE%BF%CF%84%CE%B9%CE%BA%CE%BF-%CE%BC%CE%B5%CF%84%CE%B1%CE%BE%CE%B1/> and Ploumidis 2010: 74-75. What is more, Delmouzos referred in a positive manner to some of Metaxas's educational reforms in the issue of *Nea Estia* devoted to the fiftieth anniversary of the publication of Psycharis's *To Taksidi mou* (Delmouzos 1939: 1470). About the disappointing results of the regime's efforts to earn public acceptance and support, see Angelis 2006: 274-309, Veremis & Koliopoulos 2006: 381 and Petrakis 2006: 176-190. For some of Kambanis's affirmations with regard to the regime's popularity see Kambanis 1938e: 872, as well as here, p. 81 (footnote 21). Cf. Nikoloudis 1937: 3.

The first issue of *To Neon Kratos* starts with an article by the Deputy Minister of Press and Tourism, Theologos Nikoloudis, bearing the same title as the periodical.<sup>14</sup> In this text Nikoloudis attempted to justify the coup of 1936 by demonstrating the reasons that presumably had rendered it necessary, as well as mythologising the regime while exhibiting its main achievements up to date and its goals for the future. Within the framework of this dissertation the most interesting characteristic of this article is that it introduced some basic concepts and ideological principles of the regime's propaganda, several of which are to be found in some of Kambanis's texts in *To Neon Kratos*, as it shall be shown hereinafter.<sup>15</sup> The main themes found in Nikoloudis's text are: anticommunism, antiliberalism and antiparlamentarianism,<sup>16</sup> the laud of Kapodistrias,<sup>17</sup> the depiction of Metaxas as a gifted governor that the nation was blessed to have as its leader, the divinisation of the common people, the projection of the regime's theoretical background,<sup>18</sup> the state's authoritarian and at the same time 'fatherly' character, the assertion that a mere handful of men does not appreciate the dictatorship's achievements, the exaltation of Idealism (in contrast to Materialism) and the aspiration for a national

---

<sup>14</sup> Nikoloudis 1937.

<sup>15</sup> See here, pp. 81-88. See also Argyriou's claim that 'σημαντικό ρόλο στον ιδεολογικό προσανατολισμό του περιοδικού έπαιξε ο υπουργός Θ. Νικολούδης' (Argyriou 2002b: 564).

<sup>16</sup> Although anticommunism and antiparlamentarianism were fascist principles as well, they could also be attributed to the Greek ideological tradition of the Right-wing; see for example Sarandis 2009: 47.

<sup>17</sup> Kapodistrias was the only political figure of the past that seems to be totally accepted by the regime. The reasons are presumably his authoritarian rule and his independence from the traditional political circles of Greece (therein also lies the motive for his assassination) that could associate him with Metaxas and with the dictatorship's efforts to present itself as a landmark in the nation's history parallel to that of the Revolution and the first years of independence (see also here below, pp. 82, 84).

<sup>18</sup> It is eloquently stated that 'το κράτος είναι ένα δόγμα εν ενεργεία' (Nikoloudis 1937: 3).

renaissance that would create the 'Third Greek Civilisation', following the ones of Ancient Greece and Byzantium.<sup>19</sup>

Kambanis's first article, entitled 'Εσωτερική πολιτική', used the celebrations for the first-year anniversary of the 1936 coup as a starting point,<sup>20</sup> but could rather be seen as a political manifesto. Amongst the various indications that prove the propagandistic quality of the text are the assertion that the enthusiasm shown by the common people during the celebrations was utterly sincere,<sup>21</sup> the averment that, apart from a few hundred 'professional politicians', there is no one in Greece longing for a return to the pre-1936 polity,<sup>22</sup> as well as the use of extremely positive adjectives about Metaxas and his actions<sup>23</sup> or the employment of pompous expressions regarding the state's achievements.<sup>24</sup>

The fact that Kambanis's articles in *To Neon Kratos* pertain in reality to the sphere of political propaganda allows a discussion of them based on some themes that were commonplace in the regime's rhetoric.<sup>25</sup> One of the most basic such themes, which has been associated with the influence that Fascism exerted on the

---

<sup>19</sup> On this notion of 'renaissance' and the 'Third Hellenic Civilisation' see Sarandis 2009: 48-50.

<sup>20</sup> Kambanis 1937a: 15.

<sup>21</sup> Kambanis 1937a: 15.

<sup>22</sup> Kambanis 1937a: 15.

<sup>23</sup> See for example the following phrases: 'ο κ. Μεταξάς, ο λαβών την ηρωικήν πρωτοβουλίαν του Αυγούστου' (Kambanis 1937a: 15) and 'ο ακατάβλητος κ. Πρωθυπουργός' (Kambanis 1937a: 16); emphasis added.

<sup>24</sup> See for example the following phrases: 'Η βία του Κράτους εθαυματούργησε' (Kambanis 1937a: 16) and 'έκαμε την Ελλάδα υπολογίσιμον παράγοντα διεθνή' (Kambanis 1937a: 17); emphasis added.

<sup>25</sup> Interestingly enough many of these motifs were also used in propaganda aimed at the country's youth; see Angelis 2006: 171-236.

theoretical discourse of the 4th-August dictatorship, is the presentation of the regime as a milestone of Greek history often paralleled to the 1821 Revolution.<sup>26</sup>

Already in his first article Kambanis presented the 'New State' as the tombstone of the National Schism and in this case he was not proven wrong, since the dictatorship was followed by the German Occupation and even before the liberation the conflict between the Royalists and the Liberals had become a thing of the past.<sup>27</sup> During the Occupation the National Schism was transformed into another division, that of Leftists (predominantly Communists) and Right-wingers, which led to the Greek Civil War. The following passage is rather interesting, due to the fact that it corroborates the differentiation of Kambanis's political stance from the one he had during the Great War, when he was a fervent advocate of the King's standpoint and an extremely active participant in the debate on the question of the country's involvement in the war or the maintenance of neutrality:<sup>28</sup>

Είκοσι περίπου χρόνια μετά το τέρμα του Μεγάλου Ευρωπαϊκού Πολέμου, δεκαπέντε έτη μετά την σύμπτυξιν του Έθνους εις τα ευρωπαϊκά του σύνορα, θα ήτο γελοίον και συγχρόνως ολέθριον να συζητούμεν περί του αν έπρεπε να μετάσχωμεν, ή να μη μετάσχωμεν εις την διεθνή σύρραξιν, και να συζητούμεν δια τας ευθύνας της καταστροφής.<sup>29</sup>

Apart from doing away with the dispute between Venizelists and Royalists, the dictatorship's historical significance lies in yet another achievement according to

---

<sup>26</sup> Angelis 2006: 181.

<sup>27</sup> Kambanis 1937a: 15-16.

<sup>28</sup> See for example the discussion of *Ellinika Chronika* in chapter 2.

<sup>29</sup> Kambanis 1937a: 15-16.

Kambanis: it managed to eradicate class struggle and fostered national unity.<sup>30</sup> Moreover, the government resolved two distressing problems for the Greek interwar society that had emanated from the 1922 Catastrophe. These problems were the provision of the necessary means for the survival of the country's population that had drastically increased after the 1923-1924 population exchange between Turkey and Greece,<sup>31</sup> as well as the restoration of the national bonds amongst all the inhabitants of the country.<sup>32</sup>

Elaborating on the issue of national unity Kambanis pointed out that:

υπό την αιγίδα του παλινορθωθέντος Βασιλέως, ο κ. Μεταξάς ήνωσε τους Έλληνες. Δια της βίας; Έστω! Αλλά σήμερα ευλογούμεν όλοι τ' αποτελέσματα της βίας αυτής: Διότι σήμερα αντελήφθημεν όλοι τ' αγαθά της ενότητας.<sup>33</sup>

The authoritarian features of the regime is a subject touched upon in Nikoloudis's aforementioned text too and state violence is a recurring motif in Kambanis's articles in *To Neon Kratos*.<sup>34</sup> Nonetheless, Kambanis did not regard neither the New State as a

---

<sup>30</sup> Kambanis 1937a: 16-17 & 1938a: 149, 150 & 1938b: 260. The elimination of class struggle and concepts such as 'class collaboration' were basic parts of the New State's rhetoric; see for example Sarandis 2009: 54-55.

<sup>31</sup> Kambanis 1937a: 17. On the population exchange see Close 1995: 4, <http://www.todayszaman.com/news-314148-nansens-solution-revisiting-the-turkish-greek-population-exchange-by-sener-akturk-.html> and Clark 2006.

<sup>32</sup> Kambanis 1937a: 17.

<sup>33</sup> Kambanis 1937a: 17.

<sup>34</sup> Nikoloudis 1937: 4. See for instance Kambanis 1938b: 261 and also the passage quoted here, p. 81 (footnote 24): 'Η βία του κράτους εθαυματούργησε'. The encomium of authoritarianism by Kambanis reached such a degree, that even Venizelos was praised for being autocratic during the Balkan Wars (Kambanis 1938a: 147). Although Venizelos was not named in that article, the reference to him is clear and in any case contradicts not only Kambanis's usual negative disposition towards the Liberals' leader that was manifested as early as the 1910s, but also the regime's common practice not to mention Venizelos at all when it came to the territorial expansion of the Balkan Wars and to

dictatorship nor Metaxas as a dictator. Quite to the contrary, he juxtaposed it to the coups and military dictatorships of previous years claiming that the interventions of the armed forces in political life have ceased and that the coup of 1936 was an 'uprising from above'.<sup>35</sup>

A doctrine that the Greek dictatorship borrowed from the interwar fascist states is the so-called *Führerprinzip*, the ideologeme of charismatic leadership.<sup>36</sup> Metaxas is presented as the nation's leader, something that could be related to the appellations *duce* and *Führer* used in Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany respectively, but he is also endowed with fatherly attributes, which calls to mind another authoritarian state of the Interwar, USSR, where Stalin was called 'Little Father of the Peoples' or 'Papa Stalin'.<sup>37</sup> Furthermore, this doctrine is evident in some of Kambanis's articles in such a way that allows its association with the regime's attempt to link itself to the heritage of the first years after the outbreak of the Greek War of Independence: Kapodistrias, the first Governor of the independent Greek State is paralleled to Metaxas.<sup>38</sup> The first laudatory mention of Kapodistrias in Kambanis's texts is actually a quotation from Anastasios Vyzantios, a nineteenth-century journalist whom Kambanis attempted to 'enlist' in the regime's genealogy.<sup>39</sup>

---

extoll King Constantine's role as head of the army and liberator of the 'New Lands' instead (see Angelis 2006: 192).

<sup>35</sup> Kambanis 1937a: 16.

<sup>36</sup> See Angelis 2006: 193 & Kokkinos n.d.: 76-77 & Petrakis 2006: 32-63.

<sup>37</sup> One of the principal components that constituted the 'myth of the perfect leader' in the extreme right-wing regimes of the interwar period are, according to Angelis, industriousness and infatigability (Angelis 2006: 195). See for example Kambanis 1938b: 263: 'Σήμερον υπάρχει Κυβερνήτης οδηγός, αρχηγός εργασίας και χαλκέντερος εργάτης ο ίδιος'.

<sup>38</sup> See also Kokkinos n.d.: 77.

<sup>39</sup> Kambanis 1937b: 212.

Moreover, the stark similarity between Kapodistrias and Metaxas is stressed by Kambanis himself in later texts.<sup>40</sup>

Another cardinal component of Kambanis's contributions to *To Neon Kratos* is the concept of freedom. He repeatedly associated freedom with authoritarianism and presented the imprisonment of members of the Communist Party or of leaders of the Labour Unions as a basic part of the kind of freedom he advocated:

Απεκτήσαμεν όλοι την ακριβήν έννοιαν της ελευθερίας. Διότι ο Γληνός δεν είναι ελεύθερος να εγκληματή κατά της Εθνικής Παιδείας. Διότι ο ασύλληπτος Ζαχαριάδης – συνελήφθη – δεν είναι ελεύθερος να φονεύη. Διότι οι εργατοπατέρες δεν είναι ελεύθεροι να προπαγανδίζουν τον πόλεμον των τάξεων.<sup>41</sup>

In general Kambanis maintained that the notion of freedom had been misconceived before Metaxas's rule and in reality only started to exist after 1936, when it was associated with the notions of hierarchy and the submission of the individual to the whole, i.e. to the society and the state.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Kambanis 1938b: 263 & 1938e: 869-870 & 1938f: 1022, 1940a: 502. Moreover, in 1938f: 1022 the notion of Metaxas as the successor of Kapodistrias is evinced: 'Το Κράτος που ιδρύσαμεν την 4<sup>ην</sup> Αυγούστου είναι εκείνο που είχεν εκθεμελιωθή από τον κοτζαμπασισμόν την ημέρα του θανάτου του Καποδίστρια'. It should be noted that Kambanis's interest in Kapodistrias existed well before 1936; as a matter of fact, in the early 1930s he was planning to publish a historical study on Kapodistrias, but, as it was the case with several other projects that Kambanis announced, this never happened; see Bastias 1999: 71.

