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ABSTRACT

This thesis will provide a close, critical and comparative reading of Nikos Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain as a whole, namely both the ones included in the book Σαμηδένηαο-Ηζπαλία and those published in the newspapers Eleftheros Typos and I Kathimerini. The focus will not be on their literary value, but on the extent to which these texts function as cultural, historical, political and ideological documents relating to one man's view of a country and an era. In the first chapter of my thesis I will refer to Kazantzakis’ successive journeys to Spain and examine the transformation of his newspaper articles into a book. In the second chapter I will present the themes that recur in Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain and the author’s reflections on them. The third chapter will be devoted to Kazantzakis’ coverage of the Spanish Civil War and his attitude towards it. In the fourth chapter Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain will be compared with those of the Greek writers Kostas Ouranis and Zacharias Papantonio who also visited the country in the same period and wrote about it. Finally, it will be demonstrated that Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain deserve to be noticed, as they not only reveal things about the country in the crucial years 1926-1936, but about the author as well.
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Introduction

“Travel has recently emerged as a key theme for the humanities and social sciences, and the amount of scholarly work on travel writing has reached unprecedented levels.”\(^1\) Though travel writing seems to have its roots in the Homeric *Odyssey*, the literature of travel had not received critical attention worldwide until recently.\(^2\) Hence, there has been a difficulty in defining it and in deciding whether it constitutes a literary genre or not. The fact that it often embraces the forms of ethnographic writing, journalism and autobiography adds to its hybrid nature and has prompted the scholar Jan Borm to argue that travel writing “is not a genre, but a collective term for a variety of texts both predominantly fictional and non-fictional whose main theme is travel.”\(^3\) Contemporary research tends to examine travel texts as texts that should be acknowledged and evaluated not only for their literary value or lack of it, but also for the fact that they function as agents of a plethora of issues (ethnographic, anthropological, historical, cultural, political etc.).

In contrast to its undoubtedly growing popularity among academics abroad, in Greece travel writing has not attracted scholars’ attention on a large scale. The studies by Stelios Xephloudas (*Ταξιδιωτικά*, 1956), Petros Charis (*Από τον πανόραμα στον καινούριο κόσμο*, 1970), Apostolos Sachinis (“Ο ταξιδιωτικός εντυπώσεις”, 1971) and Annita Panaretou (*Ελληνική Ταξιδιωτική Λογοτεχνία*, 1995) appear to be the only

\(^2\) The terms “travel writing”, “travel literature” and “literature of travel” are considered synonyms by Jan Borm. (See: Jan Borm, “Defining Travel: On the Travel Book, Travel Writing and Terminology” in *Perspectives on Travel Writing*, Glenn Hooper & Tim Youngs (ed.), Aldershot: Ashgate 2004, p.13)
ones to discuss the subject of travel writing for Greek writers. These scholars did not question whether travel writing ("ταξιδιωτική λογοτεχνία" in Greek) was a genre or not; they all took it for granted that it was.⁴ As a result, they presupposed that travel texts, which belong to the “genre” travel writing, are first and foremost literary and that non-literary travel texts should not be considered as part of travel writing. Sachinis and Panaretou, who have dealt with the subject of travel writing in Greece more extensively, have argued that it became a literary genre when writers of fiction began to work in it. They both claimed that it should be distinguished from travel reportage written by journalists rather than authors. Furthermore, they seemed to agree that the year 1927, when Kazantzakis’ book Ταξιδεύοντας was published, constituted the starting point for the development of travel writing in Greece.

Though it appears that it was not Kazantzakis who invented Greek literary travel writing (this honour probably belongs to Kostas Ouranis), he was the one who established it as an art form for Greek letters.⁵ Kazantzakis’ first travel writings were composed when he was a doctoral student in Paris. After that, he went on to spend almost half his life abroad; he resided at one time or another in most European countries and visited the USSR, China, Japan and the Middle East. He worked for various Greek newspapers as a correspondent; the numerous accounts of his travels, first published in newspapers, afterwards provided voluminous material for his five travel books: Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία (part of which was first published in Ταξιδεύοντας in 1927 followed by the whole book in 1937), Ταξιδεύοντας-Ιταλία, Αίγυπτος, Σινά, Ἱερουσαλήμ, Κύπρος, Ο Μοριάς (the “Ιταλία” part was first published in 1927 and the

⁴ Sachinis and Panaretou mainly base themselves on Albert Thibaudet’s “Le Genre Littéraire du voyage” (in Réflexions sur la critique, 1939), which actually re-established travel writing as a literary genre.
complete volume in 1961), *Taξιδεύοντας-Αγγλία* (1941), *Taξιδεύοντας-Ιαπωνία-Κίνα* (published in 1938) and *Taξιδεύοντας-Ρωσία* (part of which was first published in 1928 as *Τι είδα στη Ρωσία* (από τα ταξίδια μου) followed by the whole book in 1956);⁶

Though Kazantzakis often travelled as a newspaper correspondent in order to earn some money and make a living, he really loved to travel and acknowledged the deep influence travelling had on him. There are two phrases in his oeuvre that best demonstrate that and I will quote them both, as it is interesting to see how a writer like Kazantzakis, who often changed his mind, remained loyal to his primary acknowledgement of the role of travel. One is the very first phrase of the preface to *Taξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία:* “Το ταξίδι κι η εξομολόγησή (κι η δημιουργία είναι η ανώτερη και πιστότερη μορφή της εξομολόγησης) στάθηκαν οι δυο μεγαλύτερες χαρές της ζωής μου.”;⁷ the other can be found in his autobiography *Αναφορά στον Γκρέκο*, his swan-song: “Στη ζωή μου οι πιο μεγάλοι μου ευεργέτες στάθηκαν τα ταξίδια και τα ονείρα”.⁸ Thus, it can be understood that the high quality of his travel pieces, which earned him the distinction of being called one of the two “fathers” of travel writing in Greece,⁹ was not unrelated to his genuine love for travel.

---

⁶ All the books have been translated into English; *Taξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία* and *Taξιδεύοντας-Αγγλία* were both translated by Amy Mims and took the titles *Spain* (New York: Simon and Schuster 1963) and *England. A travel journal* (New York: Simon and Schuster 1965) respectively; *Taξιδεύοντας Ιαπωνία-Κίνα* was translated by George C. Papageotes and took the title *Japan, China* (New York: Simon and Schuster 1963); *Taξιδεύοντας Ιταλία-Αγγλία-Σινά-Ισραήλ-Κίνα* was translated by Themi and Theodora Vasilis and was entitled *Journeying: travels in Italy, Egypt, Sinai, Jerusalem and Cyprus* (Boston: Little, Brown 1975); finally, *Taξιδεύοντας-Ρωσία* and *Τι είδα στη Ρωσία* were both translated by Michael Antonakis and Thanasis Maskaleris in one book with the title *Russia. A chronicle of three journeys in the aftermath of the revolution* (Berkley: Creative Arts Book Co. 1989).


Indeed travel writing was generally considered Kazantzakis’s forte by the Greeks. Aimilios Hournouzios, the well-known writer, journalist and literary critic, who was also the editor of the newspaper *I Kathimerini*, to which Kazantzakis sent most of his reports from Spain, argued that Kazantzakis continued the classical tradition of literary perambulations that had been carved out by Hippolyte Taine and Stendhal. G. P. Savvidis recognized Kazantzakis only as a great reporter and writer of impressive travel pieces. Even Theotokas, who generally did not appreciate Kazantzakis’ contributions to other genres, admitted in his diary on 13 April 1946 that his travel writing stood out from the rest, writing: “Το θέατρο του δεν είναι θέατρο, η ποίησή του δεν είναι ποίηση, η φιλοσοφία του δεν είναι φιλοσοφία, η μυθιστοριογραφία του δεν είναι μυθιστορηματική και μονάχα τα Ταξίδια του είναι καλή δημοσιογραφία.”

Perhaps the most applauded of his travel books and the one that determined Kazantzakis’ popularity as a travel writer was *Ταξίδεψιουντας-Ισπανία*, part of which was first included in the landmark book *Ταξίδεψιουντας* of 1927. Kazantzakis went to Spain four times (August-September 1926, October 1932-January 1933, October-November 1936, September 1950); his book, *Ταξίδεψιουντας-Ισπανία*, was based on the reports he had sent from his first three journeys to the newspapers *Eleftheros Typos* (12 December 1926 - January 1927) and *I Kathimerini* (21 May 1933 - 3 June 1933 and 24 November 1936 - 17 January 1937). Just after it was published in book form in 1937 by *Pyrsos*, it received dithyrambic reviews by the author’s contemporaries; more

---

11 Aimilios Hournouzios, “*Ισπανία* του κ. Ν. Καζαντζάκη”, *I Kathimerini*, 19 April 1937.  
particularly, in April 1937, Andreas Karantonis, who characterized Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία as “perfect work of literature” (“τέλειο λογοτέχνημα”), wrote: “Από ένα βιβλίο ταξιδιωτικών εντυπώσεων με τόσο πλούσιο υλικό σαν την Ισπανία του Καζαντζάκη, μπορεί κανείς να πάρει ό,τι του αναλογεί και ό,τι του χρειάζεται.”14 Aimilios Hourmouzios argued that Kazantzakis’ travel accounts from Spain were real works of literature (“πραγματικά λογοτεχνήματα”) that combined art, history, aesthetics, ethnography, myth, drama, tradition and contemporary reality. According to Hourmouzios, Kazantzakis brought Spain into sharp focus.15 In his review Minas Dimakis wrote: “Κλείνοντας το βιβλίο του Καζαντζάκη, νιώθεις τον εαυτό σου γεμάτο χαρά και υπερηφάνεια που είσαι Έλληνας κι έχεις να διαβάζεις τέτοια βιβλία σαν την «Ισπανία».”16 Petros Charis, who emphasized the dynamic presence of Kazantzakis’ personality in his texts, added: “Δεν ξέρω αν βρήκε το ψυχικό του κλίμα στην Ισπανία. Είχε όμως την ευκαιρία να φέρει στην επιφάνεια ό,τι το δραματικό και το σκοτεινό ήταν μέσα του και να γράψει ένα βιβλίο με μοναδική ενότητα και με παλιό που περνάει αμέσως στον αναγνώστη του.”17 Giannis Hatzinis, who agreed with Petros Charis that Kazantzakis’ book on Spain was more revealing of a personality (i.e. that of Kazantzakis) than a country, wrote: “Μπορούμε να ονομάσουμε αποκαλυπτικό αυτό το βιβλίο. Ο συγγραφέας μας οδηγεί ως το βάθος της Ισπανικής ψυχής, -γιατί όχι κι’ ως το βάθος της ιδίας της δικής του ψυχής;”18

The book Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία has been appreciated in later studies too.

James K. Demetrius (1965) considered the second part of Kazantzakis’ book, “Viva la

14 Andreas Karantonis, “Τα Βιβλία: Νίκου Καζαντζάκη: Ταξιδεύοντας, Α’ Ισπανία”, Τα Νεα Γραμματα (1935-1944), April 1937, p.33. The article was republished in Andreas Karantonis, Κριτικά Μελέτηματα, Athens 1980.
15 Aimilios Hourmouzios, “«Ισπανία»” του κ. Ν. Καζαντζάκη”, op. cit., p. 1.
Muerte!”, one of the most beautiful pieces of prose writing that Kazantzakis had ever composed. 19 Emmanuel Hatzantonis (1966), who analysed the book further, claimed that Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία was responsible for the belated discovery of Spain by Greek men of letters and applauded its predominantly literary nature. 20 Apostolos Sachinis (1971), characterized Kazantzakis’s travel book on Spain as his best. 21

In parallel with the qualities of Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία, scholars have also highlighted the importance of the Spanish experience for Kazantzakis. Nikiforos Vrettakos pointed out that, whereas during his first two trips to peacetime Spain, Kazantzakis enjoyed the marvels of that world, in his third trip he confronted the destruction of these marvels: “Πράγματα που είχε δει την προηγούμενη, την άλλη μέρα τα είδε στάχτη. Όλοι αυτοί ταυτίστηκαν με το νόμο που διέπει τις κινήσεις της αγονίας του: όλα άνερα, όλα σκάλα, όλα τίποτα.” 22 In other words, what Kazantzakis saw in Spain both chimed with and endorsed his own preconceived ideas, which were more explicitly analysed in his philosophical essay, Ασκητική (1927). Recently Peter Bien attributed the significance of his Spanish experience for Kazantzakis to the fact that it constituted the testing ground for his new “freedom”. 23 Indeed, on his way to Spain in 1936, Kazantzakis wrote to his friend, Pantelis Prevelakis: “Με τέτοιου οπλισμο -δηλ. ολόγυμνος- κάνω την πρώτη κρίσιμη εμπειρία της νέας μου ελευθερίας: πάω να δω την αιματομένη Ισπανία.” 24

21 Apostolos Sachinis, op. cit., pp. 80-81.
23 Peter Bien, Politics of the Spirit, volume 2, op. cit., p.25.
In the same vein, there is something else that added to the importance of the Spanish experience for Kazantzakis. It seems that Spain provided him with a congenial environment. Spanish people, whom he analyzes in depth, as will be shown in the second chapter, are characterized by vehemence and passion, qualities that Kazantzakis both appreciated and admired. In addition, the Spanish temperament is often presented by Kazantzakis as very close to his own temperament. The affinity Kazantzakis felt for Spain and Spaniards was explicitly expressed by him during his second journey to Spain in one of his letters to Pantelis Prevelakis: “Εδώ στην Ισπανία νιώθω καλύτερα mon climat, εδώ, θαρρώ, θα μπορούσα να δουλέψω. Έχει η ράτσα αυτή ορμή, χαρά, τραγικότητα, θερμότητα, μάτια όλο φλόγα, μορφές εξαίσιες –που νιώθω πως βρίσκουμαι, σαν τον Greco, ανάμεσα σε αδέρφοις…”\(^\text{25}\) In another letter to Prevelakis, Kazantzakis recognizes how closely his soul is related to the Hispanic soul: “Ωστόσο εδώ διαβάζω υσπ[ανική] ποίηση, μεταφράζω πολλά τραγούδια, πάω στο «Ateneo» και ξεφυλλίζω βιβλία, μπαίνω στην υσπ[ανική] ψυχή, που όλο και μου φαίνεται πως συγγενεύει με την ψυχή μου βαδύτερα από κάθε άλλη.”\(^\text{26}\)

Though generally appreciated by critics and despite the significance of the Spanish experience for Kazantzakis, as seen above, \textit{Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία} has yet to receive a detailed analysis in terms of a close reading that would shed light on Kazantzakis’ view of the country and the contribution this text has made to the image of Spain. In addition, the few studies that have dealt with Kazantzakis’ book on Spain have not examined all the relevant texts, namely both his reports published in

\(^{25}\text{Ibid., p. 343.}\)

\(^{26}\text{Ibid., p. 354.}\)
‘Eleftheros Typos’ and ‘I Kathimerini’ and the texts that were finally included in the book.