<sup>41</sup> Kambanis 1937a: 16.

<sup>42</sup> See for example 1937b: 210, 216 & 1938a: 149 & 1938c: 378, 380, 381 & 1938e: 869, 872, 876 & 1938f: 1023-1024. Kokkinos properly described the phenomenon as a 'new signification of the meaning of individual liberties' (Kokkinos n.d.: 69-71). Cf. also Kambanis 1939: 127, where Kambanis talked about the notion of freedom in Ancient Greece in juxtaposition to that introduced by the French Revolution of 1789.

The absence of freedom before 1936 is linked to the two predominant political ideologies prior to the 4th-August coup: Liberalism and Communism. However, it should be made clear that the influence of Communism as presented in Kambanis's first article is merely an exaggeration, because Communism was not a truly considerable ideological current in Greece before WWII.<sup>43</sup>

Kambanis attempted to deconstruct both ideologies and chiefly Liberalism.<sup>44</sup> He accused the latter of being too individualistic, encouraging the existence of a very weak state and propagating a fictional majoritarian system where nominal majorities were rendered almost omnipotent.<sup>45</sup> In several articles he equated the political parties with gangs concerned only about their own interest or he castigated the corruption that was prevalent among the MPs and the professionalisation of politics, phenomena that were plaguing the Greek political scene since the nineteenth century and continued to do so even after Kambanis's time.<sup>46</sup> What is more, he often argued that the parliamentary system, which was transplanted from Britain, was not

---

<sup>43</sup> Kambanis 1937a: 17-18. 'It was during the 1941-44 that the Greek Communist Party witnessed the most rapid and spectacular rise in its political influence. From being a small insignificant party during the interwar years with a membership which had reached a maximum of 14.000 members in 1936, [...] it had grown rapidly and by the time Greece was liberated, had become an organization with almost 300.000 members' (Loulis 1982: xiii; see also the table showing the 'KKE membership from 1931 to 1944' in p. xiv). On top of that, in the last elections before the 4th-August coup, those of January 1936, KKE's percentage was just 5.76 %, allowing it to elect only 15 MPs; on the contrary, the Liberals' percentage was 37.26 % (126 MPs) and if one adds up the percentages of all the Venizelist parties, then an impressive 43.86 % (141 MPs) is reached (see Dafnis 1955: 402). Cf. Richter 1989, where both the course towards the massive growth of KKE during the German Occupation and the party's gradual weakening after the 'Decembrians' of 1944 are analysed.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. here, chapter 4, p. 80 (footnote 16). On antiliberalism and antiparlamentarianism see also Angelis 2006: 211-214.

<sup>45</sup> See for example Kambanis 1937a: 17-18 & 1937b: 209, 212 & 1938e: 875, 876 & 1938f: 1024.

<sup>46</sup> See for example Kambanis 1937a: 18 & 1938a: 146, 147, 152. See also the passage from Anastasios Vyzantios in Kambanis 1937b: 211, where it is mentioned that: 'το επί Τουρκίας αρματωλίκι έτεκε γνήσιον τέκνον το βουλευτικόν αξίωμα'.

suitable for a nation so politically immature and he equated Parliamentarianism to meaningless and void verbalism.<sup>47</sup> Nevertheless, his attack against Liberalism was not only relative to the pathology of Greek Parliamentarianism, but to the excesses and deficiencies of the liberal economy as well, and chiefly to the concept of the free market.<sup>48</sup>

As for Communism, he marked it as the opposite extreme of Liberalism, as a ‘reverse Liberalism’, where the individual vanishes, society is militarised and citizens are expendable.<sup>49</sup> In addition, he referred to the abolition of private capital and property and depicted USSR as a society of beggars. His criticism against Communism often contained a direct or indirect preaching of ethics, such as the following: ‘πολύ περισσότερον από τας κατευθύνσεις του είναι ένοχα τα μέσα της δράσεώς του. Αντίθετα προς την φύσιν του ανθρώπου. Αντίθετα προς κάθε ηθικήν’.<sup>50</sup>

Some other notions constantly invoked in the New State’s rhetoric to which Kambanis referred are the trinity of religion, family and nation either discussed as a whole or separately, but at any rate bringing to mind the even greater obsession with these notions that the Colonels’ Junta showed some decades later.<sup>51</sup> In the very first

---

<sup>47</sup> See for example Kambanis 1938a: 150, Kambanis 1938f: 1021.

<sup>48</sup> See for example Kambanis 1937a: 18. Cf. Kambanis 1938c: 380 where the two are explicitly associated: ‘Ο κοινοβουλευτισμός απέθανε μαζί με την φιλελευθέραν οικονομίαν’.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. here, chapter 4, p. 80 (footnote 16). About anticommunism see also Angelis 2006: 206-210.

<sup>50</sup> Kambanis 1937a: 18.

<sup>51</sup> In Vangelis Angelis’s discussion of the topics of the regime’s propaganda which was aimed at the country’s youth the notions of nation, religion and family cover the three first sections (Angelis 2006: 172-189), which could be seen as an indirect way of stressing their significance. Specifically about the

issue of *To Neon Kratos* Kambanis claimed that the regime would not allow these concepts to be questioned by anyone, that according to it these are matters not to be part of a debate.<sup>52</sup>

Despite its apparent influence from other totalitarian regimes of the interwar period, Kambanis maintained more than once the New State's independence and originality.<sup>53</sup> As a matter of fact, he even supported that the regime is not part of any bloc, not even an anticommunist one.<sup>54</sup> Indeed, explicit references to Mussolini or Hitler are rare in Kambanis's texts, however quotations from Salazar appear more than once and even Mussolini's known phrase 'Tutto nello Stato, niente al di fuori dello Stato, nulla contro lo Stato' is used once, but modified and without any mention that it was borrowed from him.<sup>55</sup>

### *O EIKOSTOS EON*

In both issues of *O Eikostos Eon* Kambanis's texts make their appearance under a column entitled 'Πρόσωπα – Πράγματα – Ιδέες' and in both cases they

---

role of religion in the dictatorship, see Kallis 2007. Cf. the slogan 'Πατρίς, Θρησκεία, Οικογένεια' used to excess by the 1967 dictatorship (the history of the slogan until the Interwar is discussed in Gazi 2011).

<sup>52</sup> Kambanis 1937a: 16. At least as far as the institution of family is concerned, Kambanis was hinting first of all at the members of KKE; see for instance Kambanis 1938d: 637.

<sup>53</sup> See for example the following assertion: 'Ημείς δεν πρόκειται ν' αντιγράψωμεν κανένα. Ούτε τον Μουσολίνι, ούτε τον Χίτλερ, ούτε τον Σαλαζάρ.' (Kambanis 1938a: 150); see also Kambanis 1938f: 1020. However, even that statement is indicative of the regime's ideological affinities, if not influences.

<sup>54</sup> Kambanis 1938f: 1020.

<sup>55</sup> Salazar is quoted in Kambanis 1937b: 216 & 1939: 133. As for Mussolini's aphorism, it appears without its first part (which in any case is deduced from the other two parts): 'Ουδέν έξω του Κράτους. Ουδέν εναντίον του Κράτους' (Kambanis 1938c: 381). The original speech of Mussolini containing that slogan can be found in Mussolini 1928: 157.

focus on matters associated with the language question. His first text is occasioned by the recent death of scholars and authors, most of whom had contributed to the discussion revolving around the language question.<sup>56</sup> All of them died during 1941 or the first months of 1942.

The first one mentioned is the linguist Yeoryios Chatzidakis (1848-1941) and this should be linked in all likelihood to the significance of his work and not to the fact that he died before the others (he is the only one amongst those examined in the article who died in 1941).<sup>57</sup> Therein also lies the reason that Kambanis devoted nearly four pages to Chatzidakis (pp. 83-86), whilst his remarks for each one of the other three intellectuals mentioned cover less than a page and indeed in Eliseos Yianidis's case merely a paragraph.<sup>58</sup>

Kambanis portrayed Chatzidakis as the leader of an academic faction, the successor of Kontos and the main opponent of Psycharis, in other words he alluded to a series of quite famous debates regarding the language question, which he also discussed in his *History of Modern Greek Criticism*.<sup>59</sup> Kambanis here rightly pointed to Chatzidakis's frequent self-contradictions that resulted in misunderstandings: some people were led to believe that he was a “δεύτερο[ς] Μιστριώτη[ς]”.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Kambanis 1942a

<sup>57</sup> About Chatzidakis see Aliyizaki 2007.

<sup>58</sup> It should also be noted that Kambanis was Chatzidakis's student at the University. See for instance [http://www.livepedia.gr/index.php/%CE%9A%CE%B1%CE%BC%CF%80%CE%AC%CE%BD%CE%B7%CF%82\\_%CE%86%CF%81%CE%B9%CF%83%CF%84%CE%BF%CF%82](http://www.livepedia.gr/index.php/%CE%9A%CE%B1%CE%BC%CF%80%CE%AC%CE%BD%CE%B7%CF%82_%CE%86%CF%81%CE%B9%CF%83%CF%84%CE%BF%CF%82).

<sup>59</sup> Kambanis 1935:96-144. See also Minas 2011.

<sup>60</sup> Kambanis 1942a: 83

Kambanis made extensive use of passages in this text, as he had almost always done when he dealt with the language question. In one of these passages Chatzidakis says:

αν σήμερον άνδρες έχοντες τας αρετάς των αρχαίων Αθηναίων συνέτασσον εν τη νεωτάτη γλωσσική φάσει ταύτη φιλολογικά καλλιτεχνήματα αντάξια των αρχαίων, αυτή θα καθίστατο η γραπτή γλώσσα του έθνους.<sup>61</sup>

Should one combine that with Kambanis's own remark that Chatzidakis 'είχε [...] πολεμήσει κάθε πεζογράφο, που κύρωνε με το παράδειγμά του το δημοτικισμό του',<sup>62</sup> what seemed to be Chatzidakis's main inconsistency could probably be deconstructed. In reality the forefather of Greek Linguistics was not opposed to the use of the Demotic, but he regarded its users as inadequate for valorising it.

Kambanis focused on the way Chatzidakis managed to rebut 'Psycharism', i.e. Psycharis's linguistic theory and practice. In fact he aligned himself with Chatzidakis and depicted him as the forerunner of his own linguistic views, as a precursor of 'Neodemoticism'. According to him, Chatzidakis provided tools essential not only for the surmounting of Psycharism, but also for the establishment of a form of the demotic language capable of being used in every aspect of the Modern Greek life.<sup>63</sup> As Kambanis eloquently concluded:

---

<sup>61</sup> Kambanis 1942a: 84

<sup>62</sup> Kambanis 1942a: 85

<sup>63</sup> Kambanis 1942a: 85. For an overall presentation of Chatzidakis's role in the language question see Bambiniotis 2011.

Ο Χατζιδάκις μας βοήθησε να υπερνικήσουμε τον Ψυχαρισμό – να πάμε προς το μεταψυχαρισμό, να συμφιλιώσουμε το δημοτικισμό με τη γλωσσική πραγματικότητα του παρόντος.<sup>64</sup>

The text, which seems a kind of epitaph, goes on with some paragraphs about the poet Ioannis Gryparis (1870-1942), who had died a few days before the publication of that issue (13 March) and a paragraph referring to Eliseos Yianidis (1865-1942).<sup>65</sup> Finally, Kambanis devoted some paragraphs to Dimitrios Gr. Kambouroglous (1852-1942), who had died some weeks earlier (21 February).<sup>66</sup> The former depicted the latter's literary output as unappealing,<sup>67</sup> he stressed, nonetheless, the importance of his 'historical' work calling him 'Αθηναιοδίφη'. All in all, this first article is permeated by a melancholic mood and rather than a critical text it should be seen as a homage or tribute.

In his second (and last) text in *O Eikostos Eon* Kambanis used two known nineteenth-century satirical texts that thematise the language question as a starting point for more general observations on the modern Greek language. Iakovakis Rizos Neroulos's *Korakistika* and D. K. Vyzantios's *Vavylonia* treat two of the main aspects of the Greek language question: firstly, the attempts at 'rectifying' the modern language (in other words archaising it, something that led to the phenomena of 'purification' that perturbed Greek society for decades and were specifically crystallised under the term 'Katharevousa') and, secondly, the linguistic chaos that

---

<sup>64</sup> Kambanis 1942a: 86

<sup>65</sup> About Gryparis see Mitsakis 2007; about Yianidis see Ziras & Petrotou 2007.

<sup>66</sup> Kambanis refers to him as 'Kambouroglou', but I chose what was probably the most common type of his surname, i.e. 'Kambouroglous'. About him see Meraklis & Anagnostopoulos 2007.

<sup>67</sup> Kambanis 1942a: 87

ruled over Greece due to the existence of so many different (and in some cases mutually unintelligible) dialects.<sup>68</sup>

Kambanis argued that at least the second problem had almost been solved at his time as far as the spoken form of the language is concerned and he attributed this mostly to the centripetal forces that Athens was exerting. Urbanisation, the confluence and merging of various Greek populations as well as the concentration of most of the nation inside the state borders, which had eliminated the factors of distance and remoteness, fostered the homogenisation and standardisation of the language.<sup>69</sup> It is chiefly the *Gelehrtentradition* as imposed through institutions and mainly through the educational system that led to the extinction of the Athenian dialect of the 'pre-independence' years and to the formation of the version of the Greek language that was spoken in Athens at the time the article was written.

As for the written language Kambanis maintained:

Γραφομένη κοινή γλώσσα δεν έχουμε: Δηλαδή έχουμε πολλές. Και υπάρχουν πολλοί που νομίζουν πως η πολυγλωσσία είναι πλούτος. Ενώ είναι φτώχεια. § Υπήρχε Βαβυλωνία του προφορικού λόγου. Υπάρχει – και ποιος ξέρει για πόσον καιρό – Βαβυλωνία του γραπτού. Κ' ένας καινούργιος Βυζάντιος θα μπορούσε να κάνει καινούργια γλωσσική κωμωδία. Το υλικό είναι άφθονο.<sup>70</sup>

Hereupon the critic illustrated the fragmentation of his contemporary written language as exposed by the newspapers and the various print media as well as by the schoolbooks. Nonetheless, the situation seemed better as far as fiction is

---

<sup>68</sup> Kambanis 1942b.

<sup>69</sup> Kambanis 1942b: 64.

<sup>70</sup> Kambanis 1942b: 65 (emphasis added).

concerned: in literature Kambanis noticed some propitious developments. Moreover, he openly criticised the role of the Academy and claimed that it proved to be inferior to the expectations that were prevailing prior to its founding.

Finally, he presented the emergence of other modern European languages (French, Spanish, Portuguese) claiming that it was the dominance of the dialect spoken in Paris, Castile and Lisbon respectively that led to the standardisation of a common spoken and written language. And he concluded:

Η δημοτική των πόλεων, η νεοδημοτική, πρέπει να προσανατολίση προς την πραγματικότητα τον γραπτό μας λόγο. Δεν προτείνω να φωνογραφήσουμε τη δημοτική των πόλεων. Αλλά να τη μελετήσουμε, να βρούμε τον εσώτερο ρυθμό της, και να τον ακολουθήσουμε.<sup>71</sup>

## CONCLUSION

The analysis provided above demonstrates that both periodicals edited by Kambanis during the rather turbulent period between 1936 and 1944 had a political character that was not solely limited to the discussion of current political events; in fact, they could both be defined as politically engaged serial publications. At the same time, there are no contributions of his in these periodicals purely dealing with literature, theatre or art. The contributions to *To Neon Kratos* are clearly politically oriented, while the ones to *O Eikostos Eon* revolve around another issue with political implications, namely the language question.

---

<sup>71</sup> Kambanis 1942b: 66.

## **A PERIOD OF IDEOLOGICAL RECONSIDERATION: KAMBANIS'S FINAL WORKS (1945-1956)**

Despite the fact that Kambanis's activities during that period were rather limited, they have a totally distinct character from his work analysed in the previous chapter, and therefore it was deemed necessary that they be studied separately. This chapter contains two major sections, each dealing with one of the books he published after the liberation from the Nazis: *Ο Δημήτριος Γούναρης και η ελληνική κρίσις των ετών 1918-1922* (1946) and the fifth edition of his *History of Modern Greek Literature* (1948).

### ***DIMITRIOS GOUNARIS***

This book is mainly an overview of the political situation in Greece during the Great War and the beginnings of the National Schism. As a matter of fact, there are hundreds of pages where the historical events of that period are presented, but no mention to Gounaris is made. In other words, the book could be defined as a historical study rather than a political biography.

Kambanis used various sources for the writing of this book: newspapers (interviews and articles), parliament proceedings, his personal conversations with Gounaris or other politicians, oral accounts of other people who sometimes are not

even named, official documents, trial proceedings, historical studies, memoirs, telegrams and letters. However, it is sometimes rather difficult to pinpoint the exact sources, since he neither used a reference system nor did he include a bibliography in this work. According to a note that he appended to the book:

Η βιβλιογραφία, περί της οποίας γίνεται λόγος εις τον πρόλογον του παρόντος βιβλίου, δεν κατέστη δυνατόν να περιληφθή εις τον περιορισμένον χώρον του: Θα περιληφθή εις το συμπληρωματικόν έργον μου δια τα γεγονότα του 1922 και την Δίκην των Εξ.<sup>1</sup>

Nevertheless, like on two other occasions that Kambanis announced the forthcoming publication of a book, the book on the ‘Trial of the Six’ was never published.<sup>2</sup>

There are issues addressed in this book that had been discussed before in Kambanis’s articles, especially in *Ellinika Chronika*. However, this time the author attempted to be more objective and present both sides, but without abandoning his overall positive stance towards Gounaris and the royalist faction. In a preliminary statement Kambanis claimed:

Ότι περιέχεται εις αυτό το βιβλίον δεν είναι ματαία απολογητική φιλολογία, ιστορία κομμένη εις τα μέτρα του κομματικού συμφέροντος. Δεν ανήκω πλέον εις κανένα κόμμα.<sup>3</sup>

This statement brings to mind Kambanis’s political attitude during his early years, for example in his periodical *O Pan*.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Kambanis 1946: 352.

<sup>2</sup> See here, chapter 3, p. 64 and footnote 9.

<sup>3</sup> Kambanis 1946: 6.

Nonetheless, the more dispassionate approach towards the Liberals and Venizelos himself could be associated with the overcoming of the National Schism after Metaxas's dictatorship.<sup>5</sup> In fact, following the liberation of Greece from the Germans, Royalists and Venizelists joined forces under the auspices of Britain against the common enemy, the Communists.<sup>6</sup> Within this framework, even fascists or Nazi collaborators, such as Kambanis himself, were often treated by the establishment in a much more favourable way than the Leftists; as a matter of fact, sometimes the assistance of the former against the latter was sought by the Greek governments and the British.<sup>7</sup> Besides, the *Laiko Komma* was in power again the year that this book was published (1946), in coalition with the successors of Venizelos.

Nevertheless, the narrative that Kambanis produced and mostly the documents that he provided in its support create a picture of the years under consideration that is clearly positive for the royalist faction. Not only the King's initial standpoint in the Great War is justified, but the stance of the royalist faction during the months of Greece's official neutrality is presented as very favourable towards Entente. As a matter of fact, from some point on Constantine wanted to join Entente, according to Kambanis's account, but he expected a proper handling of the situation on behalf of the French and the British in order to do it. Yet, the latter chose to treat Greece as a subordinate country and preferred the option of having

---

<sup>4</sup> See here, chapter 1, p. 23 (footnote 38).

<sup>5</sup> See also here, chapter 4, p. 82.

<sup>6</sup> See for example Close 1995: 127.

<sup>7</sup> Margaritis 2010: 11, 16, 19, 24, 27, 31.

Venizelos lead the country to war, and hence favoured the 1916 *Ethniki Amyna* movement in Thessaloniki.

In addition to the quasi 'return' to the political views of Kambanis's early years, the language of this book manifests yet another reconsideration. The advocate of demoticism that wrote texts in favour of the demotic even in *O Eikostos Eon* during the German occupation compromised and set aside his demoticist standards. However, he attempted to justify his choice to write the book in *katharevousa* in the following way:

Η [...] δημοτική την οποίαν γράφουν μερικά εφημερίδες όταν χρησιμοποιείται δια την έκφρασιν πολιτικών ιδεών, είναι τόσον πρόχειρος, τόσον ανάμεικτος με ξενισμούς λεκτικούς ή φραστικούς, ώστε σπανίως να μας ικανοποιή. [...] Η καθαρεύουσα θα χρησιμοποιείται επί πολύ ακόμη, όπως αποδεικνύει το γεγονός ότι και εγώ, αντίπαλος των καθαρολόγων, έγραψα το παρόν βιβλίον εις γλώσσαν, που δεν αγαπώ, ούτε πιστεύω.<sup>8</sup>

This book is the result of Kambanis's close relation with Gounaris and another proof of this relation is a book published a few years after Gounaris's death. In that book, written by Ioannis Mallosis and published in 1926, Kambanis played a significant role. Two texts of his appear there: the first one is the reproduction of an interview he had with Gounaris and was initially published in the newspaper

---

<sup>8</sup> Kambanis 1946: 64.

*Akropolis*;<sup>9</sup> the second one is a portrait of Gounaris first published in the newspaper *Nea Ellas*, which is used as a preface to the second part of the book.<sup>10</sup>

### ***HISTORY OF MODERN GREEK LITERATURE***

Despite the changes, additions and improvements, the fifth edition remains by and large a 'person-centered' history of literature. After all, the use of 'generations' or 'schools' as a structural element and interpretational tool begins with Dimaras's history and is used largely by Linos Politis and to a rather exaggerative degree by Valetas.<sup>11</sup>

This edition is not just supplemented and bibliographically informed; it also integrates some of Kambanis's revised views on much discussed topics and an interestingly accepting or sometimes positive handling of some modernist or even leftist authors. For instance, the book contains a much more balanced discussion of Solomos than the previous editions,<sup>12</sup> wherein Kambanis even recants his older views on the fragmentary character of solomic poetry.<sup>13</sup> Characteristic are also his positive remarks on Konstantinos Theotokis,<sup>14</sup> Cavafy<sup>15</sup> and Elytis.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Mallosis 1926: 236-246.

<sup>10</sup> Mallosis 1926: 301-302.

<sup>11</sup> See Dimaras 1948, Politis 1978, Valetas 1966. About the distinction between these two types of history of literature, see Veloudis 2002: 373-378.

<sup>12</sup> Kambanis 1948: 131-158.

<sup>13</sup> Kambanis 1948: 156.

<sup>14</sup> Kambanis 1948: 307-308.

<sup>15</sup> Kambanis 1948: 272-277.

<sup>16</sup> Kambanis 1948: 395-396.

The fifth edition of Kambanis's *History of Modern Greek Literature*, like all the other editions, abounds with quotations and passages taken from the texts under consideration and it may be defined more as a presentation of these texts than a historical study. This could be considered to some extent as a remnant of the method he used in his book reviews, since this book can be seen as a processed pastiche of them. At the same time, however, this could be regarded as a deliberate choice that aims at the attainment of objectivity, as Chatzinis, for instance, claimed.<sup>17</sup> In other words, the author's subjective opinions and ideology are presumably minimised this way and the problems stemming from his human likes or dislikes are supposedly set aside. Therefore, Kambanis's work is (self)advertised as 'descriptive' and not 'prescriptive', since the author's authoritative role diminishes.

## CONCLUSION

This chapter outlined Kambanis's postwar intellectual activities that revolved around a twofold, yet implicit, effort. On the one hand, he attempted to discard his extreme political beliefs of the last decade and, on the other hand, he tried to preserve his prewar status as an intellectual.

---

<sup>17</sup> Chatzinis 1949.

## CONCLUSION

This dissertation outlined Kambanis's course from a promising young critic to an acknowledged intellectual and from a tolerant and open-minded youngster to a rather narrow-minded and politically militant man during the prewar years. Moreover, it touched upon the years of his 'downfall' and his attempt to revisit his political image and retain his prestige as an intellectual after WWII.

Kambanis's particularity is based mostly on his ideological vicissitudes. The exclusion of such a prolific and erudite critic from the canon cannot but be attributed to his political choices. His prolificacy was after all combined with a remarkable range of interests and topics. For Kambanis was not a 'criticus purus', but what could probably be defined as a 'criticus universalis'. The selection of his oeuvre presented in this thesis revealed texts about literature, theatre, painting, sculpture, politics, international relations and anthropology amongst other things. Furthermore, Kambanis was also a skilled translator and a litterateur himself (albeit a mediocre one) and the editor of a great many serial publications (probably more than any other critic of the Interwar).

Apart from literature, which was Kambanis's privileged area of activity, a special reference is required for his general interest in history.<sup>1</sup> An interest that was not only restricted to the Greek or European context, but expanded even to the history of Egypt, as his book *Η Αίγυπτος των Φαραώ* indicates. What is more,

---

<sup>1</sup> See Kambanis's own statements about this interest in Bastias 1999: 70-71.

during the time he was a Professor at Panteios his lectures revolved around historical topics as well. In addition, his three major books, *History of Modern Greek Literature*, *History of Modern Greek Criticism*, *History of Aesthetic Theories* manifest his inclination for historiographical works. Last but not least, even his book on Gounaris deals more with the historical context of the Great War and the National Schism than with Gounaris himself

Another principal interest of his was, of course, politics. His aforementioned book about Gounaris is the culmination of his engagement in the cause of the royalist camp during the Great War. However, his interest in politics was manifested well before his affiliation with the conservative faction, but it was an example of negative criticism against the Greek social and political conditions without the favouring of any specific political party or ideology. The course towards political engagement that started in the 1910s climaxed in his active support of the 4th-August regime. Nonetheless, the editorship of the pro-Nazi periodical *O Eikostos Eon* was not accompanied by texts in favour of the political status quo of the time.