Hence, in the present thesis I will attempt a close critical and comparative reading of Kazantzakis’ texts on Spain as a whole, that is both the journalistic material and the book. For this purpose, I shall firstly consider it important to compare the travel pieces he sent to the two newspapers for which he was a correspondent with the material that was finally included in the book. Differences between them, later additions or omissions might indicate changes in Kazantzakis’ thoughts. Furthermore, I intend to investigate the themes that recur in Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain and the author’s reflections; hence, questions like “On what did Kazantzakis concentrate most when he was travelling?” and “What attracted his attention most frequently?” will hopefully find answers in my second chapter, which constitutes my main focus. The third chapter will be dedicated to Kazantzakis’ visit to Spain during the Spanish Civil War. In this chapter I will discuss Kazantzakis’ decision to cover the war from the Nationalist side and the extent to which he remained loyal to his intention to be impartial. In addition, since Kazantzakis was not the only Greek writer to write a travel book on Spain between 1926 and 1936, I consider it essential in my fourth chapter to compare Kazantzakis’ view of Spain with that of Ouranis and Papantoniou, who also wrote important texts on Spain. In this way, Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain will be further illuminated not only as regards their content, but also in relation to their form, style and techniques.

As well as 'Σαμηδεύνληαο-Ηζπαλία', I believe that all Kazantzakis’ travel books deserve a closer reading. Though scholarly research on his novels is extensive, his travel books have not been studied thoroughly. Furthermore, despite Kazantzakis’
worldwide fame, his travel writing has not attracted much critical notice abroad. Hence, future studies on Kazantzakis’ more or less neglected travel books will be invaluable, as they could illuminate another aspect of the oeuvre of this influential author mainly famous for his novels. Kazantzakis’ pioneering role and his contribution to travel writing in Greece (five travel books and a plethora of travel reports) should not be underestimated.
Chapter 1

Kazantzakis’ journeys to Spain:
from the newspaper articles to the book

Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία (first published as a book in 1937) is based on eighty-seven journalistic reports that were published in the newspapers Eleftheros Typos (12 December 1926 - 7 January 1927) and Ι Kathimerini (21 May 1933 - 3 June 1933 and 24 November 1936 - 17 January 1937). However, it includes only part of this extensive journalistic material. Parts of the texts published in the newspapers and even whole reports are absent from the book. Hence, the question that arises and to which I will endeavour to provide an answer is: according to what criteria was the selection of the journalistic accounts to be included in the book made? In this chapter, I will also attempt to compare the journalistic material with the texts that were finally included in the book and examine possible changes in Kazantzakis’ ideas. To this end, I shall first provide more detailed information about Kazantzakis’ trips to Spain which gave rise to his reports and then comment on the transformation of the journalistic material into a book.

As I have already mentioned, Kazantzakis travelled to Spain four different times: August - September 1926, October 1932 - March 1933, October - November 1936 and September 1950. His experiences included in the book Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία derive from his three first visits to the country. The book consists of two

---

1 I am basing myself on the invaluable bibliography Katsimpalis composed on Kazantzakis’ published works (Giorgos Katsibalis, Βιβλιογραφία Ν. Καζαντζάκη. Α’ 1906 - 1948, Athens: 1958). The eighty-seven reports to which I refer do not include eight reports from 1933 that were republished by Ι Kathimerini in 1936 as an introduction to his later reports. It should be noted that the republished reports have been slightly edited (mainly minor changes in the titles and in the spelling).
parts: the first part could have the title “Spain in peacetime”, as it comes from the author’s first two journeys to Spain, while the second, entitled “Viva la Muerte!” refers to the Spanish Civil War and draws on Kazantzakis’ third trip to the country. Between these two parts, a canto on Don Quixote which Kazantzakis had written in Aegina in May 1934 was inserted when the book was reprinted by Diphros in 1957. All later editions of the book were based on this definitive Diphros edition which continues in publication to the present day.

Kazantzakis’ first encounter with Spain took place in August - September 1926. From the available journalistic material we learn that he passed from France into Spain and visited Barcelona, Madrid, Toledo, Córdoba, a small provincial town in Castile that is not named, Valencia, Seville and Granada. During this journey, he interviewed Primo de Rivera, the Spanish dictator. The newspaper Eleftheros Typos published Kazantzakis’ first impressions of Spain in twenty-five texts from 12 December 1926 to 7 January 1927. In 1927 the volume Σαμηδεύνληαο was published by the publishing house Serapeion in Alexandria and contained parts of Kazantzakis’ impressions of Spain, Italy, Egypt and Sinai.

On 3 October 1932 Kazantzakis went again to Spain. At first, he resided in Pension Abella (Calle San Bernardo 13), and then in the house of his friend, Timoteo Pérez Rubio, a Spanish painter. In Madrid, Kazantzakis found his old friend, the poet Juan Ramon Jimenez and met the Spanish dramatists Jacinto Benavente and Valle-Inclán and other intellectuals. During this period he began to translate the best of contemporary Spanish lyric poetry, which he published in the Greek periodical O

---

2 Don Quixote, the well known protagonist of Cervantes’ eponymous novel, dominates Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain. For more information on the references to Don Quixote, see the second chapter of my dissertation.
Kyklos. He also made a French adaptation of his tragedy Νηθεθόξνο Φωθάο (1927) and composed a canto as homage to Dante.

On December 1932, distressed by his father’s death, he started a long journey by train through Spain, a journey of some 2,000 kilometers: he went to Avila, Salamanca, Valladolid, Burgos, Zaragoza, Valencia, Alicante and Elche. When he went back to Madrid (on 4 January 1933), he began writing down his impressions of Spain. In the middle of March 1933, just before he left Spain, he started composing a new canto for his other hero, El Greco. Kazantzakis published his new reports from Spain in the Greek newspaper I Kathimerini (21 May 1933 - 3 June 1933). In 1934 he revised the “Ισπανία” part of the old Ταξιδεύοντας published in 1927, adding new pages derived from his second journey to Spain.

In 1936 Kazantzakis was sent as correspondent to war-torn Spain by the Greek newspaper I Kathimerini. On 25 October he was in Burgos, on 3 November in Toledo, on 5 November in Getafe. On 19 November, according to his passport, Kazantzakis returned to Greece. Between 24 November 1936 and 17 January 1937 I Kathimerini published Kazantzakis’ reports from the Spanish Civil War under the title “Τι είδα, 40 ημέρες, εις την Ισπανίαν”. Some of these impressions constituted the

3 Kazantzakis translated poems by the following contemporary Spanish poets: J. R. Jiménez, Antonio Machado, Miguel de Unamuno, Pedro Salinas, Moreno Villa, Federico García Lorca, Rafael Alberti and Vicente Aleixandre.

4 Anastasia Markomihelaki, based on Kazantzakis’ passport that is being exhibited in Nikos Kazantzakis’ Museum (Varvaroi, Heraklion Crete), has recently argued: “Με βάζε απόην την έθζεκα, αποκαθίσταται η λανθασμένη εντύπωση που έχει τόσο ο Ανεμογιάννης όσο και ο Μιόν (2007, 39) ότι ο Καζαντζάκης επέστρεψε στο τέλος του μηνός.” For more information see Anastasia Markomihelaki, “Ο Νίκος Καζαντζάκης στον Ισπανικό Εμφύλιο, μέσα από τις συλλογές του Μουσείου στους Βαρβάρους”, announcement in the forth conference of the Society for Modern Greek studies of the Iberian Peninsula and Latin America, under publication, Zaragoza (Spain), 1-3 October 2009.

5 As mentioned above, the newspaper republished some of Kazantzakis’ reports from his second trip to Spain in 1932 as an introduction to his later reports. In the newspaper there is the following note: “Οτι αναγνώσται μας αδιατέρως, δεν θα ελπιδοφόρησαν τας περιφήμους εκείνας περιγράφας του κ. Νίκου Καζαντζάκη ες Ισπανίας, τας δημοσιευόμενα εις τας στήλες αυτές. Επειδή δε πλείτους εξακολουθοῦν να ζητοῦν χα τους αρχείους της εφημερίδος τα σχετικά φύλλα, αρχίζουμε αναδημοσιεύοντες από
second part of the book Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία, which was published in 1937 by the publishing house Pyrsos.

The last time Kazantzakis visited Spain was in September 1950. On this trip, he travelled around the country for seventeen days with his wife Eleni and his French friends Jean-Pierre, Yvonne Métral and Lucienne Fleury. During this last trip to Spain he visited Barcelona, Tarragona, Valencia, Alicante, Córdoba, Toledo, Ilieszkas, Madrid, Vitoria and San Sebastián. Kazantzakis’ last journey to Spain signalled the end of a series of visits to a country that had deeply influenced him.

Following the details of Kazantzakis’ journeys to Spain, I intend to explore the transformation of the journalistic material produced by the first three visits to the country into successive versions of a travel book. From Kazantzakis’ correspondence with Prevelakis we learn that the publishing house Serapeion in Alexandria had accepted Kazantzakis’ suggestion that he should publish his travel accounts from Spain, Italy, Egypt and Sinai in book form (Ταξιδεύοντας, 1927) on condition that the writer excluded all the ephemeral references and comments from his writings: “Εδώ βρήκα γράμμα από τη Ν[έα] Ζωή [της] Αλεξάντρ[ει]ας· δέχεται να μου τυπώσει ένα βιβλίο μου Ταξιδεύοντας όπου θα συγκεντρώσω, εξαφανίζοντας ό,τι εφήμερο υπάρχει, τα ταξίδια: Ισπανία, Παλαιστίνη, Αίγυπτο, Στινά.” Kazantzakis began rewriting, correcting and shortening his reports: “Από το πρώτο ος τη νύχτα γράφει το

---

6 On 15 September 1950 Kazantzakis wrote to Prevelakis from Toledo: “Αγαπέκέλε αδειθέ, μαλαγπξίδσ ηελ Ηζπαλία, μαλαβιέπσ θαη μαλαραίξνπκαη ηα πάληα θαη η' απνραηξεηώ.” (Pantelis Prevelakis, Τετράκοσια Γράμματα του Καζαντζάκη στην Πρεβελόκη, Athens: Kazantzakis Publications (Patroclos Stavrou) 1984, p. 629)

7 The details on Kazantzakis’ journeys to Spain are from: Pantelis Prevelakis, Τετράκοσια Γράμματα του Καζαντζάκη στην Πρεβελόκη, Athens: Kazantzakis Publications (Patroclos Stavrou) 1984.

8 Ibid., p. 36.
After his second journey to Spain in 1932 - 1933, the accounts of which were published in *I Kathimerini*, Kazantzakis decided to rewrite the old *Σαμηδεύντας* by adding the experience of his recent trip to Spain; furthermore, he expressed for the first time the desire to publish his writings on Spain in a separate book: “Αυτές τις μέρες ξαναγράφω το *Σαμηδεύντας*, συμίγνοντας πλήθος άλλα, στοχασμούς, θύμησες, επεισόδια… Θα θέλει να βγει, με την οριστική τούτη μορφή που τους δίνω τώρα, μια σειρά: 1) *Ισπανία*, 2) *Αγ[ππηνο]-Σινά*-Ιερουσαλήμ, 3) *Ρουσία*, 4) *Toda-Raba*, κι ίσως, αργότερα, άγραφο ακόμα: 5) *Κρήτη*. Information as to how the selection of texts to be included in the second part of *Σαμηδεύντας*-Ισπανία (published as a book in 1937 by *Pyrsos*) was made is provided by Aimilios Hourmouzios in the book review he published in *I Kathimerini* (19 April 1937): “Οι πρώτες αυτές ανταποκρίσεις, συγνωσιμένες, πλουτισμένες –δεν χρησιμοποιώ τη λέξη «αναθεωρημένες» γιατί η πρώτη κατερή εντύπωση παραμένει αυτούσια και στον πιρήνα και στην ακτινοβολία της- αποτελούν το πρώτο μέρος του βιβλίου του. Το δεύτερο που τίτλοφορείται «Βίβλα Λα Μουέρτε», (Ζήτω ο Θάνατος) είναι οι ανταποκρίσεις που διάβασαν οι αναγνώστες της «Καθημερινής» από την τελευταίαν αποστολή της στην Ισπανία, αλλά τακτοποιημένες χωρίς την επείγουσα ανάγκη της ερημερικής επικαιρότητος που ανάγκασε τον απεσταλμένο συγγραφέα να δώσει στο ταξίδι της Ισπανίας, που γινόταν μέσα στον καπνό και στο αίμα του εμφυλίου πολέμου, το χαρακτήρα άρθρων βγαλμένων από την πιο άμεση επικαιρότητα. Εδώ στο βιβλίο, τα

9 Ibid., p. 46. It should be noted that the reports Kazantzakis had sent to *Eleftheros Typos* were in a more puristic language (katharevousa); Kazantzakis, a well-known demoticist, turned the puristic language of the reports into vernacular in the book.

10 Ibid., p. 415.
Accordingly, from the available sources, it appears that Kazantzakis – either on his own initiative or in accordance with the requirements of the publishing houses – tended to exclude from *Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία* the purely journalistic texts that served the aim of a short-term purpose and to keep those that were more literary.

To be more specific, as far as the first part of the book is concerned, some parts of it are later additions, as they were never included in the journalistic material. Furthermore, in some cases, parts of an article dedicated to one place Kazantzakis had visited are added to a section in the book dedicated to another. For example, a part of his trip to Madrid has been added to the section “Βαγηαληνιί”. This does not create problems, as in this specific part Kazantzakis is talking about the wider area of Castile to which both Madrid and Valladolid belong and about Don Quixote and Cervantes that are more general themes. In the second case, a part of Kazantzakis’ visit to Barcelona is included in the “Σεβίιηα” section of the book. Surprisingly, this extract does not deal with a general subject which could fit in anywhere but is a specific description of a scene in a harbour, where strange people come and go. Ultimately, where had Kazantzakis seen this? In Barcelona? In Seville? Or was it another figment of his imagination?

It should be noted that the structure of the first part of the book does not follow the chronological order of Kazantzakis’ travels. The impressions from his first

---

journey are combined with those from his second. Hence, while the first section of the book, entitled “Μπαίνοντας στην Ισπανία” begins with the impressions that were included in the very first text published in *Eleftheros Typos* in 1926, the rest of that section includes thoughts and impressions that were part of the first report published in *I Kathimerini* in 1933. The next two sections, “Μιράντα” and “Μπούργκος” draw on Kazantzakis’ second trip to Spain, while the fourth section entitled “Βαγηαληνιί” is based partly on Kazantzakis’ first visit to Spain and partly on his second. The next three sections, “Σαλαμάνκα”, “Αβίλα” and “Εσκοριάλ” come from Kazantzakis’ second trip to Spain. The main part of the eighth section, “Μαδρίτη”, also draws on this second journey. However, there are also some extracts from his first trip to Spain. The last five sections of the book, “Τολέδο”, “Κόρδοβα”, “Σεβίλια”, “Γρανάδα” and “Ταφρομαχία” together with the brief epilogue all draw on the author’s first trip to Spain.