Moreover, the language question holds a special place in Kambanis's career. Apart from his activity as a member of 'Glossikos Syllogos', which promoted the neodemoticist standpoint, his three histories are also associated with the language question, since they demonstrate his efforts to provide 'scholarly' works in the demotic, which was probably the most appropriate way to valorise it. Especially the *History of Modern Greek Literature* and the *History of Modern Greek Criticism* manifest an attempt to establish a demotic canon in the intellectual history of Greece and to

create a posteriori a demoticist genealogy. After all, the latter book is more a history of the language question than of literary criticism.

The study of Kambanis's work leads to the formulation of other questions that could be posed, but cannot be addressed here. For instance, what was Kambanis's relation to other critics of his time as well his place in a critical tradition? He seems to be to some extent part of the 'Nationalist' / 'Ethnocentric' / 'Idealist' criticism. Not only his critical thought bears resemblance to that of his contemporaries, Yiannis Apostolakis and Fotos Politis, but he was also influenced by figures such as Ion Dragoumis, Periklis Yannopoulos or Heptanesian Idealist critics, like Iakovos Polyas and Yeoryios Kalosgouros. A detailed investigation of this issue would require the comparative study of several other critics with whom Kambanis seems to share a critical background, such as I. M. Panayiotopoulos and Spyros Melas.

Other issues that could be researched are related to the way in which the Greek literary and critical canon has been formed. In Kambanis's case, his late political choices are taken as a window to the approach to his earlier critical output. This applies much more to his, so to say, collaboration with the Nazis, than it does to his even greater and overt support to the 4th-August regime. After all, many other scholars, writers, artists etc. had shown their support to or at least their respect for Ioannis Metaxas.<sup>2</sup> As a matter of fact, the members of the intellectual and cultural elite that advocated, followed or compromised with the regime were a lot more than usually assumed nowadays. There were, however, certain mechanisms, inherent to

---

<sup>2</sup> See for example the contributors of *Nea Estia* 340, which was dedicated to Metaxas.

the literary field or related to the political and financial context, that enabled some of the former 'collaborators' either of the 1936 dictatorship or of the occupation forces to become or remain part of the canon, whereas they excluded others, the most striking example for the latter category being perhaps Kambanis himself. This phenomenon is covered by a haze of rumours and hearsays, but there is neither a concrete picture of it, nor has it been studied properly. Its study and the designation of its mechanisms could be the aim of future research.

In conclusion, it should be stated again that this dissertation aimed at a non-ideological approach to Kambanis's work in an attempt to evince that the exclusion of an author from the canon for political reasons should not be confused with the importance or the quality of their output. To my mind, approaches that take Kambanis's condemnable support to the extreme right-wing ideologies or regimes of his time as a starting point and hence reach the groundless conclusion that all of his work should be condemned too, as if permeated by the same principles and ideas, should be dismissed. First of all, as this dissertation shows, the spirit and beliefs expressed in *To Neon Kratos* are not the same as those expressed throughout Kambanis's career. A person's ideological stance is not something intransient and atemporal, and therefore it is a fallacy to judge an author's overall output based on his late political ideas. Secondly, I am of the opinion that it is not the scholars' duty to judge or exclude people from their study due to ideological reasons. Nor is it the duty of a Modern Greek scholar to pronounce an author neither guilty nor innocent, neither a traitor nor a patriot. If the author and intellectual in question played a

significant role in his time and influenced the formation of his cultural context, either in a positive or a negative way, he should be studied regardless. After all, the main task of such a scholar is to contribute to the understanding of the period under consideration and to the creation of a more comprehensive (and at the same time more comprehensible) picture of the past in its entirety, with its positive and negative aspects.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY<sup>1</sup>

1. A. 1916. 'Πολιτικά Χρονικά', *Ελληνικά Χρονικά*, pp. 76-79.
2. Agras, T. 1943. 'Κριτική και επικαιρότης', *Καλλιτεχνικά Νέα* 23 (13 Nov. 1943), p. 2.
3. Agras, T. 1980. *Κριτικά*, ed. K. Steryiopoulos, vol. 1, Athens.
4. Agras, T. 1981. *Κριτικά*, ed. K. Steryiopoulos, vol. 2, Athens.
5. Agras, T. 1984. *Κριτικά*, ed. K. Steryiopoulos, vol. 3, Athens.
6. Agras, T. 1995. *Κριτικά*, ed. K. Steryiopoulos, vol. 4, Athens.
7. Alisandratos, Y. Y. 2001. 'Τέσσερα περιοδικά ιδεών στη δεκαετία του '30: Νέοι Πρωτοπόροι, Ιδέα, Σήμερα, Το Νέον Κράτος (Γενική επισκόπηση)', in *Ο περιοδικός τύπος στον μεσοπόλεμο (26 και 27 Μαρτίου 1999)*, Athens, pp. 283-328.
8. Alivizatos, N. 1983. *Οι πολιτικοί θεσμοί σε κρίση (1922-1974). Όψεις της ελληνικής εμπειρίας*, Athens.
9. Aliyizaki, S. 2007. *Λεξικό νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι*, s.v. 'Χατζιδάκις, Γεώργιος Ν.', Athens, pp. 2358-2359.

---

<sup>1</sup> The copies of the periodicals *Akritas* and *Ellinika Chronika* used for this thesis were bound in volumes and there were no covers of individual issues. Since no other information that could certify either the page span or the date of publication of each issue was found, the texts in them are recorded in a different way than the contributions to any other periodical listed in this bibliography. Namely, only the pages and, in the case of *Akritas* which was divided into four volumes, the number of volume are recorded (neither the number of issue nor the date of publication).

It is, moreover, noted here that the entry no. 192 of this bibliography is the only one that regards exclusively the appendix and not the main text of this thesis.

10. Anagnostopoulos, V. D. & Paradeisi, E. 2007a. *Λεξικό νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι*, Athens, s.v. 'Νιοβάνας, Παύλος', pp. 1582-1583.
11. Anagnostopoulos, V. D. & Paradeisi, E. 2007b. *Λεξικό νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι*, Athens, s.v. 'Πάλλης, Αλέξανδρος', pp. 1672-1673.
12. Anastasiadis, Y. 2001. *Πολιτική και συνταγματική ιστορία της Ελλάδας (1821-1941)*, Thessaloniki.
13. Anastasiadi-Symeonidi, A. 2011. 'Ευαγγελικά και Ορεσטיακά' in Y. Bambiniotis (ed.), *Το γλωσσικό ζήτημα. Σύγχρονες προσεγγίσεις*, Athens, pp. 253-281.
14. Andreiomenos, Y. 2010. *Η πνευματική ζωή υπό επιτήρηση. Το παράδειγμα του περιοδικού Το Νέον Κράτος*, Athens.
15. Angelis, V. 2006. 'Γιατί χαίρεται ο κόσμος και χαμογελάει, πατέρα...'. 'Μαθήματα Εθνικής Αγωγής' και νεολαιίστικη προπαγάνδα στα χρόνια της μεταξικής δικτατορίας, Athens.
16. Anon. 1908. 'Φιλολογικά μνημόσυνα: Γιώργος Ζουφρές', *Ημερολόγιον Σκώκου* vol. 23, pp. 90-93.
17. Anon. 1916a. 'Δια την δημιουργίαν δημοσίας συνειδήσεως', *Ελληνικά Χρονικά*, pp. 1-2.
18. Antoniou-Tiliou, M. 2007a. *Λεξικό νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι*, Athens, s.v. 'Ελληνικά Χρονικά', pp. 622-623.

19. Antoniou-Tiliou, M. 2007b. *Λεξικό νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι*, Athens, s.v. 'Περιοδικόν μας, Το', pp. 1784-1785.
20. Apostolidou, V. 1992. *Ο Κωστής Παλαμάς ιστορικός της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας*, Athens.
21. Arayis, Y. <sup>3</sup>1988 (<sup>1</sup>1980). *Ζητήματα λογοτεχνικής κριτικής*, vol. 1, Athens – Ioannina.
22. Argyriou, A. 1981. 'Τάσεις της κριτικής σκέψης στο μεσοπόλεμο' in *Η κριτική στη νεότερη Ελλάδα*, Athens, pp. 201-246.
23. Argyriou, A. 2002a. *Ιστορία της ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας και η πρόσληψή της στα χρόνια του Μεσοπολέμου (1918-1940)*, vol. 1, Athens.
24. Argyriou, A. 2002b. *Ιστορία της ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας και η πρόσληψή της στα χρόνια του Μεσοπολέμου (1918-1940)*, vol. 2, Athens.
25. Argyriou, A. 2003. *Ιστορία της ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας και η πρόσληψή της στους δύστηνους καιρούς (1941-1944)*, vol. 3, Athens.
26. Argyriou, A. 2004. *Ιστορία της ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας και η πρόσληψή της στα χρόνια του ετεροκαθορισμένου εμφυλίου πολέμου (1945-1949)*, vol. 4, Athens.
27. Argyriou, A. 2005. *Ιστορία της ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας και η πρόσληψή της στα χρόνια της επισφαλούς δημοκρατίας (1950-1956)*, vol. 5, Athens.
28. Argyriou, A. 2005. *Ιστορία της ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας και η πρόσληψή της στα χρόνια της αυτοσχέδιας ανάπτυξης (1957-1963)*, vol. 6, Athens.

29. Argyriou, A. 2007a. *Ιστορία της ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας και η πρόσληψή της όταν η δημοκρατία δοκιμάζεται, υπονομεύεται και καταλύεται (1964-1974 και μέχρι τις ημέρες μας)*, vol. 7, Athens.
30. Argyriou, A. 2007b. *Ιστορία της ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας και η πρόσληψή της όταν η δημοκρατία δοκιμάζεται, υπονομεύεται και καταλύεται (1964-1974 και μέχρι τις ημέρες μας)*, vol. 8, Athens.
31. Bakoyiannis, M. Y. 1994. *‘Το Περιοδικόν μας’ (1900-1901)*, Thessaloniki.
32. Bambiniotis, Y. 2011. *‘Τεώργιος Χατζιδάκις: η θέση του στο γλωσσικό ζήτημα και η συμβολή του στην αποκατάσταση της γλωσσικής μας ταυτότητας’* in Y. Bambiniotis (ed.), *Το γλωσσικό ζήτημα. Σύγχρονες προσεγγίσεις*, Athens, pp. 447-459.
33. Bastias, K. 1929. *‘Λόγια και Πράγματα’*, *Ελληνικά Γράμματα* 74 (16 Nov. 1929), pp. 700-701.
34. Bastias, K. 1999. *Φιλολογικοί περίπατοι. Συνομιλίες με 38 συγγραφείς του 20ου αιώνα*, A. Ziras (ed.), Athens.
35. Bataković, D. T. 2004. *‘Serbia and Greece in the First World War: An overview’*, *Balkan Studies* 45, pp. 59-80.
36. Beaton, R. 1994a. *‘Για μια νέα προσέγγιση στην ιστορία της ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας (19<sup>ου</sup> και 20<sup>ού</sup> αιώνα)’*, in *Ζητήματα ιστορίας των νεοελληνικών γραμμάτων*, Thessaloniki, pp. 51-54.
37. Beaton, R. 1994b. *An introduction to Modern Greek Literature*, Oxford.
38. Boufea, A. 2006. *Τα λογοτεχνικά περιοδικά της κατοχής*, Athens.

39. Burke, S. 2010. *The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault, and Derrida*, Edinburgh.
40. Chatz. 1957. 'Άριστος Καμπάνης', *Νέα Εστία* 708 (Jan 1957), p. 61.
41. Chatzinis, Y. 1949. 'Άριστου Καμπάνη: «Ιστορία της Νέας Ελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας», Έ έκδοσις συμπληρωμένη', *Νέα Εστία* 516 (Jan 1949), pp. 58-59.
42. Clark, B. 2006. *Twice a stranger. How mass expulsion forged Modern Greece and Turkey*, London.
43. Clogg, R. (ed.) 2002. *Greece 1940-1949: Occupation, Resistance, Civil War (A documentary history)*, Basingstoke & New York.
44. Close, D. H. 1995. *The origins of the Greek Civil War*, London – New York.
45. Coble, P. M. 2003. *Chinese Capitalists in Japan's New Order: The Occupied Lower Yangzi, 1937-1945*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London.
46. Dafnis, G. 1955. *Η Ελλάς μεταξύ δύο πολέμων (1923-1940)*, vol. II, Athens.
47. Dante, A. 1997. *Divina Commedia. Paradiso*, A. M. Chiavacci Leonardi (ed.), Milan.
48. Delmouzos, A. P. 1939. 'Ο Δημοτικισμός και η επίδρασή του στην Ελληνική Παιδεία', *Νέα Εστία* 309 (1 Nov 1939), Athens, pp. 1463-1471.
49. Delopoulos, K. 2005. *Νεοελληνικά φιλολογικά ψευδώνυμα*, Athens.
50. Demiri, Ch. 2007. *Λεξικό νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι*, Athens, s.v. 'Εικοστός Αιών<sup>2</sup>, Ο', p. 590.