Furthermore, most of the dialogic parts of the journalistic material, such as Kazantzakis’ interviews and conversations with important personalities or ordinary people, have not been included in the book. The conversation with Isabel de Palencia, “the leader of the feminist movement in Spain”, the conversation with Luis Benjoumea on the dangers in Spain, the interview with Primo de Rivera, the

---

discussion with the poet Juan Ramón Jiménez and even his talk with a nun in the small provincial town where he was waiting for the train to Valencia have been left out of the first part of the book. Most of the dialogues that have been included in the book are Kazantzakis’ conversations with ordinary people.

Biographical details on celebrities, such as Christopher Columbus and El Greco have been eliminated and there are less historical references in the book than in the newspaper articles. Moreover, in the newspaper articles one can find various references to the political situation in Spain, most of which were not included in the book: e.g. the reasons for the decline of Spain; a written message from Primo de Rivera that Kazantzakis quoted in the newspaper article; Kazantzakis’ discourse with Luis Benjumea mentioned above; the views of the republican camp; what he has learned about Primo de Rivera, the interview with him and Kazantzakis’ views on him; or the transition from monarchy (Primo de Rivera and King Alfonso) to republic (Azaña). The fact that many of these texts were omitted from the book creates some ambiguity. For example, the view is expressed in the book that, before formulating an opinion on a subject, it is preferable to listen to two different views. Yet the reader must wonder how Kazantzakis reached that conclusion.

---

can be found in a journalistic text, in which it can be seen that Kazantzakis, after his discussion with Benjumea, a Rivera supporter, then asked for the views of the republican opposition.  

The negative comments on the Spanish found in the journalistic material tend to disappear from the book. Was Kazantzakis attempting to whitewash their image when he decided to publish his writings in a more permanent form, i.e. as a book? Had he perhaps changed his mind about certain issues? Or, had the intervening period left him (as usually happens) with mostly good memories of Spain? In my opinion, there is no easy answer to these questions, though all of the above could constitute reasons for Kazantzakis’ reluctance to include these negative comments in his book.

To be specific, in the travel pieces, Spaniards are imputed with various negative characteristics: they are not passionate about cleanliness and seem to be rather irritable: “Ο ισπανός καθαρίζει ένα μήλον, ρίχνει τις φλούδες κάτω, στο βαγόνι. Αλλ’ όταν εύρη το μήλον χαλασμένο, θυμόνει και του δίδει μια και το πετά έξω από το παράθυρον. Πρέπει να ερεθισθεί. Η καθαριότητής δεν του έχει γίνει πάθος. Βήχει, φτύνει χάμου. Όταν πολυβαστάζει ο βήχας, εξάπτεται, σηκώνεται και φτύνει έξω. Γιατί θύμωσε και θέλει με βίαια να κτυπήσει, να τιμωρήσει το σάλιο.” They are philanderers: “Όταν μπαίνει μια γυναίκα στο βαγόνι, οι νέοι αναστατώνονται, παίρνουν στάσεις ερωτικής, –χάνουν όρες βυθισμένοι σε εκστασικήν, νοθράν ενατένισιν. Λέγω: Κρήμα εις την φλόγα αυτών των ματιών, πώς χάνεται! Οι Ισπανοί,  

26 Towards the end of his life, Kazantzakis visited China, where he caught Asian flu which proved extremely harmful to his already enfeebled body. In a personal conversation with his wife Eleni, who asked him whether he had regretted going to China, Kazantzakis answered in the negative and added: “Περιέργοι είσαστε εσείς οι άνθρωποι. Μόνο το κακό θυμάστε… Εγώ μονάχα το καλό…” (Eleni Kazantzaki, “Μνημόσυνο”, Νέα Εστία, 25 December 1959, p.35).
They have lost their appreciation of their own country: “Εξασαν και την εκτίμησή των εις την μεγάλην πατρίδα των”. They are gamblers: “Μανία τυχοδιωκτική των Ισπανών. Σε κανένα μέρος του κόσμου δεν υπάρχει τέτοια μανία για τα τυχερά παιχνίδια. [...] Υστερα από την Παναγία και την Αμερική, η Λοταρία.” The Spanish who live in the provinces do not have their own views: “Μεγάλη θλίψη να κοιτάξεις πώς περιμένουν το βράδυ, με τι λαχτάρα, στις πλατείες, τις πρωτευουσιανίκες εφημερίδες. Δεν τολμούν να σκεφτούν, να σχηματίσουν γνώμη, να διατυπώσουν επιθυμίες, πριν να διαβάσουν την εφημερίδα της πρωτεύουσας και να δουν τι λέει. Το αίμα έφυγε από το σώμα, τραβήχτηκε στο κεφάλι, η επαρχία και εδώ, όποις παντού μαράθηκε.” As well as being egocentric, undisciplined and anarchistic, the Spanish are also inclined to be envious. “Ο χαρακτήρας του Ισπανού ο τόσο ατομικιστής, ο τόσο ακατάλληλος για πειθαρχία, υποταγή κι οργάνωση, ελεύθερος τώρα, έξπασε χωρίς χαλινάρι, μέσα στην ακαταστασία και τη σφοδρότητα της πρώτης δημοκρατικής πνοής. Ήταν φυσικό όλα τα ταπεινά προβήματα να περιπλακούν επικίνδυνα. [...] Η αναρχία είναι βαθιά ανάγκη του Ισπανού. [...] Γι’ αυτό μια από τις κακίες του Ισπανού είναι ο φθόνος.”

In the journalistic texts, Kazantzakis tends to compare Spaniards with people from other countries and most often with Germans and Russians. In most cases, the comparison is more favourable to the others: “Οι νέοι καλοκτενισμένοι,
καλοπουντρασμένοι, κάθονται όρες, ξεχάσκωτοι, με μεγάλα μάτια και βλέπουν.
Καμιά ανησυχία, τίποτε δεν ταράζει το μυαλό. Χωρίς να θέλω ενθυμούμαι τους νέους
tης Ρωσίας και συγκρίνω. Εκεί πέρα η φλόγα, η μέριμνα, η ταραχή, αι λέσχαι κ’ αι
συζητήσεις, τα χλωμά πρόσωπα, τα τριμένες μπλούζες, τα ξυρισμένα κεφάλια.
Καφενεία δεν υπάρχουν, μήτε χαζέματα εις τους δρόμους, μήτε η λαγγεμένες ματιές
στις γυναίκες."32 Moreover, after describing how dirty the Spanish are, Kazantzakis
notes that: "Ένας Ρώσος σήμερα κάνει προσπάθειαν να είναι καθαρός, έχει στον νουν
του και εφαρμόζει με ενθουσιασμόν νεοφωτίστου ό,τι τελευταία έμαθε. Ένας
Γερμανός είναι καθαρός, σαν μηχανή, χωρίς πια προσπάθεια. Από όλους μου αρέσει
ο Ρώσος· έχει κάτι πιο ανθρώπινο, πιο συμπαθητικόν· η διαρκής αυτή προσπάθεια
δίδει αξίας εις την αρετήν του." One paragraph later, he adds: "Ο λαὸς λέγει: «Όταν
ακούσης ἐνα να επαληθή την πατρίδα του, είναι Αγγλός· όταν ακούσης ἐνα να υβρίζη
tους Γερμανούς είναι Γάλλος· όταν ακούσης ἐνα να μικραίνει την πατρίδα του είνε
Ισπανός.»”33

In addition, though in the book Spanish women are attributed many qualities,
the negative comments on their appearance found in the journalistic texts have been
omitted: "Κάθομαι εις μίαν μικρὰν πλατείαν και κοιτάζω τας νέας μορφᾶς: βίαια
φυσιογνωμία, ξωμά, γοργοκόνιτα μάτια, μακρουλά, ορθογώνια πηγούνια, η
gυναίκες, αι περισσότεραι, άσχημες, θερμές και βαμένες."34 Elsewhere he becomes
even more harsh: "Σε όλη την Ισπανία μάταια ζήτησα τον ηδυπαθή, επικίνδυνο τύπο
tης Ισπανίδας, όπως κάθε άνδρας τον έχει στο νου του. Έχουν ακόμα στην

32 Nikos Kazantzakis, “Γυναίκες και άνδρες της Μαδρίτης - Φλογεροί χωρίς πνευματικήν ανησυχίαν”,
33 Nikos Kazantzakis, “Κόρδοβα, αι Αθήναι της Δόσεως, Το κέντρον του αραβικ. Πολιτισμοό-Σανθαί
κοιλάδαι της Ανδάλουσίας”, op. cit., p. 1.
34 Nikos Kazantzakis, “Γυναίκες και άνδρες της Μαδρίτης - Φλογεροί χωρίς πνευματικήν ανησυχίαν”,
Ανδαλουσία το «Θανατηφόρο», όπως το ονόμασαν, κούνημα της μέσης, τα μάτια τους είναι σχεδόν πάντα οραιότατα. Αλλά γενικά οι Ισπανίδες δεν είναι οραίες: άχαρες, παχειές, με κρεατοελιές μόλις προσχωρήσουν τα χρόνια. Ο, τις σώζει είναι η υγιήλη κτένα κι’ απεπάνω η μαντίλια: αυτή δίδει ανάστημα και μυστηριώδες θέλγητρο. Η μαντίλια είναι η λεοντή της Ισπανίδας: το φρονιμώτερο είναι να μην τους την αφαιρέσετε.“35

Unlike the book, in which all references to Greece have been eliminated, Greece appears quite frequently in the newspaper articles, perhaps because Kazantzakis was addressing the readers of a Greek newspaper. Sometimes, he draws parallels between the two countries: “Αυτή η Ισπανία του Σάντσου δεν είναι ακόμα πολύ γνωστή εις την Ελλάδα. Ρέει, εξελίσσεται, δεν πήρε ακόμα στερεάν όψιν. Κι’ ακριβώς η δραματική αυτή στιγμή της προσπαθείας και της αναζητήσεως που διατρέχει η Ισπανία, ενδιαφέρει την Ελλάδα. Γιατί πολλά σημεία, ψυχικά και πρακτικά μας πλησιάζουν με την μακρυσμένη αδελφή και συγνά η δόξα της κι’ ο ξεπεσιμός μουίζουν με την ιδική μας δόξαν, παλη και νέα, και με τον ιδικόν μας ξεπεσιμό, παλη και νέο. Και πολλά σύγχρονα προβλήματα της είναι όμοια με τα δικά μας. Το πρόβλημα του Κοινοβουλίου, της ελευθερίας, της δημοκρατίας, της διοικήσεως, το οικονομικόν πρόβλημα, η στρατοκρατία. Κι’ αι λύσεις που εκεί μάχονται να τους δώσουν, καλάι ή κακάι, πάντοτε μπορούν να είνε χρήσιμες στην Ελλάδα.”36 Or elsewhere: “Τα καφενεία είναι γιομάτα –όπως και εις την Ελλάδα. [...] “Με πρώτησε για τις γυναίκες στην Ελλάδα. Της είπα: -Οπως παντού, όμοια και εις την Ελλάδα, η γυναίκες είναι σήμερα ανώτεραι από τους άνδρας. Έχουν

Another direct connection with the Greek reality can be seen in the following passage: “To 1898 –όπως εις εμάς το 1897– υπήρξε μέγας οδύνηρός και συνάμα σωτηρίας σταθμός εις την εξέλιξιν της συγχρόνου Ισπανίας.”

To the question of the Spanish poet Juan Ramón Jiménez “What do you do in Greece?”, Kazantzakis replies amongst other things: “[...] Σκ πξόβιεκα θαη σ’ εμάς είναι όπως παντού: Πώς να βρούμε την νέαν μορφήν εις τας νέας μας αγιοίς; Πώς το νέον φοβερόν, μαυρόμενον διονυσιακόν πνεύμα να συμφιλιωθή πάλιν με την «απολλόνειουν» ισορροπίαν –για να γίνη έργον τέχνης; Αυτή είναι η μεγαλητέρα απαξχήλιση των εκλεκτοτέρων νέων εις την Ελλάδα.” The incisive comment that follows is even more interesting: “Ετσι απεκρίθηκα κι’ όμως ήξευρα πως η ανησυχία αυτή που ανέφερα πως σχίζει την καρδιά των νέων μας, δεν υπάρχει στην Ελλάδα. Την εφεύρα την στιγμήν εκείνην, γιατί εντράπηκα.”

There are several other references to Greece in the newspaper material, both implicit and explicit, which have also been excluded from the book.

As far as the second part of the book is concerned, the greater part of the extensive journalistic material from which it derives (forty-seven reports) has not been included in it. The parts that have been kept seem to be the ones that Kazantzakis considered the most representative of his experience in war-torn Spain. On the other hand, parts that have been omitted seem to belong to two different categories: those that describe issues strongly connected to the contemporary reality.
of the war and serve the short-term aims that dominate journalistic texts; examples of this category are: Kazantzakis’ encounter with Franco, details on the different political forces that make up the Nationalist side in Spain, Kazantzakis’ repeated and harshly negative comments on foreign journalists, the role of the Catholic Church in the war and so forth. The second category of texts that have not been included in the book is made up of those parts in which Kazantzakis deals with minor issues which tend to be slightly repetitive: references to problems he frequently faces when asking permission to enter a place, successive transfers from one place to another, short visits to different areas of the country and incidents that take place there, the atrocities of war, discussions (especially with soldiers), references to art and interpolations on democracy, life and death in war-time etc. have all been omitted.

It is likely that many of these issues had to be omitted on account of the book’s length. Not every detail of the forty-seven newspaper articles could have been included in one book. However, in some cases, it is difficult for the reader to get a detailed view of Kazantzakis’ stance on the Spanish Civil War. For example, his affinity with Franco and the Falangists, to which I will refer more extensively in the third chapter of my thesis, is not apparent in the book. Indeed, the omission of Kazantzakis’ positive comments on Franco and the Falange might indicate that he later reconsidered these thoughts.

After comparing the book with the newspaper material, it can be seen that the material selected for inclusion in the book was more literary than journalistic. However, as the parts that have been left out were not only ones serving short-term aims, it appears that in some cases, Kazantzakis either changed his views or attempted to whitewash the image he had given of Spain. The exclusion of various parts of the
journalistic material often leads to ambiguity and, especially as regards the second part of the book, does not give the reader a comprehensive view of Kazantzakis’ position on certain issues. Hence, I argue that Kazantzakis’ travel book on Spain deserves to be published in a more complete version, which will include all the reports he sent to the newspapers. As I will try to demonstrate in the next chapter, apart from their literary value, which has been generally acknowledged, Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain also function as the testimony of a Greek intellectual, who contrived to acquaint Greeks with the art, literature, architecture, history and politics of Spain as well as the character of Spaniards.
Chapter 2

Themes and reflections in Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain

Kazantzakis sets his agenda from the very first part of his writings on Spain (both in the newspaper reports and in the book). All the themes he is going to deal with appear in a single paragraph: landscapes (“πεδιάδες”, “κοιλάδες”), people (“Άντρες”, “Γυναίκες”), buildings (“τζαμιά”, “εκκλησίες”, “παλάτια μουσουλμανικά”) and art (“μουσική, μονόσερτη άραπική”, “Μουρίλλου”, “Βελάσκεθ”, “Γκόγια”, “Γκρέκο”).¹ In this chapter I intend to explore firstly the development of the above-mentioned themes that recur in Kazantzakis’ travel pieces on Spain and secondly his reflections on several issues which arise during his journeys. For this purpose, I consider it important to divide the chapter into two sections, namely “Themes” and “Reflections”, so as to provide a more comprehensive view of Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain. Furthermore, it should be noted that I will examine these writings as a whole, i.e. both the newspaper accounts and the book.