51. Dimaras, K. Th. 1933. 'Κριτική, ποίηση και ψυχανάλυση', *Νέα Εστία* 145 (1 January 1933), pp. 46-48.
52. Dimaras, K. Th. 1939. 'Δημοτικισμός και κριτική. Δοκίμιο συνθέσεως', *Νέα Εστία* 309 (1 November 1939), pp. 1408-1511.
53. Dimaras, K. Th. 1948. *Ιστορία της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας*, Athens.
54. Dimaras, K. Th. 1981. 'Τι, ίσως, είναι η κριτική' in *Η κριτική στη νεότερη Ελλάδα*, Athens, pp. 247-264.
55. Dimiroulis, D. 2003. *Φάκελος 'Διονύσιος Σολωμός'. Ανατομία ενός εθνικού θρίλερ*, Athens.
56. Divani, L. *Η εδαφική ολοκλήρωση της Ελλάδας 1830-1947*, Athens.
57. Dounia, Ch. 1996. *Λογοτεχνία και πολιτική. Τα περιοδικά της Αριστεράς στο μεσοπόλεμο*, Athens.
58. Duus, P. 1996. 'Imperialism without colonies: The vision of a greater east Asia co-prosperity sphere', *Diplomacy and Statecraft* vol. 7, issue 1, pp. 54-72.
59. Englezakis, B. 1995. *Studies on the history of the Church of Cyprus, 4th-20th centuries*, trans. N. Russell, Nicosia.
60. Euripides 1911. *Τρωάδες*, trans. A. Kambanis, Athens.
61. Euripides 1912a. *Ελένη*, trans. A. Kambanis, Athens.
62. Euripides 1912b. *Πήσος*, trans. A. Kambanis, Athens.
63. Fafaliou, M. S. 1995. *Ιερά Οδός 334: μαρτυρίες από το Δρομοκαΐτειο*, Athens.
64. Fenwick, C. G. 1936. 'The "Failure" of the League of Nations', *The American Journal of International Law* vol. 30, no. 3 (July 1936), pp. 506-509.

65. Gazi, E. 2011. *Πατρίς, θρησκεία, οικογένεια: ιστορία ενός συνθήματος (1880-1930)*, Athens.
66. Genette, G. 1997. *Paratexts. Thresholds of interpretation*, trans. J. E. Lewin, Cambridge – New York – Melbourne.
67. Gordon-Smith, G. 1916. *Through the Serbian Campaign: The Great Retreat of the Serbian Army*, London.
68. Gorky, M. 1904a. 'Ο σύντροφός μου', trans. A. G. K., *Ακρίτας* vol. I, pp. 44-49.
69. Gorky, M. 1904b. 'Ο σύντροφός μου (Διήγημα-συνέχεια)', trans. Ar. G. K., *Ακρίτας* vol. I, pp. 94-98.
70. Gorky, M. 1904c. 'Ο σύντροφός μου (Διήγημα-συνέχεια)', trans. Ar. G. K., *Ακρίτας* vol. I, pp. 117-119.
71. Gorky, M. 1904d. 'Ο σύντροφός μου (Διήγημα-συνέχεια)', trans. Anon., *Ακρίτας* vol. I, pp. 215-219.
72. Gorky, M. 1904e. 'Ο σύντροφός μου (Διήγημα-συνέχεια)', trans. A. I. K., *Ακρίτας* vol. I, pp. 308-312.
73. Gouli, E. 2007. *Λεξικό νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι*, Athens, s.v. 'Πολίτης, Φώτος, pp. 1844-1846.
74. Gounelas, Ch. D. 1984. *Η σοσιαλιστική συνείδηση στην ελληνική λογοτεχνία, 1897-1912*, Athens.
75. Grekou, A. 2007. *Λεξικό νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι*, Athens, s.v. 'Ακρίτας', pp. 45-46.

76. Haidia, E. 2000. 'The punishment of collaborators in Northern Greece' in M. Mazower (ed.), *After the war was over. Reconstructing the family, nation, and state in Greece, 1943-1960*, Princeton & Oxford, pp. 42-61.
77. Heine, H. 1904a. 'Γκαίτε', trans. Ar. G. K., *Ακρίτας* vol. I, pp. 84-88.
78. Heine, H. 1904b. 'Γκαίτε', trans. Ar. G. K., *Ακρίτας* vol. I, pp. 114-117.
79. Iordanidou, A. 2007. *Λεξικό νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι*, Athens, s.v. 'Γλωσσικό ζήτημα', pp. 417-420.
80. K. 1904a, 'Τα ξένα περιοδικά', *Ακρίτας* vol. I, pp. 63-64.
81. K. 1904b, 'Νεκρολογία. Ο θάνατος του Lembach', *Ακρίτας* vol. I, p. 142.
82. K. A. 1904. 'Νεκρολογία. Εμμανουήλ Ροΐδης', *Ακρίτας* vol. I, pp. 110-111.
83. Kalligas, P. 1991. *Θάνος Βλέκας*, E. N. Chorafas (ed.), Athens.
84. Kalligas, P. 2001. *Thanos Vlekas (A novel)*, trans. & introduction Th. Doulis, Evanston.
85. Kallis, A. A. 2007. 'Fascism and Religion: The Metaxas Regime in Greece and the 'Third Hellenic Civilisation. Some theoretical observations on "Fascism", "Political Religion" and "Clerical Fascism"', *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* Vol. 8, No. 2 (June 2007), pp. 229-246.
86. Kamb. 1904a, 'Η διδασκαλία του Φάουστ από το Βασιλικόν', *Ακρίτας* vol. II, pp. 430-431.
87. Kamb. 1904b. 'Εξ αφορμής της διδασκαλίας του Φάουστ (Σημειώσεις)', *Ακρίτας* vol. II, pp. 431-433.
88. Kambanis, A. & Kytikas, D. 1923. *Η Αίγυπτος των Φαραώ*, Cairo.

89. Kambanis, A. 1901a. 'Αιώνια τραγούδια', *Το Περιοδικόν μας* 26 (15 Mar 1901), p. 39.
90. Kambanis, A. 1901b. 'Ο Ύμνος μας και ο Υμεναίος μας', *Το Περιοδικόν μας* 28 (15 Apr 1901), pp. 92-93.
91. Kambanis, A. 1901c. 'Σημειώσεις', *Το Περιοδικόν μας* 28 (15 Apr 1901), pp. 100-101.
92. Kambanis, A. 1901d. 'Συνεντεύξεις επί του ζητήματος', *Το Περιοδικόν μας* 29 (1 May 1901), pp. 111-113.
93. Kambanis, A. 1901e. 'Σημειώσεις', *Το Περιοδικόν μας* 29 (1 May 1901), pp. 134-135.
94. Kambanis, A. 1901f. 'Επί του ζητήματος', *Το Περιοδικόν μας* 30 (15 May 1901), pp. 140-141.
95. Kambanis, A. 1901g. 'Τα σύμβολα της νέας θρησκείας: Προσευχή' *Το Περιοδικόν μας* 30 (15 May 1901), pp. 146-147.
96. Kambanis, A. 1901h. 'Σημειώσεις', *Το Περιοδικόν μας* 30 (15 May 1901), pp. 159-160.
97. Kambanis, A. 1904a. 'Οι Κίτρινοι', *Ακρίτας* vol I, pp. 4-7.
98. Kambanis, A. 1904b. 'Τα περιοδικά', *Ακρίτας* vol. I, pp. 31-32.
99. Kambanis, A. 1904c. 'Ύστερ' από τον Τρικούπη', *Ακρίτας* vol. I, pp. 33-36.
100. Kambanis, A. 1904d. 'Μιχαήλ Σιγάλας (Πορτραίτο)', *Ακρίτας* vol. I, pp. 62-63.

101. Kambanis, A. 1904e. 'Σολωμός. Σημειώματα δια τους αισθητικούς της αύριον', *Ακρίτας* vol. I, pp. 66-68.
102. Kambanis, A. 1904f. 'Η δίνη', *Ακρίτας* vol. I, p. 89.
103. Kambanis, A. 1904g. 'Σαρωνικού γαλήνη', *Ακρίτας* vol. I, pp. 89-90.
104. Kambanis, A. 1904h. 'Ένας λόφος του Κορυδαλού', *Ακρίτας* vol. I, p. 90.
105. Kambanis, A. 1904i. 'Σολωμός. Σημειώματα δια τους αισθητικούς της αύριον', *Ακρίτας* vol. I, pp. 129-132.
106. Kambanis, A. 1904j. 'Διθύραμβος του φωτός', *Ακρίτας* vol. II, pp. 408-409.
107. Kambanis, A. 1904k. 'Επίγραμμα', *Φυλλίς* vol. III, no. 4 (Apr 1904), p. 79.
108. Kambanis, A. 1905a. 'Πώς σκέπτονται τα βιβλία', *Ακρίτας* vol. II, pp. 446-453.
109. Kambanis, A. 1905b. 'Χρονικά του μηνός', *Ακρίτας* vol. III, pp. 26-29.
110. Kambanis, A. 1905c. 'Η παρακμή', *Ακρίτας* vol. III, p. 186.
111. Kambanis, A. 1905d. 'Μια φιλολογική επιστολή και μια απάντησις', *Ακρίτας* vol. III, pp. 229-231.
112. Kambanis, A. 1907. 'Διάλογος εις το σεληνόφως', *Ηγησώ* 7 (Nov 1907), pp. 97-99.
113. Kambanis, A. 1908. 'Κλεψύδρα [Σκέψεις γεννώμεναι από τα πράγματα]', *Ο Παν* 1 (Nov 1908), pp. 1-6.
114. Kambanis, A. 1909. 'Κλεψύδρα', *Ο Παν* 2 (Jan 1909), pp. 33-35.
115. Kambanis, A. 1914. *Προσφορά στον Ηφαιστο*, Alexandria.
116. Kambanis, A. 1915. 'Ο Γούναρης', *Ο Νουμάς* 555 (7 Mar 1915), pp. 109-110.

117. Kambanis, A. 1916a. 'Η διανοητική Ευρώπη και ο πόλεμος. Au dessus de la mêlée', *Ελληνικά Χρονικά*, pp. 13-18.
118. Kambanis, A. 1916b. 'Η διανοητική Ευρώπη και ο πόλεμος. Au dessus de la mêlée (B')', *Ελληνικά Χρονικά*, pp. 110-112.
119. Kambanis, A. 1920. *Καλλιγιάς και Ζαμπέλιος*, Athens.
120. Kambanis, A. 1923. *Ναοί και Τάφοι*, Alexandria.
121. Kambanis, A. <sup>1</sup>1925. *Ιστορία της Νέας Ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας (1000 μ.Χ. – 1900)*, Cairo.
122. Kambanis, A. <sup>2</sup>1925. *Ιστορία της Νέας Ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας (1000 μ.Χ. – 1900)*, Alexandria,
123. Kambanis, A. <sup>3</sup>1933. *Ιστορία της Νέας Ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας (έως το 1932)*, Athens.
124. Kambanis, A. 1934. '[no title]', in 'Τα Παράκαιρα' του Κωστή Παλαμά, Athens, pp. 3-12.
125. Kambanis, A. 1935. *Ιστορία της Νέας Ελληνικής κριτικής*, Athens.
126. Kambanis, A. 1936. *Ιστορία των αισθητικών θεωριών*, Athens.
127. Kambanis, A. 1937a. 'Εσωτερική πολιτική', *Το Νέον Κράτος* 1 (Sep 1937), pp. 15-18.
128. Kambanis, A. 1937b. 'Ο ιστός της Πηνελόπης', *Το Νέον Κράτος* 3 (Nov 1937), pp. 209-216.
129. Kambanis, A. 1938a. 'Άφετε τους νεκρούς θάπτειν τους εαυτών νεκρούς', *Το Νέον Κράτος* 6 (Feb 1938), pp. 145-152.