2.1. Themes

In this section I will deal with the following recurrent themes in Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain: Spanish literature and art, Spaniards, public buildings in Spain, Spanish history and politics and Spanish landscapes. The order in which these themes

have been arranged was decided in terms of their individual significance; more particularly, I shall start with the themes that occur most frequently and end with those that are not part of the author’s main focus.

**Spanish literature and art**

Spanish literature and art seem to play a dominant role in Kazantzakis’ travelogues about Spain. Paradoxically, though he himself is not interested in creating a work of art in writing about Spain, as he states in the preface to *Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία*, Spanish literature and painting, attracted above all else his attention during his travels in the country. Moreover, the first thing he asks in his first conversation on the second trip concerns two of the best-known literary creations of Spanish culture, namely Carmen and Don Quixote. Even if this conversation is a figment of Kazantzakis’ imagination, it shows once again that Spanish literature and art were among his primary interests.

A predominant figure in Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain is undoubtedly Don Quixote, the well known protagonist of the eponymous novel by Cervantes. As Alexandra Samouil has shown, Don Quixote first emerges as a character in Kazantzakis’ oeuvre in the book *Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία*. According to the same scholar, Don Quixote’s philosophy, which could be summarized in Kazantzakis’ words “Μνάχα η μέσα μας επιθυμία είναι αλήθεια και ζωή”, could be Kazantzakis’

---

2 “Η εξομολόγηση τούτη μακάρι να ‘χει την αξία μιας καλής πράξης’ τίποτα μεγαλύτερο δεν πεθυμάτως. Γιατί δεν κάνω τέχνην αφήνω την καρδιά μου να φωνάζει.” Ibid., p.8.

3 Ibid., p.18.
own motto. For Kazantzakis, not only did Don Quixote represent Spain, but Spain was also identified with Don Quixote.

As Alexandra Samouil has rightly argued, Cervantes’ novel is more than a thematic source for Kazantzakis. Thus, apart from functioning as a symbol of Spain, Don Quixote appears in Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία as a comic mask for the tragic soul of Spanish people, an idealist, a dreamer who pursues chimeras, one who symbolizes human destiny, and one of God’s two masks (the other, according to Kazantzakis, is that of Don Juan). Don Quixote and Sancho Panza represent the soul of Spain. Kazantzakis likens both El Greco and Columbus to Don Quixote. For Kazantzakis, Don Quixote, Sancho Panza and Dulcinea symbolize human nature through the ages; in the very first section of the book, there is a discussion with a young Spaniard, which, whether real or imaginary, shows how the characters of Cervantes’ novel have been transformed into diachronic symbols of the Spaniard: “–Κι ο Δον Κιρώτης; –Μηχανικός. –Δεν είναι αιώνιος; –Είναι. Μα αλλάξει. Τότε ήταν οπότης. […] Τώρα είναι μηχανικός. […] –Κι η Δουλισνέα; –Αλλαξε κι αυτή. Κατέβηκε από τα σύννεφα

4 Alexandra Samouil, Ιδιόγενος της Ιδέας, Η περιπλάνηση του Δον Κιρώτη στην Ελληνική λογοτεχνία, Polis, Athens: 2007, pp. 192-205. As Alexandra Samouil shows, Kazantzakis tried to write a script for a film about Don Quixote, which never came to fruition. He also translated a poem by Antonio Machado about Unamuno as Don Quixote published in 1933 and wrote a poem entitled “Don Quixote” in 1934 which was published in 1938. In the latest edition of Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία, this poem has been placed between the first and the second part. It is also the eleventh poem in the collection Σεξελινεία published in 1960. Don Quixote is also present in Οδύσσεια, the Kazantzakis’ epic written between 1925 and 1935 and published in 1938, in Αναορά στον Γκρέκο (1961) and more implicitly in Βίος και ποιήματα του Άλεξ Ζορμπά (1946).

5 “Ήρθε τέλος ο μυστικός καρπός, η βαθύ σύνθεση, ο ήρωας όλης τούτης της γης, που έσμεζε όλα τα παράταρα, εφημερία πρόσωπα, σ’ ένα πρόσωπο αιώνιο, που αντιπροσωπεύει πια την Ισπανία στα μεγάλα συνέδρια του καρπού και του τόπου: ο άγιος μεγαλομάρτυρας Δον Κιρώτης” and “Η Ισπανία είναι ο Δον Κιρώτης ανάμεσα στα άθλη” (Nikos Kazantzakis, Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία, op. cit., p.14) Or later: “Ναι το αληθινό βαθύ δράμα του Δον Κιρώτη, δηλαδή της Ισπανίας” (Ibid., p. 18). Or later: “Μερικοί όμως διανοούμενοι τινάχτηκαν αποφασίστειν. Αίτησε στην αρχή, στιγά στιγά πληθώναν, περικυκλώσαν τον ετοιμάζοντα Δον Κιρώτη [ολο. την Ισπανία] κι άρχισαν να κάνουν συμβολικό πώς να τον σώσουν” (Ibid., p.71).

6 Alexandra Samouil, Ιδιόγενος της Ιδέας, Η περιπλάνηση του Δον Κιρώτη στην Ελληνική λογοτεχνία, op. cit., p.107.
Another personality from the world of art who appears and reappears in Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain is El Greco. Kazantzakis recalls several paintings he saw in Spain and provides details that enable the reader to feel as if s/he is standing in front of them. They include: “View of Toledo”, “The Apostle Bartholomew”, “The Apostle Simon”, “St John the Evangelist”, “The Resurrection”, “The Martyrdom of Saint Maurice” etc. The greater part of the section “Τολέδο” is dedicated to El Greco. In a way the painter compensates for the dirty streets, the ugly women, the unbearable mass of tourists and the dullness of Toledo. Kazantzakis visits the painter’s house, observes the landscapes El Greco saw and gives biographical details about him starting with his death. He refers to the characteristic light in El Greco’s paintings, to his agony and to the intensity of his portraits. Finally, he endeavours to explain the recent popularity of El Greco. After an extensive essay on art in general, he concludes that El Greco was a painter in a transitional period, which he attempted to express through his paintings. This explained why El Greco had become popular again when Kazantzakis visited Spain and, indeed, why El Greco will remain popular in any transitional period. Moreover, when Kazantzakis draws his conclusions after his first

7 Nikos Kazantzakis, Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία, op. cit., pp. 16-17.
8 At this point, it should be mentioned that in 1932 Achilleus Kyrou published a book on Theotokopoulos (Achilleus Kyrou, Δομήνικος Θεοτοκόπουλος Κρης, Athens: Ekdotikos Oikos Dimitrakou 1932), in which the scholar stressed the importance of the “Byzantine Greekness” of the painter. In reply to that, Giannis Miliadis, wrote a book review in 1933 (Giannis Miliadis, “«Αρηιιέσο Κύρου: "Δομήνικος Θεοτοκόπουλος" Εκδοτικός Οίκος Δημητράκου. Αθήνα, 1932»”, Nea Estia, vol. 13, issue 146, 1933, pp. 116-118), in which he expressed disapproval of Kyrou’s book; the latter, according to Miliadis, did not deal with El Greco’s painting as art, but as a national event. The dispute went on and it is considered to spring from the trend toward Greekness that dominated the decade of the 1930s (for more information on the subject see Dimitris Tziouas, Οι μεταμορφώσεις του εθνικισμού και το ιδεολόγημα της ελληνικότητας στο Μεσοπόλεμο, Athens: Odysseas 1989). Kazantzakis, who during that period travelled to Spain and eulogized El Greco, could not have remained silent. In a letter to Prevelakis, who had sent him Kyrou’s book, he wrote: “Τον Κύρο θα τον διαβάσω και θα Σας τον επιστρέψω. Μα μετά του άριστα, με ανθίσει.” (Pantelis Prevelakis, Τρευκόσπιτα Γράμματα του Καζαντζάκη στον Πρεβελάκη, op. cit., p. 267.)
journey to Spain, he admits: “Πέντε είναι αι ανώταται συγκινήσεις που μου έδωκε η Ισπανία: η Αλάμπρα, η ταυρομαχία, το τζαμί της Κόρδοβας, μια γυναίκα που είδα στην Κόρδοβα κι ’ επάνω απ’ όλα, στην κορυφή ο Γκρέκο.”9 [The stress is mine].

Kazantzakis’ appreciation of the art of El Greco is even more evident in his writings on the Spanish Civil War. Toledo, which had disappointed him on his first trip with its dullness and filled him with embarrassment, because he had expected it to be as El Greco had painted it, had become a painting by El Greco during the war: “Το Τολέδο είχε γίνει ένας πίνακας του Γκρέκο με φλόγινα παλλόμενα σχήματα, με πανύψηλους ανέπλαυους τοίχους, παράλογο, υπέρλογο, ρυμοτομημένο σύμφωνα με μιαν αλλοπρόσολή αλαφροδικιωτή αρχιτεκτονική. Το θέαμα είταν τόσο γοητευτικό που δε μου’ κανε καρδιά να φύγω. […] Το Τολέδο είχε γίνει παί άγριο, όπως του ταιριάζει, βρήκε επιτέλους το σώμα που ανταποκρίνεται στην πολυμική αγέρωχη ψυχή του.”10 He even recalls and quotes El Greco’s own words, «Βαγκέστισα πια!»11 which express the way he feels: he was bored of seeing Toledo as a “jolly provincial city full of merchants, photographers, priests”12; now that Toledo had become ruins, change could finally take place. Later, in the section “Η Μαδρίτη που χάνεται (Α’)”, he seems to express a different view: “Κι ο Γκρέκο; Ο Γκρέκο μέσα στα κανόνια, στις πυρκαγιές και στα αίματα, ο μεγάλος Κρητικός, χάθηκε. […] μα τώρα ποιος νοιάζεται για τους Αποστόλους του και τους αγγέλους του μέσα στο φοβερό τούτον αδερφοστρόβιλο,”13

10 Nikos Kazantzakis, Taξιδεύονταξ-Ισπανία, op. cit., p. 163.
11 Ibid, p. 163.
The answer to who cares about these things should perhaps be: “Kazantzakis” as can be seen in several parts of the journalistic texts that have been omitted from the book: In his article of 1 December 1936, Kazantzakis asks for a permit to visit the Alcázar. He says to the colonel: “–Θα ήθελα να πεταχτώ, πρόσθεσα, στο Τολέδο, να δω τα ηρωικά απομεινάρια του Αλκάθαρ. Να δω αν λείπη τίποτα κι’ από τον πατριώτη μου τον Γκρέκο.”¹⁴ Later, in his article of 16 December 1936, he admits: “Δυστυχώς δεν αναπνέω αποκλειστικά το σύγχρονον αντιαισθητικόν αγέρα, παλιές παλαιώκες αγάπες μ’ εμποδίζουν να ζήσω άρτια τον σημερινό σιδερένιο αιώνα όπου μπήκαμε. Και κάποτε-κάποτε –σπάνια τ’ ομολογώ με υπερηφάνεια– θυμούμαι μέσα στον πυρετό του ισπανικού παλμού, περνώντας από την Ιλλέσκας, κοιτάζοντας από το Αλκάθαρ, τον πανύψηλο, μυστικόπαθο, πνευματικόν αθλητή Γκρέκο.”¹⁵ In the middle of the civil war, Kazantzakis visits the church of Santo Tomé in Toledo, where the painting “The burial of Count Orgaz” is, to see if it remains intact. Then, he visits the “House of El Greco” and wonders: “Άξα γε σώζεται εκεί το «Αποστολάτο» του;”¹⁶ As he enters the house, he asks the caretaker: “–Πληγώθηκε κανένας;” And, while the caretaker answers referring to people, Kazantzakis notes: “Νόμισε πως ρωτούσα για ανθρώπους. Πού να ξέρη πως ρωτούσα αν πληγώθηκε κανένας Απόστολος!”¹⁷ Then, he visits the Ospedale di Tavera, outside Toledo, where four of El Greco’s paintings are kept. Unfortunately, he does not find them in their places and feels inconsolable. Certainly, the references to El Greco and to Kazantzakis’ concern as to the fate of his masterpieces fate are not limited to the above-mentioned examples.

In his writings on Spain Kazantzakis mainly focuses on two different categories of artist: poets/prose writers and painters. The poets/prose writers are: Abu Ali Sina Balkhi or Ibn Sina more commonly known by his Latinized name Avicenna, who was a Muslim mathematician and poet; Don Miguel Unamuno, whom he names “η πιο παλλόμενη και πιστή προσωποποίηση της αιώνιας Ισπανίας”\(^{18}\), the well-known Spanish dramatist of the Golden Age, Pedro Calderón de la Barca y Henao; “the great” Luis de Góngora y Argote, a Baroque lyric poet; Francisco Gómez de Quevedo y Santibáñez Villegas and the Italian poet Dante whom he compares with Cervantes; the lyric poet Fray Luis Ponce de León; Lope de Vega, a Baroque playwright and poet; Antonio Machado, a Spanish poet; the poet Juan Ramón Jiménez Mantecón; Ángel Ganivet García, a writer and Spanish diplomat; José Augusto Trinidad Martínez Ruíz, a poet and writer; the poet, dramatist and theatre-director Federico García Lorca; the dramatist and novelist Valle-Inclán; the Basque writer Pío Baroja y Nessi and the writer Gabriel Miró Ferrer.

The painters that Kazantzakis mentions are: Bartolomé Esteban Murillo, Diego Rodríguez de Silva y Velázquez, Francisco José de Goya y Lucientes, El Greco and the German Albrecht Dürer. Kazantzakis says that Madrid is naked like the Maja, referring to the well-known painting by Goya, “The Nude Maja”. He also tries to explain what led Goya to create the “Black Paintings” and recalls the famous painting “Saturn devouring his son”. Speaking about Goya, he takes the opportunity to comment on the fundamental and persistent way in which the artist worked with his own environment, namely, with what he saw around him. Finally, Kazantzakis refers to the Spanish sculptor Gregorio Hernández.

The multitude of references to literature and art in Kazantzakis’ texts on Spain indicates how much the author was attracted by them. As I have endeavoured to show, the theme of art is central to Kazantzakis’ thought and dominates the greater part of his writings on Spain. The two figures that pervade his writings on Spain are, undoubtedly, Don Quixote from the world of literature and El Greco from the world of painting. These two figures, together with the plethora of literary men and artists to which Kazantzakis refers, enable the reader to acquire an overall view of Spanish art and literature through the eyes of an author who was knowledgeable about these things.