130. Kambanis, A. 1938b. 'Χθες και σήμερα', *Το Νέον Κράτος* 7 (Mar 1938), pp. 259-265.
131. Kambanis, A. 1938c. 'Οι διανοούμενοι και το "Νέον Κράτος"', *Το Νέον Κράτος* 8 (Apr 1938), pp. 377-382.
132. Kambanis, A. 1938d. 'Προσταγή συνειδήσεως', *Το Νέον Κράτος* 10 (June 1938), pp. 633-637.
133. Kambanis, A. 1938e. 'Το τρίτον έτος', *Το Νέον Κράτος* 12 (Aug 1938), pp. 869-876.
134. Kambanis, A. 1938f. 'Η γυναίκα του Λωτ', *Το Νέον Κράτος* 13 (Sep 1938), pp. 1019-1024.
135. Kambanis, A. 1939. 'Έθνος και Κράτος', *Το Νέον Κράτος* 20 (Apr 1939), pp. 126-136.
136. Kambanis, A. 1940a. 'Η τετραετία', *Το Νέον Κράτος* 32-33 (Apr-May 1940), pp. 499-503.
137. Kambanis, A. 1940b. 'Ιστορία και Ζωή', *Το Νέον Κράτος* 34 (June 1940), pp. 642-644.
138. Kambanis, A. 1940c. 'Η ιστορία πηγή ζωής', *Το Νέον Κράτος* 35 (July 1940), pp. 710-717.
139. Kambanis, A. 1940d. 'Επίλογοι. Η πνευματική επιστράτευσις και το αίμα της ψυχής', *Το Νέον Κράτος* 38-39 (Oct-Nov 1940), pp. 989-993.
140. Kambanis, A. 1942a. 'Πρόσωπα – Πράγματα – Ιδέες', *Ο Εικοστός Αιών* 1 & 2 (Feb & Mar 1942), pp. 83-88.

141. Kambanis, A. 1942b. 'Πρόσωπα – Πράγματα – Ιδέες', *Ο Εικοστός Αιών* 3 & 4 (Apr & May 1942), pp. 63-66.
142. Kambanis, A. 1946. *Ο Δημήτριος Γούναρης και η Ελληνική κρίσις των ετών 1918-1922*, Athens.
143. Kambanis, A. <sup>5</sup>1948. *Ιστορία της Νέας Ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας*, Athens.
144. Kambanis, A. <sup>4</sup>n.d. *Ιστορία της Νέας Ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας*, Athens.
145. Karaoglou, Ch. L. et al. 1996. *Περιοδικά λόγου & τέχνης (1901-1940). Αναλυτική βιβλιογραφία και παρουσίαση*, Vol. 1, Thessaloniki.
146. Karaoglou, Ch. L. et al. 2002. *Περιοδικά λόγου & τέχνης (1901-1940). Αναλυτική βιβλιογραφία και παρουσίαση*, Vol. 2, Thessaloniki.
147. Karaoglou, Ch. L. et al. 2007. *Περιοδικά λόγου & τέχνης (1901-1940). Αναλυτική βιβλιογραφία και παρουσίαση*, Vol. 3, Thessaloniki.
148. Kastrinaki, A. 2005. *Η λογοτεχνία στην παραγμένη δεκαετία 1940-1950*, Athens.
149. Kayialis, T. 1996. 'Παύλος Καλλιγάζ', in N. Vayenas (ed.), *Η παλαιότερη πεζογραφία μας (1830-1880)*, vol. 4, Athens, pp. 158-187.
150. Kayialis, T. 2007. *Η επιθυμία για το Μοντέρνο. Δεσμεύσεις και αξιώσεις της λογοτεχνικής διανόησης στην Ελλάδα του 1930*, Athens.
151. Kechayioglou, Y. 1980. 'Οι ιστορίες της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας', *Μαντατοφόρος* 15, pp. 5-66.
152. Kokkinos, Y. n.d. *Η φασίζουσα ιδεολογία στην Ελλάδα. Η περίπτωση του περιοδικού 'Νέον Κράτος' (1937-1941)*, Athens.

153. Kokoris, D. 1999. *Όψεις των σχέσεων της Αριστεράς με τη Λογοτεχνία στο Μεσοπόλεμο (1927-1936)*, Patras.
154. Kokoris, D. 2007. *Λεξικό νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι*, Athens, s.v. 'Βωμοί', p. 340.
155. Kollias, S. Y., 1973. *Θρησκευτική ανθολογία ποιήσεως 1453-1973*, vol. 2, Athens – New York.
156. Kondylakis, I. 1930. *Όταν ήμουν δάσκαλος κι' άλλα διηγήματα*, introduction A. Kambanis, Athens.
157. Kordatos, Y. 1962. *Ιστορία της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας (Από το 1453 έως το 1961)*, Athens, vol. 1-2.
158. Kotzia, E. 2006. *Ιδέες και αισθητική: μεσοπολεμικοί και μεταπολεμικοί πεζογράφοι, 1930-1974*, Athens.
159. Kranidiotis, N. 2010. 'Η Κύπρος υπό Βρετανική κυριαρχία', in *Ελληνική Ιστορία. Από τη μετεμφυλιακή ανασυγκρότηση στη μεταπολίτευση*, Athens.
160. Kriaras, E. 1969. *Διονύσιος Σολωμός. Ο βίος – το έργο*, Athens.
161. Kriaras, E. 1997. *Κωστής Παλαμάς: Ο αγωνιστής του δημοτικισμού και η κάμψη του*, Athens.
162. Lavagnini, B. 1937. 'Αρίστου Καμπάνη: "Ιστορία της Νέας Ελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας"'. Έκδοσις Δ'', *Το Νέον Κράτος* 3 (Nov 1937), pp. 301-302.
163. Leopardi, G. 1912. *Ηθικά έργα*, trans. A. Kambanis, Athens.
164. Lorentzatos, Z. 1980. 'Η έννοια της λογοτεχνικής κριτικής', *Εκhebόλος* 5 (autumn 1980), pp. 325-354.

165. Loulis, J. C. 1982. *The Greek Communist Party 1940-1944*, London – Canberra.
166. Lyssari, Ch. & Papakyritsis, S. 2007. *Λεξικό νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι*, Athens, s.v. 'Νέον Κράτος, Το', pp. 1564-1565.
167. Mallosis, I. 1926. *Η πολιτική ιστορία του Δημητρίου Π. Γούναρη*, vol. I, Athens.
168. Maniadakis, K. 1939. 'Ένας αποκαλυπτικός λόγος. Νεολαία της χθες και νεολαία της σήμερον', *Το Νέον Κράτος* 17 (Jan 1939), pp. 1508-1512.
169. Mantzoufas, Y. A. 1937. 'Η πολιτική κατάσταση εν Ελλάδι προ και μετά την 4<sup>ην</sup> Αυγούστου', *Το Νέον Κράτος* 2 (Oct 1937), pp. 113-120.
170. Margaritis, Y. 2010. 'Η μάχη της Αθήνας. Στρατιωτικές επιχειρήσεις από 4 Δεκεμβρίου 1944 ως 6 Ιανουαρίου 1945', in Kardasis, V. & Psaromilingos, A. (eds), *Δεκέμβρης '44. Οι μάχες στις γειτονιές της Αθήνας*, Athens, pp. 9-32.
171. Maris, A. 1985. *Ο Ελευθέριος Βενιζέλος και το κίνημα του Θερίσου*, Chania.
172. Masson-Vincourt, M. P. 1997. *Paul Calligas (1814-1896) et la fondation de l'état grec*, Paris.
173. Mastrodimitris, P. D. 2005 (<sup>1</sup>1974). *Εισαγωγή στη νεοελληνική φιλολογία*, Athens.
174. Mazower, M. 1996. 'Hitler's New Order, 1939-45', *Diplomacy and Statecraft* vol. 7, issue 1, pp. 29-53.
175. Melas, S. 1916. 'Νέα βιβλία. Τασώ, Στο σκοτάδι κι' άλλα διηγήματα', *Ελληνικά Χρονικά*, pp. 69-71.

176. Meraklis, M. Y. 2007. *Λεξικό νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι*, Athens, s.v. 'Βώκος, Γεράσιμος', pp. 339-340.
177. Meraklis, Y. M. & Anagnostopoulos, V. D. 2007. *Λεξικό νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι*, Athens, s.v. 'Καμπούρογλου(ς), Δημήτριος Γρ.', pp. 1006-1007.
178. Metaxas, I. 1939. 'Το διάγγελμα του αρχηγού προς τον ελληνικόν λαόν', *Το Νέον Κράτος* 24 (Aug 1939), pp. 501-504.
179. Minas, K. 2011. 'Γλωσσικές αντιμαχίες: Κωνσταντίνος Ασώπιος – Παναγιώτης Σούτσος, Κωνσταντίνος Κόντος – Κωνσταντίνος Ασώπιος, Δημήτριος Βερναρδάκης – Κωνσταντίνος Κόντος, Γεώργιος Χατζιδάκις – Δημήτριος Βερναρδάκης' in Y. Bambiniotis (ed.), *Το γλωσσικό ζήτημα. Σύγχρονες προσεγγίσεις*, Athens, pp. 235-251.
180. Mitrović, A. 2007. *Serbia's Great War, 1914-1918*, London.
181. Mitsakis, K. & Paradeisi, E. 2007. *Λεξικό νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι*, Athens, s.v. 'Εφταλιώτης, Αργύρης.', p. 735.
182. Mitsakis, K. 2007. *Λεξικό νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι*, Athens, s.v. 'Τρυπάρης, Ιωάννης.', pp. 443-444.
183. Moullas, P. 1981. 'Η αθηναϊκή πανεπιστημιακή κριτική και ο Ροΐδης' in *Η κριτική στη νεότερη Ελλάδα*, Athens, pp. 55-77.
184. Moullas, P. 1992. *Ο λόγος της απουσίας: δοκίμιο για την επιστολογραφία με σαράντα ανέκδοτα γράμματα του Φώτου Πολίτη (1908-1910)*, Athens.
185. Moullas, P. 1993. *Η Μεσοπολεμική πεζογραφία*, vol. 1, Athens.

186. Moullas, P. 1994. 'Ιδεαλισμός και κριτική: Μερικές οριοθετήσεις' in *Όψεις της λαϊκής και της λόγιας λογοτεχνίας*. 5<sup>η</sup> επιστημονική συνάντηση αφιερωμένη στον Γιάννη Αποστολάκη, Θεσσαλονίκη, 14-16 Μαΐου 1992, Thessaloniki, pp. 57-69.
187. Moullas, P. 2001. *Η δεκάτη Μούσα. Μελέτες για την Κριτική*, Athens.
188. Mussolini, B. 1928. *Discorsi del 1927*, Milan.
189. Nakas, Th. 2011. 'Αχιλλέας Τζάρτζανος: η γλωσσική του δικαίωση' in Y. Bambiniotis (ed.), *Το γλωσσικό ζήτημα. Σύγχρονες προσεγγίσεις*, Athens, pp. 503-517.
190. Nikolareizis, D. 2011. 'Η κριτική – προπάντων η κριτική!': *Δοκίμια κριτικής*, Ούγος Φώσκολος & Ανδρέας Κάλβος, Ch. L. Karaoglou (ed.), Athens.
191. Nikoloudis, Th. 1937. 'Το Νέον Κράτος', *Το Νέον Κράτος* 1 (Sep 1937), pp. 1-5.
192. Palamas, K. n.d. *Άπαντα*, vol. 8, Athens.
193. Panaretou, A. 1993. 'Το περιοδικό *Το Νέον Κράτος*', *Τεύχη του ΕΛΙΑ* 3, pp. 129-168.
194. Papakostas, Y. 1988. *Φιλολογικά σαλόνια και καφεενεία της Αθήνας (1880-1930)*, Athens.
195. Papakyritsis, S. 2007. *Λεξικό νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι*, Athens, s.v. 'Παν, Ο', p. 1674.
196. Papayeorygiou, S. 1996. *Η πρώτη περίοδος της 'Αγγλοκρατίας' στην Κύπρο (1878-1914): πολιτικός εκσυγχρονισμός και κοινωνικές αδράνειες*, Athens.

197. Papayeoryiou, S. 2004. *Από το γένος στο έθνος. Η θεμελίωση του ελληνικού κράτους, 1821-1862*, Athens.
198. Patsis, Ch. 2008. *Κωστής Παλαμάς. Ο στυλοβάτης του δημοτικισμού και κοινωνικός αναμορφωτής*, Athens.
199. Pesketzi, M. K. 2003. *Θεωρία της λογοτεχνίας και νεοελληνική λογοτεχνική κριτική*, Athens.
200. Peterfy, E. 1916a. 'Η Θεία Κωμωδία του Δάντη (Α')', *Ελληνικά Χρονικά*, pp. 46-64.
201. Peterfy, E. 1916b. 'Η Θεία Κωμωδία του Δάντη (Β')', *Ελληνικά Χρονικά*, pp. 128-138.
202. Peterfy, E. 1916c. 'Η Θεία Κωμωδία του Δάντη (Τέλος)', *Ελληνικά Χρονικά*, pp. 197-208.
203. Petrakis, M. 2006. *Metaxas Myth: Dictatorship and Propaganda in Greece*, London – New York.
204. Petsalis-Diomidis, N. 1988. *Η Ελλάδα των δύο κυβερνήσεων 1916-1917: καθεστωτικά, διπλωματικά και οικονομικά προβλήματα του εθνικού διχασμού*, Athens.
205. Plato 1911a. *Λύσις*, trans. A. Kambanis, Athens.
206. Plato 1911b. *Λάχης*, trans. A. Kambanis, Athens.
207. Ploumidis, S. 2010. 'Το καθεστώς Μεταξά, 1936-1940' in E. Chatzivasileiou, (ed.) 2010. *Η δικτατορία του Ιωάννη Μεταξά*, Athens, pp. 52-76.
208. Politis, F. 1983. *Επιλογή κριτικών άρθρων*, ed. N. Politis, vol. 1-4, Athens.