#### Spaniards

During his second trip to Spain, Kazantzakis wrote from Madrid to Prevelakis:

“Να μπορούσα να’ μενα σε μια μοναξία εννιά μήνες και να ταξιδεύω τρεις, θα’ ταν θαρρώ ακριβώς ό,τι μου χρειάζεται. Επαφή με ανθρώπους, κοινωνική ζωή ή δράση κλπ. δε με γνωμοποιούν, μου είναι πράγματα ανώφελα και εξεταστικά.”

However, people are an inextricable part of Kazantzakis’ travel-writing on Spain. Not only does he observe, describe and analyze them, but he also enters into discussion with them. In this section, I will divide the people with whom Kazantzakis engages into two categories: ordinary Spanish people and Spanish celebrities. As I will attempt to demonstrate, people function in two ways in these travel pieces: they are either representing Kazantzakis’ own views, which are thereby expressed in a more indirect way, or they are the ones who enable him to formulate an opinion.

---

Kazantzakis often observes and debates with people who come from the lower classes: in the first section, he has a brief chat with a woman who had come to Spain from France, where she had been working in the vineyards. Kazantzakis seems to identify with her because, as he declares, he is a worker too, but from other vineyards. At this point, it is hard to tell whether Kazantzakis was referring to the fact that he was actually working for a newspaper or whether the comment is part of his philosophy of life and the way he viewed himself. The long conversation with Don Manuel, a modern Spanish man, whether real or imaginary as mentioned above, is a means of presenting the way the traditional symbols of Spain have changed over the years. In Miranda, Kazantzakis meets an old peasant and his wife and inquires of them about life in a democracy. At this point, Kazantzakis seizes the opportunity to explain why he was visiting Spain (something he also mentions in the preface to the book). Thanks to the old couple and their belief ("Όλα είναι του Χάρου!")21, Kazantzakis realizes that from a simple peasant to Calderón and Cervantes, the consciousness of nothing and the belief that life is a dream are the most representative characteristics of the Spanish soul. In the section “Τολέδο” he meets an old woman in the “House of El Greco” who reminds him of the utilitarianism and the self-interest that characterize ordinary people.

Kazantzakis seems to be deeply interested in the characteristics of the Spaniard; hence, his texts on Spain provide the reader with a portrait of Spanish people. Spanish people are characterized by Kazantzakis in his first journey to Spain as “φιλογεράς ιδιωσυγκρασίας χωρίς πνευματικήν ανησυχίαν”22. Their egocentric

21 Ibid., p. 22.
character constitutes one of the reasons for the Spanish decline. They have degenerated; from heroic “Don Quixotes” they have become unheroic, practical and sensible “Sanchos”. They are indifferent, not keen on cleanliness and philanderers; they waste their efforts on insignificant things and do not appreciate their country.

On his second journey to Spain, Kazantzakis presents Spaniards quite differently: the real Spaniard is reticent; in order to start talking he has to be stimulated. Furthermore, through his friend Don Manuel’s words, we learn that Kazantzakis has probably changed his previous view that the Spaniards have become “Sanchos” and has realized the duality of the Spanish soul: “Η ισπανική ψυχή εἶνε Κιχοτοσάντσος. Η Σαντσοκιχότης. Εξαρτάται από την εποχή. Πότε υπερτερεί το ένα στοιχείο, πότε το άλλο.” Later, he adds another element in the portrait of the Spaniard, namely that of his love for gambling. The two virtues that Kazantzakis distinguishes in Spaniards are their deep human feelings and their stoicism, both of which derive from their Eastern, passive appreciation of reality. Spaniards are characterized by him as egocentric, proud, brave and simultaneously unable to collaborate, to work on a common project, to have the discipline to attempt a long-term task. Maybe the most representative phrase that demonstrates how Kazantzakis views Spaniards in 1933 is the following: “Η άλλη ψυχή, η ισπανική, –ανισόδρομη,
Moreover, Kazantzakis argues that the real Spaniard still retains deep inside of him his nomadic instinct and despises the peasantry. He goes even deeper into the Spanish character and observes the (only superficially) great contradiction of the Spanish soul: the co-existence of a passion for life with the feeling that everything is meaningless, since death lies in ambush. In Spain, Kazantzakis realizes, it is impossible to dislike a single person, no matter what s/he argues, because: “Οι Ισπανοί έχουν μια φλόγα στα μάτια τόσο βίατά, που μπροστά της όλες οι διαφορές κ’ οι ιδεολογίες εξαφανίζονται.” Furthermore, he adds, anarchy is a deep-seated need for the Spaniard and envy one of his disadvantages.

During the Spanish Civil War, namely on his third visit to Spain, Kazantzakis again observes the Spaniards’ characteristics and adds to the portrait he had already composed. One of the very first things he notices is the fact that the formerly passive Spaniards have woken up. Kazantzakis concludes that the war is part of the Spanish character. Furthermore, he confirms his already formulated view and stresses the Spaniards’ inability to remain disciplined and cooperate. Another characteristic that Kazantzakis attributes to Spaniards is their inability to remain alone and their desire to

have company and enter into conversation. They are keen on disagreeing but extremely polite. Kazantzakis repeats his belief as to the duality of the Spanish character, namely the fact that he is Don Quixote and Sancho at the same time.

Women seem to attract Kazantzakis’ attention rather frequently. He observes them, describes them and discusses with them. Two examples of this are as follows:

“… γριές στρίγγλες με χοντρές κρεατοελίς, γελαστές, μαυρομάτες, με παχύ χνούδι κοπέλες.” And: “Στράφηκα κι είδα: όλες οι γυναίκες είχαν καρφώσει στα μαλλιά τους ένα μπουκέτο γιασεμί.” Kazantzakis goes even further and endeavours to reach conclusions on their character and their role in society: e.g. in the section “Μπούργκος”, Kazantzakis describes a woman’s face as expressing passion and death. It seems, he says, that God is being incarnated in the bowels of a Spanish woman. In the section “Μαδρίτη”, he describes the passion in the expression of Spanish women, their erotic movements, their utter femininity. However, he explains that this is only on the surface. Spanish women, according to Kazantzakis, are not looking for a lover, but for a husband. Their most important role is that of the mother. They represent sense and balance, in contrast with Spanish men, who tend to be

---

39 Nikos Kazantzakis, “Το πολιτικόν πρόβλημα της Ισπανίας”, I Kathimerini, 5 January 1937, p. 1. “Και εδώ πάλι αποκαλύπτεται η ακατανόητη στον Ευρωπαϊκό ψυχολόγο του Ισπανού. Από τη μια μεριά γενικότατα συνήθη έννοια, δικτατορικές υπηρετικές ιδεολογίες και συνάμα ιστορικές λεπτομέρειες, αγάπη για τα πιο καθημερινά και κοινά μικρόπραγματα της ζωής. Ο Σάντος. Το εξέπαινε, στον Ισπανό, δεν ακέμε ανδρή μήμα από το γελοίο συνυπάρχει.”
40 Ibid., p.100.
dreamers. Their influence on their country is great. In Seville, Kazantzakis again praises the passion and the erotic movements of Spanish women, whom he compares with the mythic sirens.

Kazantzakis also deals with many important personalities in Spain: Francisco Giner de los Ríos, the philosopher who established the “Institute of free teaching” and attempted to mould students who would fight for a “new” Spain. Kazantzakis dedicates most of the section “Άβηια” to another significant personality of Spain, Saint Teresa; he gives biographical details and praises the example of her life. He also writes about the intellectuals of Spain who tried, after 1898, to save the “ill Don Quixote”, namely Spain. These were: Joaquin Costa, Ángel Ganivet García, Miguel de Unamuno y Jugo and José Ortega y Gasset. Kazantzakis gives some information on each of them and at the same time expresses his admiration for them. He also mentions those who contributed to the above-mentioned endeavour: Antonio Machado, Ramón María del Valle-Inclán y de la Peña, Azorín, Pío Baroja y Nessi and Miró. Later, in the section “Σεβίιηα”, Kazantzakis refers to Spinoza and quotes some of his words. Furthermore, when he tries to define the excitement that the Alhambra had aroused in him, he refers again to Spinoza and to Loyola. He also mentions Christopher Columbus and speaks with bitterness about his tragic fate. Finally, Kazantzakis makes a long reference to the philosophy of Don Juan, who constitutes one of the two masks of God (the other being Don Quixote).42

41 In the article of 15 December 1926 published in Eleftheros Typos, Kazantzakis visits Isabel de Palencia, the leader of the feminist movement at that time in Spain and discusses the subject of women in Spain and women in Greece with her; it seems that his views on Spanish women first expressed in the article of 28 May 1933 in I Kathimerini and later in the book Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία, were strongly influenced by this conversation.
42 According to the scholar Adèle Bloch, masks are omnipresent in Kazantzakis’ works; the author’s fascination with masks can be traced to his visit to Berlin in post-World War I years, when a display of
Spaniards, as I have attempted to demonstrate, not only attracted Kazantzakis’ attention, but they seem to dominate his texts on Spain. Since Kazantzakis was one of the first Greek authors to write about Spain and acquaint Greek people with a country and a culture generally unknown to them, it is obvious that he would endeavour to describe the basic elements that constitute the Spanish character. Moreover, the references to a plethora of celebrities indicate both his will to present the cream of Spanish intellectuals to his Greek readership society and, once again, the fact that he was a traveller extremely well-informed about the country he was visiting.

Public buildings in Spain

There are three main categories of buildings that attracted Kazantzakis’ attention: buildings related to an important person, buildings strongly connected with religion and palaces. The author observes them and describes their features. Buildings frequently give rise to Kazantzakis’ reflections on several issues, which I will discuss in more detail in the section “Reflections”.

One of the buildings belonging to the first category is the house of El Greco, situated in the Jewish quarter. El Greco’s house stimulated Kazantzakis to make brief

---


43 There were four Greek writers who first dealt with Spain and its culture: Zacharias Papantoniou, Spyros Melas, Kostas Ouranis and Nikos Kazantzakis. For a comparison of Kazantzakis with Ouranis and Papantoniou, see Chapter 4 of my thesis.

44 For more information on the reasons why Spain did not penetrate Greek literature and remained unknown among the Greek readership (in contrast to France, Italy, Germany, England and Russia), see Petros Charis, “Η Ισπανία στην Ελληνική λογοτεχνία”, Nea Estia, 24 (1938), pp. 71-75.

reference to the persecution of the Jews that took place at the end of the fifteenth century and, a more extensive one to El Greco, his life, work and popularity.\(^\text{46}\) In the same vein, Kazantzakis describes the small, modest house of Cervantes in Valladolid, which is at the heart of the city and the most precious part of it: “Το σπίτι αυτό είναι η μυστική καρδιά του Βαγιαντολίδ, ό,τι πολυτιμότερο έχει –γιατί σε αυτό μια φορά κατοίκησε και υπέφερε ένας μεγάλος συγγραφέας. Ο Θερβάντες.”\(^\text{47}\) The description of Cervantes’ house functions as a suitable introduction for Kazantzakis to speak about the great Spanish author.

However, churches and mosques tend to attract him even more: in Miranda, he visits the church of Saint Nicholas that used to be a mosque. In this church the head of a saint reminds him of an African mask, which gives rise to a long interpolation about Africa, the ancestor of all;\(^\text{48}\) in Burgos, the Gothic cathedral fills him with awe and makes him think of the great era of creativity and comment on Spanish religion; in Valladolid, he finds many old churches and expresses his views on the Baroque and how art should be; in Madrid, he enters a church and describes its Crucifix in detail; in Córdoba, he visits the Mezquita (the Roman Catholic cathedral and former mosque) which really touches him and after a detailed description, he sings the praises of the Muslim religion in contrast to Christianity, of which he highly disapproves; in Seville, he visits the giant cathedral, in which he views a painting of Saint Francis and another of Saint Christopher and sees the tomb of Christopher Columbus.


\(^{48}\) Nikos Kazantzakis, \textit{Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία}, op. cit., p. 20. It should be remembered that this interpolation is a later addition; in the newspaper report (“Μηξάληα ηνπ Έβξνπ”, \textit{I Kathimerini}, 22 May 1933, p. 1) after observing the African mask, Kazantzakis talks about the Spaniards’ love of gambling.
Kazantzakis generally makes only brief references to palaces and most of the time he compares their glorious past with their inglorious present. The palace in Burgos, where the queen of Castile and Leon Isabella welcomed Columbus, was deserted. Kazantzakis, though he sees the difference between the past and the present, reins in his imagination and does not go on to describe an imaginary version of Columbus’ admission into the palace. A visit to the monastery and royal palace El Escorial, situated forty-five kilometres north-west of Madrid and built by Philip II of Spain prompts Kazantzakis to recall its history and provide information about various people who are related to it in one way or another (e.g. Philip II, King Alfonso, Manuel Azaña). According to Kazantzakis, the Madinat al-Zahra, located in Córdoba, used to be a “magic palace”, an “earthly paradise”. Now he observes its ruins and contemplates death; The Alcázar of Seville, an Arabic royal palace, really impressed him with its extremely rare fusion of ecstasy and precision. The Alcázar gave rise to thoughts on the Muslim religion, which Kazantzakis appears to praise highly, especially by comparison with Christianity. Finally, the Alhambra, the well-known Moorish citadel and palace in Granada, was one of the greatest joys that the whole Spanish experience offered him. For Kazantzakis, the Alhambra represented the juncture between architecture and music, a profound connection between geometry and metaphysics and erotic suggestibility.

Though Spanish culture and Spaniards seem to constitute the two basic themes Kazantzakis deals with during his travels to Spain, buildings are not unimportant to him. Most of the time, the author attempts to describe them in words and provides details on their history and their special features. Finally, buildings quite frequently

49 “Κράτησα τη φαντασία να μην ξεχνθεί σ’ύπόκολα παρθένια –πώς μπήκε από την πόρτα τούτη και γύμωσε την αυλή με όλη την παρθενική φανταστική συνοδεία του ο Κολόμπος, ο «Δόν Κιρέοτης της Θάλασσας»…” (Nikos Kazantzakis, Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία, op. cit., p. 33).
give Kazantzakis cause for reflection and enable him to express his views on several issues.

**Spanish Politics and History**

Though the political and historical references detected in the journalistic accounts have been to a large extent eliminated in the book, I consider it important to deal with them, since they constitute an inextricable and invaluable part of Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain. Through his observations and his comments, as well as his views on the Spanish Civil War that will be examined in the next chapter, the reader is informed about Spanish history and the political situation of the country in the decade 1926-1936. Furthermore, Kazantzakis’ political comments allow the researcher to examine developments in his political stance during the above-mentioned period. Thus, in the next few paragraphs, I will endeavour to illustrate Kazantzakis’ observations on the historical and political reality of Spain.\(^{50}\)

In the very first account Kazantzakis sent to *Eleftheros Typos* from Spain (1926), he described the political problems that afflicted the country in the post-war period. Parliamentary democracy had been suspended and a system of dictatorship under Primo de Rivera was endeavouring to enforce its will by eliminating freedom. Kazantzakis claimed that the problems Spain was facing were similar to those of Greece and the solutions the Spanish government was attempting to provide might be

---

\(^{50}\) Since I will devote the next chapter of my dissertation to Kazantzakis’ view of the Spanish Civil War, which is directly related to Spanish history and politics, I will not refer here to the historical and political comments Kazantzakis made during his third trip to the country (1936).
useful to Greece. The author acknowledged two virtues in the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera: promptitude and audacity, both of which, according to him, were unattainable by a “democratic government, which is by nature cumbersome and timid.”

When Kazantzakis first visits Madrid, he observes the indifference people show towards political issues. He quotes a written message from Primo de Rivera and listens to Don Luis Benjoumea talking about the positive changes that the Rivera dictatorship had brought. Then, he listens to the views of the Democrats and, after that, he interviews Primo de Rivera. In his last report from Spain in 1927, Kazantzakis recapitulates and notes that the Spain of 1927 was not under a Fascist regime, but under a militarist one. The current political system eliminated freedom, but ensured safety, order and discipline. However, as Kazantzakis predicts, the present situation was temporary and the “smouldering” problems would flare up again.

In the second series of journalistic pieces Kazantzakis sent from Spain to *I Kathimerini*, the political references are far fewer than those on his first journey to the

51 “Κι’ ακριβώς η δραματική αυτή στιγμή της προσπαθείας και της αναζητήσεως που διατρέχει η Ισπανία, ενδιαφέρει την Ελλάδα. […] Και πολλά σύγχρονα προβλήματα της είναι όμως μαζί μας. […] Κ’ αι λύσεις που εκεί μάγκοντα κατεγορούνται, καλαί ή κακαί, πάντοτε μπορούν να είναι χρήσιμες στην Ελλάδα.” (Nikos Kazantzakis, “Εις την άλλην χρεσάνυσιν της δικτατορίας - Η Ισπανία με τα δύο πρόσωπα”, Eleftheros Typos, 12 December 1926, p. 1)


54 Kazantzakis explains the difference between them: “Ο Φασίσμος είναι σύστημα υπευθύνων απαντήσεων σε όλα τα προβλήματα της πολιτικής και κοινωνικής συμβίωσης των ανθρώπων. Καταργεί τις μικρές ελευθερίες των πολιτών, γιατί πιστεύει πως έτσι μόνο θα σώσει τη μεγάλη ελευθερία του συνόλου. Ο μελετημένος είναι ο απότομος επέμβατας ανεπανόρετος και ανεπανόρετος στρατηγός που μισούν την ελευθερία, μικρή και μεγάλη, γιατί μισούν το πνεύμα.” (Nikos Kazantzakis, “Εις την Ισπανίαν της Κάρμουν και του Πρίμου ντε Ρήφαρα - Επίλογος και Συμπεράσματα μιας επιτοπίου ερευνής”, Eleftheros Typos, 7 January 1927, p. 1)
country. Moreover, it seems that it was not his intention to deal with the political situation in Spain: “Γράφω μια σειρά άρθρα για την Ισπανία — για την Ισπανία την culturelle— σκολειά, πνευματική κίνηση, προγρές σοσιαλ ουρο πλ.” From Don Manuel, who represents the contemporary Spanish man, Kazantzakis learns that there are now three main political figures in Spain: Macià, Unamuno and Azaña. He also refers to the collapse of the dictatorship and the first difficult moments of democracy that lead to a chaotic situation mainly caused by the inability of the different ethnic groups to cooperate. The two main centres of political power are socialist Madrid and anarchist Barcelona. Since 1931, Spain had been struggling to form a new type of society and government that would be neither extreme left nor extreme right. The middle course that Spain decided to follow was based on the leftist tendencies that sprang from the social needs of the time. In the Spain of 1933 monarchy has been abolished and democracy has now been established. Kazantzakis dedicates one of his reports to the prime-minister Azaña (one of the few political references that were incorporated in the book), mainly referring to Azaña’s past life that did not presage the crucial role he would play in the future. Kazantzakis’ view on Azaña is as follows: “ένας αρχηγός αμείλικτος, με καταπληκτική διαύγεια μυαλού, με μοναδική πολιτική ευστροφία, στις πρώτες, τις πιο δύσκολες στιγμές της νέας Δημοκρατίας.”

The historical references are mostly brief. In the first report Kazantzakis sent from Spain in 1926, he referred briefly to the tribes that had passed through Spain (Iberians, Celts, Greeks, Carthaginians, Romans, Vandals, Visigoths, Arabs, Jews) and contributed to the formation of the various modern Spanish ethnicities (Catalans, Castilians, Basques, Andalusians). He also summarized the history of Spain from the

---

55 Pantelis Prevelakis, Ταυτοκόσμια Γράμματα του Καζαντζάκη στον Πρεβελάκη, op. cit., p. 356.
56 Nikos Kazantzakis, “Μαλνπέι Αζάληα ν Μπζηεξηώδεο”, I Kathimerini, 3 June 1933, p. 2.
first years of Christianity to the defeat of the Spanish armada in 1588. In Barcelona Kazantzakis listened to a Catalan narrating the history of Catalonia from the fifteenth century till the present day, when Catalonia was fighting for its independence.\(^{57}\) Kazantzakis also refers to the crucial year 1898, when the Spanish fleet was destroyed in Cuba, during the Spanish-American war, only to explain how Spain emerged in the medievalism and the political anarchy of the nineteenth century and to spotlight the “Generation of 1898” and its contribution to Spain’s recovery. The Jewish quarter where the house of El Greco was situated in Toledo prompts him to speak briefly of the persecution of the Jews in 1492 and of the history of Toledo in general. When he visits Córdoba, he also provides some brief information about its history, with an emphasis on the glorious period between 756 and 1031, out of which came the marvellous mosque of Córdoba, the Mezquita, to which Kazantzakis refers more extensively.

In his second journey to Spain Kazantzakis makes brief references to the kings of Leon and Castile who set out from Burgos to persecute the Arabs of Spain, to the Crusades, to the Spanish defeat of 1588 against England, to the history of the University of Salamanca, to the Spanish Renaissance, to the transition from an Arabic world to a Christian one, to the construction of the church of Saint Laurence in Escorial by Philip II in 1563 and to the seven centuries during which the Arabic civilization prevailed in Spain. Furthermore, aware of the crucial historical moment that Spain was experiencing, he endeavoured to shed light on the historical factors that had engendered it.

\(^{57}\) Nikos Kazantzakis, “Βαρκελώνη, η καρδιά των αλητών και της ανταρσίας την οποίαν υπέταξε τον Ντε Ρίβερα και έγινε δικτάτορ”, Eleftheros Typos, 13 December 1926, p. 1).
As I have attempted to demonstrate, Kazantzakis’ references to the political and historical reality of Spain are not insignificant. They allow the reader to become more familiar with the historical and political climate of Spain and contribute to a more comprehensive view both of the country and of the author.

**Landscapes**

Just like in his fiction, landscapes appear infrequently in Kazantzakis’ travel writing. Descriptions are brief and function as a means of giving the reader a general idea of the place Kazantzakis is visiting. For example: “Γνωμένες, ξενάθες, ακατόκητες οι λοφοσειρές μετά από το Τολέδο. [...] Κάποτε, πέτρες ύπερες λάμπουν μέσα στο κοκκινόχομα.” Kazantzakis never devotes more than one or two paragraphs to describing the landscape. However, despite the fact that he does not provide extensive and detailed descriptions of landscapes, he does not seem to underestimate their importance; in two cases in his writings on Spain, Kazantzakis highlights how significantly landscapes influence people: “Η Ισπανία είναι γεμάτη ερημιές. Απέραντες εκτάσεις, όπου τα νερά έφυγαν, μετατοπίσθηκαν οι ποταμοί, απόμειναν η αμμούδα κι ο γρανίτης. Λαμπρό εργαστήριο για ηρωϊκές ψυχές. Εδώ αναγκαστικά η ψυχή σφυρηλατείται, όπως στις μεγάλες φλογερές ή παγωμένες ερημίες.” Landscape is equally important for an artist: “Σούρνων απάνω τους αγάλμα τη ματιά μου και χαίρομαι να συλλογώμαι πώς σίγουρα τους ασκητές τούτους βράχους θα τους αγάπησε πολύ το εκπαιδευτικό, παράφορο μάτι του Γκρέκο.” Or elsewhere: “Μυστική, αδιάκοπη είναι η συνεργασία του δημιουργού με ό,τι κάθε μέρα γύρα του

58 Nikos Kazantzakis, Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία, op. cit., p. 95.
60 Nikos Kazantzakis, Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία, op. cit., p. 85.
Thus, it can be concluded that, though Kazantzakis appreciates the importance of landscapes, he does not devote his texts to describing the natural environment that surrounds him, but focuses more, as seen above, on the observation of people and the contemplation of literature and art.

2.2. Reflections

Kazantzakis’ descriptions of what he sees in Spain are frequently interrupted by long or short interpolations about various issues that come to mind. In this way, the reader acquires the impression that s/he follows the flow of Kazantzakis’ thought. These interpolations can be divided into two categories: the ones that are related to Spain and those that constitute general issues that interest Kazantzakis and recur in the rest of his oeuvre.

The interpolations of the first category allow the reader to become more familiar with the country and its people: “Η Ισπανία είναι ο Δον Κιχώτης ανάμεσα στα έθνη. Ορμάει να σώσει τη γη. Καταφρονάει τα σίγουρα αγαθά και κυνηγάει τη χιλιοπλούμεστη χίμαιρα. Εξαντλείται στη δονκιχώτικη τούτη πέρα από τη λογική εκστρατεία.”\(^62\) Interpolations of this category are those in which Kazantzakis endeavours to define those Spanish characteristics to which I have referred more extensively in the section “Spaniards”. As I have already mentioned, churches and mosques Kazantzakis visits, frequently give rise to observations on Spanish religion. In his first journey to Spain, Kazantzakis appears to be rather critical of Spanish religion. Jesuitism, according to him, has dominated Spain; the Jesuits, who consider

\(^{61}\) Ibid., p. 67.

\(^{62}\) Ibid., p. 14.
scientific knowledge a mortal sin, are responsible for education. Kazantzakis, realizing the omnipotence of the Church recalls his trip to Mount Athos and feels fear, curiosity and anger. However, he understands that a theocracy is consonant with the Spanish tradition and that each grandiose task the country has achieved has derived from the religious mania that permeates it. Kazantzakis considers the Spanish clergy backward and uneducated and concludes that Spain is “μητερία, σκοτεινή, χωρίς ελπίδα” due to the role of religion. When he visits Córdoba, he attributes its downfall to the advent of the Christians.

In writing about the Mezquita, for which he expresses his utmost admiration, he becomes even harsher about the Christian religion, especially after comparing it with Islam. In addition, Kazantzakis seems mainly to blame the clergy for the degradation of Christianity.

---

63 Kazantzakis had travelled to Mount Athos in 1914 with his friend the well-known poet Angelos Sikelianos. Their tour lasted forty days. In dark, theocratic Spain, Kazantzakis recalls his experience of Mount Athos and notes: “Θυμήθηκα ότι η Αθέα ήλθε, έγινε τον Μαναστήριο του Αγίου Όρους, μαζί με τους καλογέρους. Εκεί μια στιγμή, παραμορφωμένη από τους καλογέρους, θηρεύεται, δεν άφηνε τους ανθρώπους να αναπνεύσουν.” (Nikos Kazantzakis, “ΕΙς τον Ἑλεφθέρον και τον Πατριαρχή”, Eleftheros Typos, 22 December 1926, p. 1)


65 “Έχεις το σείτη τον σπουδαστών” της Μαδρίτης”, Eleftheros Typos, 22 December 1926, p. 1)

66 “Δεν μπορούσε να τον βλέπει. Η γης είναι ανθημενό μονοπάτι που μας πηγάνει στο μνήμη. Μπορείς να γιμνόσεις –όπως έκαψε ο Χριστιανισμός– τη στράτα σου από τα σκούληκα του πάφου και να μην μπορέσει πια να φτιάχνει κανένα αγαθό της γης” (Nikos Kazantzakis, “Κόρδοβα, Α Αθήνα της Δύσης, το κέντρο του Αραβικού Πολυτελείου”, Eleftheros Typos, 28 December 1926, p. 1)

67 “Δεν μπορούσε να τον βλέπει. Η γης είναι ανθημενό μονοπάτι που μας πηγάνει στο μνήμη. Μπορείς να γιμνόσεις –όπως έκαψε ο Χριστιανισμός– τη στράτα σου από τα σκούληκα του πάφου και να μην μπορέσει πια να φτιάχνει κανένα αγαθό της γης” (Nikos Kazantzakis, “Ο Αθήνα της Κόρδοβας – Το αναγεννηστικό”, Ελεφθέρος Τύπος, 4 Ιανουαρίου 1927, p. 1.)
On his second journey to Spain, Kazantzakis also refers to the Spanish religion: “Η θρησκεία του Ισπανού δεν είναι δόγμα αφηρημένο, μακρινή νοητή επαφή του ανθρώπου με τον απροσπέλαστο Θεό. Είναι θερμός εναγκαλισμός, είναι χέρι και πληγή – το χέρι του ανθρώπου που βοηθείει στην πληγή του Θεού.” The strong religious feeling had prevented the Renaissance from penetrating Spain and this is why Spanish art retained its unity. In the war-torn Spain of 1936, Kazantzakis seems to be once again interested in the role of the Catholic Church in the new Spanish government that will emerge after the end of the war.

The second category of interpolations includes issues that are not directly related to Spain and constitute Kazantzakis’ general concerns that are also detected in the rest of his oeuvre. For example, a saint’s head in a church in Miranda which, in the eyes of Kazantzakis, looks like an African mask prompts him to speak about Africa, the ancestor of all. Moreover, the African element recurs in Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain, as, according to Kazantzakis, it is prominent in the Spanish character. In the section “Μπούργκος”, Kazantzakis makes an interpolation about Saint Francis of Assisi, a character with which he has dealt more extensively in Ταξιδεύοντας-Ιταλία and O Φησιούλης τον Θεού. In the section “Αβιλα” there is an interpolation on how man should live his life. These thoughts of Kazantzakis, subsequently added to the book, as they cannot be found in the newspaper articles, are a clear allusion to the philosophical theory developed in his book Ασκητική,
completed in 1923 (namely before Kazantzakis travelled to Spain) and published in 1927.

In the section “Εσκοριάλ”, Kazantzakis recalls a story he had read in an old legend about Saint John the Faster and Saint Nilus and offers the opinion that paradise does not exist. Later, he returns to his own concerns and describes his own paradise and hell: “Πάντα μου ἐπλάθα στο νου ἕναν Παράδεισο δικό μου καὶ μιαν Κόλαση δική μου, που ολότελα διαφέρουν από τὸν αναγνωρισμένον επίσημο Παράδεισο καὶ Κόλαση. Ὅλοι οἱ «ζεστοί», ενάρετοι ἢ κακούργοι, θα μπούνε στὸν Παράδεισο μου· Ὅλοι οἱ «κρύοι», ενάρετοι ἢ κακούργοι, θα μπούνε στὴν Κόλαση μου. Καὶ στὸν πάτο τῆς Κόλασης, οἱ κρύοι ενάρετοι.”