209. Politis, L. 1978. *Ιστορία της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας*, Athens.
210. Richter, H. 1989. 'Die Griechische kommunistische Partei (KKE) 1944-1947: Von der Massenpartei zur Kaderpartei', in D. Staritz & H. Weber (eds), *Einheitsfront Einheitspartei. Kommunisten und Sozialdemokraten in Ost- und Westeuropa 1944-1948*, Collogne, pp. 453-468.
211. Roidis, E. n.d. *Πάπισσα Ιωάννα*, introduction A. Kambanis, Athens.
212. Sarandakos, N. 2011. 'Στα εγκαίνια της κοριτσίστικης ελικιάς', *Αυγή* (20 Nov 2011).
213. Sarandis, K. 2009. 'Η ιδεολογία και ο πολιτικός χαρακτήρας του καθεστώτος Μεταξά' in Th. Veremis (ed.), *Ο Μεταξάς και η εποχή του*, Athens, pp. 45-71.
214. Skeolas, M. 1916. 'Οι βωμοί του Κωστή Παλαμά', *Ελληνικά Χρονικά* 1 (Mar 1916), pp. 31-32.
215. Skipis, S. 1905. 'Η απάντησις', *Ακρίτας* vol. III, pp. 231-234.
216. Skipis, S. 1935. 'Πώς ο "Πρωτεύς" έγινε "Ακρίτας"', *Νέα Εστία* 198 (15 Mar 1935), p. 297.
217. Sophocles 1911. *Τραχίνιαι*, trans. A. Kambanis, Athens.
218. Sophocles 1913. *Φιλοκτήτης*, trans. A. Kambanis, Athens.
219. Spandonidis, P. 1959. *Το θέμα της κριτικής. Οι σύγχρονοι κριτικοί μας*, Thessaloniki.
220. Spandonidis, P. 1963. *Η κριτική σκέψη στη σύγχρονη Ελλάδα*, Thessaloniki.
221. Stavridi-Patrikiou, R. 1976. *Δημοτικισμός και κοινωνικό πρόβλημα*, Athens.

222. Steryiopoulos, K. 1981. 'Κλέων Παράσχος και Τέλλος Άγρας' in *Η κριτική στη νεότερη Ελλάδα*, Athens, pp. 177-199.
223. Theocritus 1903. 'Ειδύλλιον / Δάφνις', trans. A. Kambanis, *Ζωή* 2 (June 1903), pp. 23-27.
224. Theocritus 1904. 'Επιγράμματα', trans. A. Kambanis, *Ακρίτας* vol. I, p. 60.
225. Theotokas, Y. 2005. *Αναζητώντας τη διαύγεια. Δοκίμια για τη νεότερη ελληνική και ευρωπαϊκή λογοτεχνία*, D. Tziovas (ed.), Athens.
226. Thrylos A. 2010. *Κριτική - Πεζογραφία, Ποίηση, Δοκίμιο (1945-1965)*, Th. Niarhos (ed.), Athens.
227. Tonnet, H. 1996. *Histoire du roman grec des origines à 1960*, Paris – Montréal.
228. Tounda-Fergadi, A. 1991. 'The Serbian troops on Corfu: The problem of transporting them to Thessaloniki and Greek public opinion on the affair', in *Proceedings of the fifth Greek-Serbian symposium*, Thessaloniki, pp. 30-33.
229. Tsakonas, D. 1965. *Geist und Gesellschaft in Griechenland*, Bonn.
230. Tsakonas, D. <sup>2</sup>1972. *Προβλήματα ελληνικότητας. Κοινωνιολογία και φιλοσοφία του νέου Ελληνισμού*, Athens.
231. Tsakonas, D. <sup>3</sup>1973. *Εισαγωγή εις τον νέον ελληνισμόν. Κοινωνιολογία της πολιτικής και πνευματικής ζωής*, Athens.
232. Tsakonas, D. 1987. *Λογοτεχνία και κοινωνία στο Μεσοπόλεμο. Ιστορία της νεότερης ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας και πολιτικής κοινωνίας. Το κρίσιμο είκοσι με τριάντα*, Athens.
233. Tsakonas, D. 1988. *Ιδεαλισμός και Μαρξισμός στην Ελλάδα*, Athens.

234. Tsakonas, D. 1989. *Η γενιά του '30. Τα πριν και τα μετά*, Athens.
235. Tzartanos, A. 1935. 'Δημοτική και νεοδημοτική. Η προσπάθεια ενός συλλόγου', *Φιλολογικός Νέος Κόσμος* 2 (Feb 1935), pp. 3-53.
236. Tzionas, D. 1987. *Μετά την Αισθητική. Θεωρητικές δοκιμές και ερμηνευτικές αναγνώσεις της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας*, Athens.
237. Tzionas, D. 1989. *Οι μεταμορφώσεις του εθνισμού και το ιδεολόγημα της ελληνικότητας στο Μεσοπόλεμο*, Athens.
238. Tzionas, D. 1994. 'Ο Γιάννης Αποστολάκης και ο τύπος του αρνητή-διανοουμένου στην Ελλάδα', in *Όψεις της λαϊκής και της λόγιας λογοτεχνίας. 5<sup>η</sup> επιστημονική συνάντηση αφιερωμένη στον Γιάννη Αποστολάκη, Θεσσαλονίκη, 14-16 Μαΐου 1992*, Thessaloniki, pp. 37-55.
239. Tzionas, D. 2011. *Ο μύθος της γενιάς του Τριάντα: Νεότερικότητα, ελληνικότητα και πολιτισμική ιδεολογία*, Athens.
240. Valetas, Y. 1966. *Επίτομη ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας*, Athens.
241. Varelas, L. 1997. *Η αντιμετώπιση λογοτεχνικών και πνευματικών κινήσεων στην ελληνική επαρχία (1929-1940). Θέματα ιστορίας και βιβλιογραφίας της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας*, Unpublished PhD thesis, Philosophiki scholi, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
242. Veloudis, G. 1983. *Germanograecia: deutsche Einflüsse auf die neugriechische Literatur, 1750-1944*, Amsterdam, vol. II.
243. Veloudis, Y. 1989. *Διονύσιος Σολωμός. Ρομαντική ποίηση και ποιητική. Οι γερμανικές πηγές*, Athens.

244. Veloudis, Y. 2000. *Κριτικά στο Σολωμό: κριτικά, φιλολογικά, ερμηνευτικά*, Athens.
245. Veloudis, Y. <sup>3</sup>2002 (<sup>1</sup>1994). *Γραμματολογία – Θεωρία λογοτεχνίας*, Athens.
246. Veremis, Th. & Koliopoulos, Y. 2006. *Ελλάς, η σύγχρονη συνέχεια: Από το 1821 μέχρι σήμερα*, Athens.
247. Veremis, Th. 2009. 'Εισαγωγή' in Veremis, Th. (ed.), *Ο Μεταξάς και η εποχή του*, Athens, pp. 11-22.
248. Vitti, M. <sup>3</sup>1991 (<sup>1</sup>1974). *Ιδεολογική λειτουργία της ελληνικής ηθογραφίας*, Athens.
249. Vitti, M. <sup>2</sup>1995 (<sup>1</sup>1977). *Η 'γενιά του τριάντα'. Ιδεολογία και μορφή*, Athens.
250. Vitti, M. 2001. *Storia della letteratura neogreca*, Rome.
251. Voutieridis, I. 1924. *Ιστορία της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Από των μέσων του ΙΕ' αιώνας μέχρι των νεωτάτων χρόνων*, vol. I, Athens.
252. Voutieridis, I. 1927. *Ιστορία της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Από των μέσων του ΙΕ' αιώνας μέχρι των νεωτάτων χρόνων*, vol. II, Athens.
253. Voutieridis, I. 1933. *Σύντομη ιστορία της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας (1000-1930)*, Athens.
254. Wimsatt, W. K. Jr. & Beardsley, M. C. 1946. 'Intentional fallacy', *The Sewanee Review*, Vol. 54, No. 3 (Jul - Sep 1946), pp. 468-488.
255. Yeorgousopoulos, K. 1981. 'Τιάννης Αποστολάκης – Φώτος Πολίτης' in *Η κριτική στη νεότερη Ελλάδα*, Athens, pp. 145-176.

256. Yianouloupoulos, Y. N. 2003. *‘Η ευγενής μας τύφλωσις...’*. Εξωτερική πολιτική και ‘εθνικά θέματα’ από την ήττα του 1897 έως τη Μικρασιατική Καταστροφή, Athens.
257. Ziras, A. & Petrotou, Ch. 2007. *Λεξικό νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι*, Athens, s.v. ‘Γιανίδης, Ελισαίος’, p. 390.
258. Ziras, A. 2007a. *Λεξικό νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι*, Athens, s.v. ‘Αποστολάκης, Γιάννης’, pp. 155-156.
259. Ziras, A. 2007b. *Λεξικό νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι*, Athens, s.v. ‘Αιμιλία, Δάφνη’, p. 464.
260. Ziras, A. 2007c. *Λεξικό νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι*, Athens, s.v. ‘Καμπάνης, Άριστος’, pp. 1005-1006.
261. Ziras, A. 2007d. *Λεξικό νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας. Πρόσωπα, έργα, ρεύματα, όροι*, Athens, s.v. ‘Σκίπης, Σωτήρης’, p. 2030.
262. Zoras, Y. Y. 1991. ‘Οι Νεοέλληνες λογοτέχνες και ο Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος “Παρνασσός”’, *Νέα Εστία* 1529 (15 Mar 1991), pp. 384-388.
263. *Νέα Εστία* 340 (15 Feb 1941), special issue on Ioannis Metaxas.

#### WEBPAGES

264. <http://critics.ekebi.gr/> (accessed 25 Feb 2013)
265. <http://www.critique.gr/index.php?&page=article&id=907>. (accessed 31 Oct 2013)

266. <http://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/literature/studies/grammatologies/guide.html>(accessed 31 Oct 2013)
267. <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2011/11/22/west-urged-adapt-rising-power-east.html>. (accessed 29 Aug 2013)
268. <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/322120/Adamantios-Korais> (accessed 16 Oct 2013)
269. [http://www.livepedia.gr/index.php/%CE%9A%CE%B1%CE%BC%CF%80%CE%AC%CE%BD%CE%B7%CF%82\\_%CE%86%CF%81%CE%B9%CF%83%CF%84%CE%BF%CF%82](http://www.livepedia.gr/index.php/%CE%9A%CE%B1%CE%BC%CF%80%CE%AC%CE%BD%CE%B7%CF%82_%CE%86%CF%81%CE%B9%CF%83%CF%84%CE%BF%CF%82) (accessed 4 Nov 2013)
270. <http://metaxas-project.com/%CE%B4%CE%B7%CE%BC%CE%BF%CF%84%CE%B9%CE%BA%CE%BF-%CE%BC%CE%B5%CF%84%CE%B1%CE%BE%CE%B1/>(accessed 23 Oct 2013)
271. <http://www.todayszaman.com/news-314148-nansens-solution-revisiting-the-turkish-greek-population-exchangeby-sener-akturk-.html> (accessed 25 Sep 2013)
272. <http://www.mercuredefrance.fr/unepage-historique-historique-1-1-0-1.html>. (accessed 14 Aug 2013)

## APPENDIX\*

### BOOKS AND ARTICLES BY ARISTOS KAMBANIS

#### 1. BOOKS

##### 1.1. ORIGINAL BOOKS

###### 1.1.1. STUDIES

1.1.1.1. *Καλλιγάς και Ζαμπέλιος*, Athens: M. Zikakis, 1920

1.1.1.2. *Καλλιγάς και Ζαμπέλιος*, Athens: Filologykos Syllogos  
'Parnassos', <sup>2</sup>1972

1.1.1.3. *Η Αίγυπτος των Φαραώ*, Cairo: I. Politis, 1923<sup>1</sup>

1.1.1.4. *Ιστορία της Νέας Ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας (1000 μ.Χ. – 1900)*,  
Cairo: I. Politis, <sup>1</sup>1925

1.1.1.5. *Ιστορία της Νέας Ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας (1000 μ.Χ. – 1900)*,  
Alexandria: Kasigonis, <sup>2</sup>1925

1.1.1.6. *Ιστορία της Νέας Ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας (έως το 1932)*,  
Athens: Nea Estia, <sup>3</sup>1933

1.1.1.7. *Ιστορία της Νέας Ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας*, Athens: Nea Estia,  
<sup>4</sup>n.d.<sup>2</sup>

---

\*The listing is based on the chronological order of publication and not on the year that Kambanis first contributed to each periodical. However, the newspapers are listed in alphabetical order, since it was not always possible to find the exact years of publication. Although effort was made so that as many of Kambanis's contributions and publications as possible are traced, this record does not have the ambition to be exhaustive, but rather to constitute the basis for a bibliography that will include all of Kambanis's oeuvre. In cases that I did not see myself the publication in question, I note the source where the information about it is found.