At the end of the section “Μαδρίτη” Kazantzakis, having tried to explain the popularity of El Greco, makes a long interpolation about his own views on art and the artist. In “Σεβίλια” he refers to the beauty of the earth and life and mentions that only through “κραυγή” can man praise life. At the beginning of the “Γκαλάδα” section Kazantzakis, after referring to the five paths that, according to Islam, lead to God (faith, charity, prayer, fasting and pilgrimage to Mecca), clearly states that he would choose only the pilgrimage to Mecca, which might be situated in his heart: “Ἀν ἀνοίξεις τὴν καρδιά μου, δὲ θὰ βρεῖς παρὰ ἕνα μονοπάτι ὅλο πέτρα κι ἕναν ἄνθρωπο ν’ ανηφορίζει χωρίς ελπίδα.” This phrase is another clear-cut allusion to his philosophical book, Ἀσκητικὴ (1927).

Kazantzakis’ reflections on various issues add to the personal touch that in any case characterizes his writings on Spain. Again, the reader acquires a more detailed

71 Nikos Kazantzakis, Σαμηδεύησις-Ηζπαλία, op. cit., p. 64.
72 “Κραυγή”, meaning “cry”, is a fundamental term in Kazantzakis’ world view and occurs in the largest part of his oeuvre. Peter Bien has aptly defined it as “a spiritual right act that will help bring an end to the injustice of the transitional age”. (Peter Bien, Politics of the Spirit, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989, p. 22)
73 Nikos Kazantzakis, Σαμηδεύησις-Ηζπαλία, op. cit., p. 118.
view not only of the country, but of the author as well. Though sometimes Kazantzakis seems to lack control and over-theorizes, his interpolations are rarely inappropriate or entirely redundant.

~

In conclusion, the five themes developed in Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain (Spanish literature and painting, Spaniards, public buildings in Spain, politics and history of Spain and its landscapes) are blended with his reflections on a variety of issues, both related to Spain and more generally. It seems that Kazantzakis tends to be more reflective than descriptive in his writings on Spain. In other words, while he often provides detailed descriptions of works of art, people, buildings etc., most of the times he just notes his reflections on them, something that has prompted some critics to argue that Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain reveal more of the author’s personality than of Spain’s. In any case, through his travel narratives on Spain, Kazantzakis manages to provide an overall portrait of a country generally unknown to his Greek readership. At the same time, these texts reveal his talent as a storyteller (which would come under the spotlight after 1946 when the first novel of his maturity, Βίος και πολιτεία του Αλέξη Ζορμπά was published), his restless spirit and personality full of contradictions. The latter will be more explicitly demonstrated in the next chapter.

Chapter 3

Kazantzakis on the Spanish Civil War

As has been already mentioned, Kazantzakis visited Spain for a third time in October-November 1936, namely three months after the beginning of the Spanish Civil War. His impressions of this journey were published in the Greek newspaper *I Kathimerini* and some of them were later included in the second part of *Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία*, which is entitled “Viva la Muerte!”.

In this chapter I will attempt a critical reading of Kazantzakis’ texts on war-torn Spain and comment on his attitude towards the Spanish Civil War. I will refer to the probable reasons for choosing to cover the war from Franco’s side, his reluctance to take sides and what caught his attention during this 1936 journey to Spain. To this end, I consider it essential to make brief reference to the history of the Spanish Civil War and to how deeply this dramatic event in modern European history engaged the world’s intellectuals. In this chapter I will be basing myself mainly on the journalistic material, which, in contrast to the book, includes all of Kazantzakis’ writings on the Spanish Civil War.

The Spanish Civil War began after a military coup against a legally elected Republican government (the Second Spanish Republic, the president of which was Manuel Azaña) led by a group of Spanish Army generals on 17 July 1936. The war lasted almost three years (from 17 July 1936 to 1 April 1939) and ended with a

---

1 “Viva la Muerte!” meaning “Long Live Death” was the battle cry of the Spanish Foreign Legion. In my opinion, the choice of a slogan derived from the Nationalists as the title of his writings on the Spanish Civil War is provocative on that part of a writer like Kazantzakis whose aim was allegedly to be impartial while capturing the war.
victory for the military forces, the dissolution of the Republican government, the establishment of a dictatorship led by General Francisco Franco (which lasted forty years, from 1936 till Franco’s death in 1975) and the formation of the Spanish state. It “signalled the greatest clash in the conflict of forces which had dominated Spanish history. One of those antagonisms was evidently between class interests, but the other two were no less important: authoritarian rule against libertarian instinct and central government against regionalist aspirations.” The two sides in the fight, the Republican and the Nationalist (the “Reds” and the “Whites” or “Blacks”) consisted of many different groups among whom there was considerable tension (especially on the Republican side). The Republicans were supported by the Soviet Union, Mexico and volunteers who were either organized into the International Brigades or fought with anarchist or militia groups. The Nationalists were supported by Germany and Italy. Thus, the Spanish Civil War was largely seen as a proxy war between the Communist Soviet Union and the Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany. As the Nazi government acknowledged from the beginning of the war, it offered the perfect testing ground for weaponry and tactics that would be invaluable for the Second

---

3 The Republican side mainly included: a) Popular Front parties and affiliated organizations like the Unión Republicana (UR) which was the right wing of the Popular Front alliance, the Izquierda Republicana (IR) which was Azaña’s Republican left party, Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya (Lluís Companys’s Republican Left Party of Catalonia), Partido Socialista Obrero de España (PSOE), the Spanish Socialist Workers’ Party, Partido Comunista de España (PCE), The Spanish Communist Party, Partido Obrero de Unificación Marxista (POUM), the Workers’ Party of Marxist Unification led by Andreu Nin, b) Allies of the Popular Front as The Libertarian Movement (anarcho-syndicalist and anarchist) and c) Basques (PNV, ANV, STV etc.). The Nationalist side included: Alfonsine monarchists (who supported the descendants of Queen Isabella II), the Carlists (who supported the rival Borbón line of Don Carlos), the Falange (a small Fascist-style party founded by José Antonio Primo de Rivera), CEDA (the Spanish Confederation of the Autonomous Right), PRR (Partido Republicano Radical led by Alejandro Lerroux), DLR (The Republican Liberal Right party of conservatives) and LC (the Catalan League, which was the Catalan Nationalist party of the grande bourgeoisie).  
4 The International Brigades consisted of approximately 32,000 to 35,000 volunteers from 53 different countries who, seeing Fascism as an international threat, had travelled to Spain to fight for the Republic.
World War that would follow. The Spanish Civil War was a tragic event that killed several hundred thousand soldiers and civilians, a war in which propaganda on both sides played a dominant role. It signalled a clash of beliefs and a betrayal of ideals and made a deep impression on all humanity.

The extent to which the tragedy of the Spanish Civil War moved the intellectual world can be understood if one considers the many works of art that it generated. As Beevor has argued, “the Spanish Civil War engaged the commitment of artists and intellectuals on an unprecedented scale, the overwhelming majority of them on the side of the Republic.” In fact, only the Holocaust offers a parallel with the Spanish Civil War in terms of inspiring artistic and literary outpourings. According to a recent view, “it has generated over fifteen thousand books – a textual epitaph that puts it on a par with the Second World War”. Of these the most popular have been L’Espoir (1937) by André Malraux, the Spanish Testament (1937) by Arthur Koestler, the Homage to Catalonia (1938) by George Orwell and For Whom the Bell Tolls (1940) by Ernest Hemingway. All these writers, together with many

---

7 In the introduction to his The Spanish Civil War in literature, film, and art: an international bibliography of secondary literature (Westport, Connecticut; London: Greenwood Press, 1994, p. ix) based on Walter’s Haubrich “Angst vor neuen Wunden. Spanien erinnert sich seines Bürgerkrieges” (published in Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 4 August 1986, p. 21) Peter Monteath mentions that: “One estimate puts the number of literary titles stemming from the war, including not just novels but also eye-witness accounts, histories, memoirs and propaganda publications, at over 20,000.”
others, visited Spain either as war correspondents or as volunteers, and afterwards, wrote down their experiences.\textsuperscript{11}

Nikos Kazantzakis was also one of those who visited Spain in 1936 as a war correspondent; he was sent by the Greek newspaper \textit{I Kathimerini} and stayed there for forty days (October-November 1936). According to Eleni Kazantzaki, Kazantzakis’ decision to visit wartime Spain was taken after the following conversation with the editor of the newspaper, Angelos Vlachos: “(Vlachos:) –Ζέρω πως θα προτιμούσες να πας στους Κόκκινους. Μα εγώ σε στέλνω στους Μαύρους, όπως τους λέτε. –Γιατί ίσια-ίσια εμένα; –Γιατί θα πείς την αλήθεια. Φίλοι κι εχθροί σου θα δυσαρεστηθούν, τόσο το καλύτερο. Δέχεσαι; Ναι ή όχι,”\textsuperscript{12} Kazantzakis accepted the invitation, left for Spain and reported the Spanish Civil War from Franco’s side. However, bearing in mind that most intellectuals worldwide favoured the Republican side, it is reasonable to wonder why Kazantzakis chose to take the Nationalist side.

The easiest and most obvious answer to this question would be that he did not go to Spain on the Nationalist side on his own initiative; it was proposed to him. Since


his financial condition was bad, this trip offered the source of income he needed. Furthermore, at that time Greece was under the Metaxas’ dictatorship, something that made travel to Spain on the Republican side rather difficult for Greeks. The two most popular (and conservative) newspapers of the time, I Kathimerini and Eleftheron Vima appeared to be objective and impartial, but they actually tended to highlight the barbarism of the “Reds”. Only the Communist newspaper Rizospastis had sent its own correspondent to Spain, who apparently reported the war from the Republican side. Another possible answer may lie in Kazantzakis’ political attitudes during the period in which his 1936 journey to Spain takes place. During the 1930s Kazantzakis had already become disillusioned with Communism and returned to the embrace of nationalism, which is more apparent in his 1937 travel book about Greece, O Μορτάς. Furthermore, despite his long-standing sympathy for the Left, he had also expressed sympathy for the Right in the past, especially between 1910 and 1920 when he was under the influence of the Nationalist Ion Dragoumis. Hence, it appears that there could have been several reasons that urged Kazantzakis to report on the war

13 Just before her husband received the telegram from G. Vlachos suggesting he go to Spain, Eleni Kazantzaki noted: “Και το οικονομικά μας να στηρίζουν κατά διαβόλου.” (Ο Απειληστατος, p.407)
14 The examples of negative references to the “Reds” are multiple in both newspapers. Moreover, when I Kathimerini (2 October 1936) informs its readers about Kazantzakis’ arrival in Spain and the fact that he will be covering the war, it notes: “Ο Κ. ΝΙΚΟΣ ΚΑΖΑΝΤΖΑΚΗΣ ανακοίνωσε ήδη διά την επαναστατημένη Ισπανία θα ευρίσκεται εις το κέντρον της Επαναστάσεως εντός των προσεχών μιλήματος και θα έχει ίσως την όχημαν της [the stress is mine] να εισάγει μετά των στρατηγικών του Αρχιστράτηγο Φράνκο της ισπανικής πρωτεύουσας.” If we consider the importance of Madrid to the course of the war and the vigorous refusal of the Republicans to surrender, the advance of Franco and the Nationalists on it could not have been a happy moment. This is one of many references showing that I Kathimerini was well-disposed towards Franco and his supporters.
15 For more information about the Athenian newspapers’ attitudes towards the Spanish Civil War see the section “Η στάση του αθηναϊκού Τύπου” in Dimitris Philippis’ article “Η Ελλάδα μπροστά στον ισπανικό εμφύλιο (1936-39), first published in the periodical Αντί (23 April 1999, pp. 41-52) and republished in Christos D. Lazos, Πεθαίνοντας στη Μαρτίτη: Η συμμετοχή των Ελλήνων στον Ισπανικό Εμφύλιο Πόλεμο, Athens: Αιώνας 2001, pp. 166-185.
from the Nationalist side. The question now is whether this means that he supported the Nationalists.

On his way to Spain, Kazantzakis wrote a letter to his friend Pantelis Prevelakis, explaining his current political position: “Τώρα περνώ το τρίτο –θάνατο το τελευταίο:– στάδιο: το ονομάζω ελευθερία. Κανένας ίσκιος. Μονάχα ο δικός μου, μακροντέμπλικος, σκούρος μαύρος, ανηφορίζοντας. Απαλλάχτηκα από κόκκινα ή άλλα χρώματα, έπαιξα να τσιζάω την τύχη της ψυχής μου –τη σωτηρία μου με την τύχη οποιασδήποτε ιδέας. Ξέρω πως οι ιδέες είναι κατώτερες από μια δημιουργική ψυχή. Γίνομαι ολοένα amoral, anideial, μα όχι με το αρνητικό, παρά με το θετικό, βαθύ περιεχόμενο που’ χων οι λέξες τούτες –που αρνητικές είναι μονάχα στις άγονες, αναίσθητες, κρύες ψυχές. […] Με τέτοιου σπασμό –δηλ. ολόγυμνος– κάνω την πρώτη κρίσιμη εμπειρία της νέας μου ελευθερίας: πάω να δω την αιματωμένη Ισπανία.”18 In other words, though Kazantzakis accredited to the Nationalist side, on his trip to Spain, he intended to remain neutral, or “free”, as he claims. Spain constituted a test of his new “freedom”.

Furthermore, it appears that the side from which he would report the war did not really matter to him, as his primary aim was to tell the truth and be impartial; thus, in the prologue of “Viva la Muerte!” he declared: “Θα πω ό,τι είδα, τίμια, καθαρά, χωρίς καμιά μεροληψία.” […] “…χρέως του σκεπτόμενου σήμερα ανθρώπου είναι να λέει την αλήθεια.”19 A similar declaration can be found in a letter to his wife Eleni, a

---

18 Pantelis Prevelakis, Τετρακόσια Γράμματα του Καζαντζάκη στον Πρεβέλακη, Athens: Eleni N. Kazantzaki publications 1984, p.465. Kazantzakis’ letter to Prevelakis echoes the former’s response to the article by Kostis Bastias (“Νίκος Καζαντζάκης, ο ερμήνευς της Αιγίνης”, I Kathimerini, 13 July 1936, p. 1), in which Bastias comments on Kazantzakis’ ideas about Fascism in Italy and Germany. Bastias’ article was followed by Kazantzakis’ response (“Ο Φόβος και η Πίεσα”, I Kathimerini, 20 July 1936), in which he defended his desire not to take sides, since the two enemies were fighting, according to him, for the same goal.

week before leaving for Spain: “Και θα ’μαι απάνθρωπα αμερόληπτος σε ό,τι γράψω. Κι οι δύο μερίδες θα δυσαρεστηθούν, μα δε μπορώ αλλιώς. Αρχίζω πιά –αυτή ’ναι η ολόστερνη μου vision– να μην απασχολούμαι πια για ιδέες αριστερές ή δεξιές’ ένα μονάχα μ’ ενδιαφέρει και με κάνει να χαιρούμαι και να πονώ: ο άνθρωπος, ο ανθρώπινος, ο εξαίσιος σκούληκας, που σούρνεται και μάχεται να κάμει φτερά [...]”