<sup>1</sup> The book was co-authored with Dionysis Kytikas.

<sup>2</sup> No date is mentioned on the book, but it was in all likelihood published between 1935 and 1937.

- 1.1.1.8. *Ιστορία της Νέας Ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας*, Athens: Estia, <sup>5</sup>1948
- 1.1.1.9. *Ιστορία της Νέας Ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας*, Athens: Karavias, 1971<sup>3</sup>
- 1.1.1.10. *Ιστορία της Νέας Ελληνικής κριτικής*, Athens: Nea Estia, 1935.
- 1.1.1.11. *Ιστορία των αισθητικών θεωριών*, Athens: Nea Estia, 1936
- 1.1.1.12. *Ιστορία των αισθητικών θεωριών*, Athens: Galaxias, <sup>2</sup>1963
- 1.1.1.13. *Ο Δημήτριος Γούναρης και η ελληνική κρίσις των ετών 1918-1922*, Athens: Pyrsos, 1946

#### 1.1.2. INTRODUCTIONS TO / EDITORSHIP OF BOOKS

- 1.1.2.1. Ροΐδης, Ε. *Η Πάπισσα Ιωάννα*, Athens: Υ. Vasileiou, n.d.<sup>4</sup>
- 1.1.2.2. Valaoritis, Α. *Έργα*, vol. I, Athens: Eleftheroudakis, 1924
- 1.1.2.3. Valaoritis, Α. *Έργα*, vol. II, Athens: Eleftheroudakis, 1925
- 1.1.2.4. Κονδυλάκης, Όταν ήμουν δάσκαλος κι' άλλα διηγήματα, Athens: Eleftheroudakis, 1930
- 1.1.2.5. *Ανθολογία Θρακών ποιητών των νεωτέρων χρόνων*, Athens: Ekdoseis 'Thrakikon', 1936
- 1.1.2.6. *Άπαντα Βαλαωρίτη*, vol. I & II, Thessaloniki: Filoloyiki, 1961<sup>5</sup>

#### 1.1.3. CONTRIBUTIONS TO BOOKS

- 1.1.3.1. Kambanis, Α., Chatzidakis, Ν. & Korres, Σ. *Επετηρίς λαογραφικής και ιστορικής εταιρείας κυκλαδικού πολιτισμού και τέχνης*, vol. I, Athens: A.Freri & Co, 1935
- 1.1.3.2. Kambanis, Α., Golfis, Ρ., Iliadis, Υ. & Roussel, L. *Τα 'Παράκαιρα' του Κωστή Παλαμά*, Athens: Estia, 1934

---

<sup>3</sup> This book is characterised as a 'fifth edition', yet it is inaccurately mentioned that it is based on an edition published in 1935 (probably this was meant to be a reference to the fourth edition), whilst in reality it is just a reprint of the 1948 edition.

<sup>4</sup> There is no date mentioned in the copy found, but this book was probably published in the early 1920s, as most of the books of the series 'εκλεκτά έργα' of Vasileiou editions. There is also a mention of the 1920 as the year of publication in the following website, but the source cannot be considered totally trusted: [http://www.livepedia.gr/index.php/%CE%9A%CE%B1%CE%BC%CF%80%CE%AC%CE%BD%CE%B7%CF%82\\_%CE%86%CF%81%CE%B9%CF%83%CF%84%CE%BF%CF%82](http://www.livepedia.gr/index.php/%CE%9A%CE%B1%CE%BC%CF%80%CE%AC%CE%BD%CE%B7%CF%82_%CE%86%CF%81%CE%B9%CF%83%CF%84%CE%BF%CF%82).

<sup>5</sup> This publication contains an introduction by Kambanis and a 'critical analysis' by Palamas.

#### 1.1.4. CONTRIBUTIONS TO ENCYCLOPAEDIAS

- 1.1.4.1. *Μεγάλη Ελληνική Εγκυκλοπαίδεια*, vol. 1-24, Athens: Pirsos, 1926-1934
- 1.1.4.2. *Εγκυκλοπαιδικόν Λεξικό Ελευθερουδάκη*, vol. 1-12 (& 2 supplements), Athens: Eleftheroudakis, 1927-1931

#### 1.1.5. LITERARY WORKS

- 1.1.5.1. *Προσφορά στον Ήφαιστο*, Alexandria: Nea Zoi, 1914
- 1.1.5.2. *Ναοί και τάφοι*, Alexandria: Grammata, 1923<sup>6</sup>

### 1.2. TRANSLATIONS

#### 1.2.1. ANCIENT GREEK LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY

- 1.2.1.1. Epictetus, *Επικτήτου εγχειρίδιον*, Athens: Fexis, 1910
- 1.2.1.2. Plato, *Κριτίας*, Athens: Fexis 1910
- 1.2.1.3. Plato, *Λύσις*, Athens: Fexis, 1911
- 1.2.1.4. Plato, *Λάχης*, Athens: Fexis, 1911
- 1.2.1.5. Sophocles, *Οιδίππου Τύραννος*, Athens: Fexis, 1911
- 1.2.1.6. Sophocles, *Τραχίνιαι*, Athens: Fexis, 1911
- 1.2.1.7. Euripides, *Τρωάδες*, Athens: Fexis, 1911
- 1.2.1.8. Euripides, *Ελένη*, Athens: Fexis, 1912
- 1.2.1.9. Euripides, *Ρήσος*, Athens: Fexis, 1912
- 1.2.1.10. Sophocles, *Φιλοκτήτης*, Athens: Fexis, 1913

#### 1.2.2. MODERN EUROPEAN BOOKS

- 1.2.2.1. Felix Alexandre Le Dantec, *Ο αθεϊσμός*, Athens: Fexis, 1910
- 1.2.2.2. Armando Papalardo, *Η τηλεπάθεια: μεταβίβασις της σκέψεως*, Athens, 1911<sup>7</sup>
- 1.2.2.3. Giacomo Leopardi, *Ηθικά έργα*, Athens: Fexis, 1912
- 1.2.2.4. Ernest Renan, *Βίος του Ιησού*, Athens: Fexis, 1915
- 1.2.2.5. Cesare Lombroso, *Ο μεγαλοφυής*, Athens: Y. Vasileiou, 1923

---

<sup>6</sup> This book could be classified into the genre of travel writing.

<sup>7</sup> The information about the existence of this book was found in the following webpage, where no reference of the publishing house is made: [http://www.livepedia.gr/index.php/%CE%9A%CE%B1%CE%BC%CF%80%CE%AC%CE%BD%CE%B7%CF%82\\_%CE%86%CF%81%CE%B9%CF%83%CF%84%CE%BF%CF%82](http://www.livepedia.gr/index.php/%CE%9A%CE%B1%CE%BC%CF%80%CE%AC%CE%BD%CE%B7%CF%82_%CE%86%CF%81%CE%B9%CF%83%CF%84%CE%BF%CF%82).

- 1.2.2.6. Auguste Émile Faguet, *Η παγκόσμιος λογοτεχνία: εγχειρίδιον γενικής γραμματολογίας περιλαμβάνον την συνοπτικήν ιστορίαν όλων των αρχαίων και νεωτέρων λογοτεχνιών*, Athens: Υ. Vasileiou, 1920

## 2. CONTRIBUTIONS TO SERIAL PUBLICATIONS<sup>8</sup>

### 2.1. PERIODICALS

- 2.1.1. *Αττική Τρις* (1898-1914, 1915; Athens)
- 2.1.2. *Το περιοδικόν μας* (1900-1901, 1901; Piraeus)
- 2.1.3. *Τα Παναθήναια* (1900-1914, 1914-1915; Athens)
- 2.1.4. *Φυλλίς* (1901-1904; Athens)
- 2.1.5. *Ζωή* (1902-1903, 1909, 1911, 1920-1922; Athens - Constantinople)
- 2.1.6. *Ακρίτας* (1904-1906; Athens)
- 2.1.7. *Κριτική* (1903; Athens)
- 2.1.8. *Νουμάς* (1903-1917, 1918-1924, 1929-1931; Athens)
- 2.1.9. *Επιθεώρησις/ Επιθεώρηση* (1904-1907, 1919-1920; Athens)<sup>9</sup>
- 2.1.10. *Απόλλων* (1904-1909; Athens)
- 2.1.11. *Νέα Ζωή* (1904-1927; Alexandria)
- 2.1.12. *Ηλύσια* (1906; Athens)
- 2.1.13. *Ηγησώ* (1907-1908; Athens)
- 2.1.14. *Νέος Πυθμός* (1908; Athens)
- 2.1.15. *Ο Παν* (1908-1909; Athens)
- 2.1.16. *Καμπάνα* (1908, Piraeus)
- 2.1.17. *Δάφνη* (1909-1910, 1911; Athens)
- 2.1.18. *Ο Εικονογραφημένος Παρνασσός* (1910-1923; Athens)
- 2.1.19. *Ανεμώνη* (1910; Athens)
- 2.1.20. *Χρονικά* (1911-1912; Athens)

---

<sup>8</sup> Apart from the periodicals and newspapers listed below, a reference was found that Kambanis contributed in 1917 to a publication called *Πρόοδος* under the pseudonym 'Homunculus' (Delopoulos 2005: 230). However, this publication has not been identified. The same applies to the publication *Νέα Γράμματα* (it should not be confused with Karandonis's periodical *Τα Νέα Γράμματα*) (Kokkinos n.d.: 91).

<sup>9</sup> The initial title of the periodical (in 1904) was in *katharevousa*, but later the demotic form of the word was adopted. See Karaoglou et al. 1996: 129.

- 2.1.21. *Γράμματα* (1911-1919; Alexandria)
- 2.1.22. *Ελληνικά Χρονικά* (1916; Athens)
- 2.1.23. *Αυγή* (1917; Athens)
- 2.1.24. *Νεοελληνική επιθέωρησις* (1917-1920; Athens)<sup>10</sup>
- 2.1.25. *Ανθρωπότης* (1919-1920, 1921, 1922-1923; Athens)
- 2.1.26. *Τα Παρασκήνια* (1924-1928; Athens)
- 2.1.27. *Η εικονογραφημένη της Ελλάδος* (1925; Athens)
- 2.1.28. *Ερμής* (1926; Alexandria)
- 2.1.29. *Επιφυλλίδες* (1926-1929; Athens)
- 2.1.30. *Ιόνιος Ανθολογία* (1927-1941; Zante, Athens)
- 2.1.31. *Νέα Εστία* (1927-nowadays ; Athens)
- 2.1.32. *Ελληνικά Γράμματα* (1927 – 1930; Athens)
- 2.1.33. *Τα Νέα* (1930; Athens)
- 2.1.34. *Εργασία* (1930-1941; Athens)
- 2.1.35. *Ρυθμός* (1932-1934; Piraeus)
- 2.1.36. *Μηνιαίος Νέος Κόσμος* (1934; Athens)
- 2.1.37. *Φιλολογικός Νέος Κόσμος* (1935; Athens)
- 2.1.38. *Πνευματική Ζωή* (1936-1941)
- 2.1.39. *Το Νέον Κράτος* (1937-1941)
- 2.1.40. *Εικοστός Αιών* (1942)

## 2.2. NEWSPAPERS

- 2.2.1. *Ακρόπολις*
- 2.2.2. *Βαλκανικός Ταχυδρόμος*
- 2.2.3. *Έθνος*
- 2.2.4. *Ένωσις*
- 2.2.5. *Νέα Ελλάς*
- 2.2.6. *Νέον Άστν*
- 2.2.7. *Νέος Κόσμος*
- 2.2.8. *Πρωία*
- 2.2.9. *Πρωινή*<sup>11</sup>
- 2.2.10. *Πρωτεύουσα*

---

<sup>10</sup> The information that an article by Kambanis appeared in April 1919 in a periodical named *Νεοελληνική Επιθεώρησις* is found in Palamas n.d.: 493. The periodical was not identified with certainty, since I did not manage to find any issues. It is very likely though, that the periodical in question is the one published by Pournaras between 1917 and 1920.

<sup>11</sup> Varelas 1997: 221 (footnote 190).

**2.2.11.** Σκριπ<sup>12</sup>

**2.2.12.** Τηλέγραφος<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Kambanis 1946: 221.

<sup>13</sup> Varelas 1997: 218 (footnote 174).