Kazantzakis’ intention was not to take sides and express his own views, but to leave the protagonists of the events to speak for themselves and describe, in some way, the eternal human struggle.

It appears that Kazantzakis generally remained true to his aim of not taking sides. His impartiality and desire to stay neutral is reflected in some of his published thoughts: “Σκύβω σ’ ένα σωρό σκουπίδια και μαζεύω μιαν κάκκινη σημαία, μισοκαμιμένη, τρυπημένη από τις σφαίρες. Την κοιτάζω με τραχή και συλλογούμαι πόσο τρομακτικά θ’ άλλαξε το πρόσωπο της Ισπανίας κ’ ίσως και της Ευρώπης αν το κουφέλι αυτό κυμάτιζε τώρα στην κορφή του Αλκάθαρ...”

Kazantzakis recognizes that not only the face of Spain but also the face of Europe would change dramatically if the Republicans won the war; however, he does not express an opinion as to whether a “Red” victory would change things for the better or for the worse. The same question also emerges later, when Kazantzakis stresses the importance of the occupation of Madrid by the Nationalists: “Ο εθνικιστικός στρατός προχωρούσε κάθε

---

20 Eleni N. Kazantzaki, Ο Ασυμβίβαστος, op. cit., p.408.
22 The word “τρομακτικά” could mean “a lot” or “terribly”. If interpreting it in its second sense, one could argue that Kazantzakis implies that a “Red” victory would change Spain for the worse. The use of the word “κουφέλι” for the “red” flag, which could have negative connotations, potentially reinforces this view.
Kazantzakis recognized that this war did not have the characteristics of an ordinary civil war; it was a war between two ideologies, Fascism and Communism, in which the whole world was taking part. Sometimes, he tended to equate the two enemies (something that emphasizes his impartiality) so that the reader acquires the impression that “Reds” and “Whites” are no different in his eyes: “Κι οι δύο ιδεολογίες με πλήθος στόματα γεμάτα οβίδες.” Though for different reasons, they both want to burn Madrid: “Ο νασιοναλιστής Ισπανός λέει, και με το δίκιο του: – Εξαίσια, πλούσια, πολύτιμη είναι η Μαδρίτη. Μα πιο πολύτιμη είναι η Πατρίδα. Ας γίνη στάχτη για να σωθή η Ισπανία! Ο κόκκινος Ισπανός λέει: –Ας γίνη στάχτη η Μαδρίτη. Νε νοιάζουμαι για ομορφιές και παλιές δόξες κ’ αισθηματικότητες. Ας γίνη στάχτη, θα χτίσω καινούργια!” Later, when he sees some “White” soldiers looking at some “Red” hostages as if they were strange creatures, he notes: “Κ’ ήταν ίδιοι απαράλλαχτοι, σωματικά, κόκκινοι κ’ άσπροι.” Or elsewhere: “Κ’ εγώ, στριμωγμένος στη γονιά, τους καμάρωνα και δεν μπορούσα να ξεχωρίσω τον κόκκινο από τους άλλους, όλοι ήταν ένα, Ισπανοί με το ζεστό αφρικάνικο αίμα.” When he meets a Nationalist soldier who expresses a desire to avenge his father’s betrayal and murder by the leftists, he notes: “Πόσοι χλιάδες τέτοιοι εκδικητές

26 Ibid., p. 1.
Many times during his journey Kazantzakis remained silent, as he had nothing to say and truly believed that the words of others would speak for themselves. When he listened to Nationalist soldiers speaking of Republican atrocities, he noted: “Σώπαινα. Σε όλη αυτήν την τραγική διαμονή μου στην Ισπανία έμαθα να σωπάινω.” Kazantzakis quite often chose silence. The most representative example is when he meets one of those who had been besieged in the Alcázar, whom he interrupts only to ask a few questions. Kazantzakis dedicated seven of his reports to the siege of the Alcázar, something that reveals his great interest in it. He characterized the Alcázar as the “Messolonghi” of Spain and the besieged people as “the free besieged” drawing a parallel between them and the besieged of Messolonghi and alluding to the eponymous poem by Dionysios Solomos. In Toledo, he found many people who claimed to have been in the Alcázar, but, as he says, the Alcázar had now become a legend and many myths were created around it. Kazantzakis recorded the testimony of Miguel Gómez Cascajares who had both experienced and noted in his diary the events that took place. Before starting to read his diary, Cascajares recalls the story of Colonel Moscardó (for whom he expresses great admiration presenting him as a real hero), who heard his son being shot by the “Reds”

30 I tend to believe that the parallel is risky; the “free besieged” of Messolonghi were fighting against the Turks, in order to acquire their freedom after four hundred year of slavery. I will not go into the obvious differences between the two sieges; I will only dwell on the diametrically opposed ends of the two sieges: in Messolonghi, the Greeks ventured their well known heroic exodus with its tragic results, while in the Alcázar, Nationalist forces finally came and saved the besieged. Of course, I do not imply that his comparison of the besieged of the Alcázar with the besieged of Messolonghi is indicative of Kazantzakis’ favouring the Nationalists, as I believe that in this reference to the Alcázar he is expressing his sympathy for human strength and resistance in general.
over the telephone. The survivor of the siege admits the fear he and others felt and questions the reliability of the newspapers, which presented the besieged as deeply despondent. Their greatest joy was that they managed to get a radio working which enabled them to be informed about the events taking place outside and the advance of the Nationalist army which they were expecting to save them. He describes their difficulties, their agony, their exhausting attempts at resistance and the ending of the siege with the arrival of Varela’s relief force.

Going to Spain “ολόγδωμος”, Kazantzakis did not express “ready made” views but reported the conclusions he had drawn after discussions with people he met on his journey. For example, in order to define the real causes of the war, he took into consideration three different views: the first came from a “Red” prisoner who had been a teacher in Asturia. The prisoner claimed that the war was the result of the Spaniards’ passion which had its roots in their deep despair. When Kazantzakis heard this view he remembered Unamuno’s words that had attributed the war to the same cause: “Όλα αυτά γίνονται γιατί οι Ισπανοί δεν πιστεύουν τίποτα! Τίποτα! Τίποτα! Είναι «Ντεσεράδοξο»!” Though these two views were enough for Kazantzakis and enabled him to understand the situation, the view of an old woman he met afterwards, confirmed his in this understanding: “Και είναι θα και είναι θαλασσία. Να, τώρα αυτοί σκοτώνουνται. Τους είδες. Γιατί; Οι μισοί, λέει, είναι άσπροι, οι άλλοι μισοί κόκκινοι. Μα μην ακούς. Όλοι είναι το ίδιο.

31 As Beevor argues, this was the most serious psychological mistake made by the Republican besiegers. On 23 July 1936 a local lawyer called Cándido Cabello rang the Alcázar, saying that they would shoot Moscardó’s son, Luis, unless the defenders surrendered. Moscardó refused and, according to the Nationalist version, told his son, who was put on the telephone, to die bravely. In fact, Luis was not shot until a month later in reprisal for an air raid. The story’s dramatic appeal was great and it was used as a moral lesson for everyone in Nationalist territory. (p.136) This is probably why Miguel Gómez Cascajares places it first in his narration.

The three views enable Kazantzakis to reach the conclusion that the main cause of the Spanish Civil War is the Spanish character. In another case, he wants to know how this “miracle” happened, namely how the Nationalist movement broke out and managed to get so close to capturing Madrid. To this end, he had questioned many people, but nobody had given him a satisfactory or convincing answer. Only his old Spanish friend whom he met in Salamanca helps him to understand: “Συλλογιζομαι τα λόγια του φίλου μου, τα τόσο αποκαλυπτικά.” And he goes on to state the conclusions he has drawn and the answer he finally gave to his own question. After taking into consideration different opinions, Kazantzakis concluded that the Nationalist movement had emerged after the failure of democracy to fulfill its promises; instead, it brought anarchy and disillusion. In his next to last report from Spain, entitled “Συμπεράσματα”, he recapitulates the conclusions he has drawn from his forty-day perambulation in war-torn Spain. In this way, he shows that he formed opinions, only after having experienced the war, talked to some of the protagonists and collected various testimonies.

However, there are some moments, when Kazantzakis seems to position himself more explicitly in favour of some representatives of the Nationalist side. First and foremost, he expresses some admiration for Franco. He characterizes him as “δυνατή ψυχή”, “Άγιο Θερέσιο του καιρού μας”, and “μυστηριώδη απλά άντρα που

---

34 The word “miracle”, mainly used for something positive but unexpected, is used by Kazantzakis for a military coup against a legally elected Republican government. This might be another implicitly partial comment on the Nationalist side.
36 Kazantzakis admired Saint Teresa, something that is more apparent in the first part of the book, in which he devoted the largest part of the section “Avila” to her. Surprisingly, he does not hesitate to compare the Fascist Franco with Saint Teresa, despite the fact that three years earlier, in his second journey to Spain, he had also compared Rosa Luxembourg with Saint Teresa! ("Αν ζώσε στην εποχή
ανέλαβε δυσκολότατο άθλο”. He feels that Franco is a person who knows how to govern a country; he has an organizational mind and a strong will that knows how to punish and to assert itself; he is systematic and patient. Kazantzakis, who met Franco but never talked to him, felt happy to have had a chance just to see him because, as he said, he saw a person who was determined and calm, the perfect instrument of his times, an obedient worker and co-worker in the difficult times he lived in. The characteristics Kazantzakis attributed to Franco, bring to mind the qualities he admired in Mussolini, whom he had also managed to meet in Rome ten years earlier (October 1926). Kazantzakis characterized Mussolini as a powerful man (“ένας ἄνθρωπος δύνατός”) and noted that “όλοι παρασύρονται από το στρόβιλο που δημιουργεί η ύπαρξη του ἄνθρωπου τούτου” and that “το κέντρο της δύναμής του δεν είναι η διαλεξική λογική, μα η θέληση.”

Kazantzakis dedicates much of his time and his writings to the various groups that constitute the Nationalist side. He meets with representatives of “Renovación Española” (the Alfonsine monarchists), the Albinianos (Catholic monarchists), the Requetés (the Carlist militia) and the Falangists. Of all of them the Falangists are the ones he seems to find most appealing. Apart from devoting four of his reports to the Falange and writing out its hymn, he finds the Falangist leader likeable and attributes qualities to him similar to those he had attributed to Mussolini and Franco, as seen above: “Ενοιωθες πως από το ἄφθονο αυτό γεμάτο κρέας σώμα θρέφουνταν μια
And, after listening to what the Falangist had to say, he was left with the following impression: “Εσφιξα το χέρι του δυνατού νέου που μου μιλούσε με τόση σαφήνεια και τόση θερμότητα.” In other words, in contrast with the other representatives of the Nationalist groups he had met, this one made a good impression on him. In another report, Kazantzakis quotes part of the Falange’s regulations. He believed that the most leftist members of Nationalist Spain, who either could not or did not dare to join the Republican side, became Falangists. In the heart of the Falange Kazantzakis finally finds a plan for the future, something that was not given to him by the other Nationalist groups, and because he thinks it likely to influence the reorganization of Spain, he quotes part of it. He also seems to see Antonio Primo de Rivera, the leader of the Falange, as one of the “hopes” for the new Spain, i.e. the one that will emerge after the war: “Αν ο Αντώνιο Πρίμο ντε Ριέρα πέθαινε, σίγουρα μια ελπίδα της νέας Ισπανίας θα χάνονταν.” And later, after listening to a Falangist theoretician talking to him about the events that had led to the current situation, he admitted: “Εφυγα βαθιά κρατώντας στον νου μου τα λόγια του νέου φαλαγγίτη. Και περισσότερο από τα λόγια την έκφραση του προσώπου, τον τόνο της φωνής, τη φλόγα του ματιού του. Ένοιωθα πως μιλούσαν με το στόμα του εκατομμύρια νέοι σε όλο τον κόσμο.”

In Kazantzakis’ reports of 1936-1937, there are no explicit comments about the other side, the “Reds”. He only notes the views of the “Whites” about the “Reds”, without saying whether he agrees with them or not. Furthermore, he explains how the

40 Ibid., p. 1.
Nationalists saw their enemies. As he says, for them the word “Red” had acquired the sense of “devil”. It evoked horror and fatal hatred and even more: “Μη αποστροφή, όπως στους παλιούς χριστιανικούς χρόνους η επαφή του σατανά ή όπως στους άγιους η έννοια του ταμπού.” A friend of his, a Spanish poet whom he does not name, talks to him about what the Republicans lack: “Όλα τα είχαν, οι άτυποι, και μονάχα ένα τους έλειπε: αυτό το αόρατο, αστάθμητο, ακατάλυτο, πιο βαθύ κι απ’ όλες τις θεωρίες, πιο δυνατό κι απ’ όλες τις πράξεις των ανθρώπων. Αυτό που οι αντιπαλοί μας περιφρονούν και που εμείς το λέμε ψυχή. Ψυχή της Ισπανίας.”

However, in his next to last report, in which he assembles his own conclusions, there is an explicitly negative comment on the anarchists: “Ο καλοπροάρτητος Αθώνια παραμερίστηκε, γιουγκάστηκε κ’ οι πιο άγριοι και πιο επικίνδυνοι σώματα του πήραν την εξουσία: οι Αναρχικοί. Άρχισαν οι απεργίες, οι δολοφονίες, οι πυροπολημοί. Άρχισε η αποσύνθεση της Ισπανίας.” And later: “Από τη μια μεριά οι αναρχικοί, κυρίαρχοι πια στην αριστερή παράταξη. Με όλες τις έμφυτες στην ιδεολογία τους αδυναμίες: χωρίς οργάνωση, χωρίς πειθαρχία, με οδηγό μονάχα τα άγρια αχαλίνωτα πια ένστικτα.” In this case, Kazantzakis seems to express his view on a specific group on the Republican side more overtly.

As far as the themes developed in “Viva la Muerte!” are concerned, it can be understood that, unlike the first part of Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία, in the second part the theme of art has been replaced by that of the Spanish Civil War. Nevertheless, references to art are not totally absent; even in such hard times Kazantzakis cannot rid

---

46 Ibid., p. 1.
himself of his old predilections. As in the first part of the book, landscapes function as background. The people are mainly soldiers of the Nationalist side, officers, “Red” captives and ordinary people. Their role in this second part of the book is much more crucial, as they are the ones who inform Kazantzakis about the progress of the war and enable him to reach some conclusions and formulate his own opinions. Around the central theme, namely the war, various motifs are developed that appear and reappear throughout Kazantzakis’ texts on the Spanish Civil War: the extraordinary military abilities and callousness of the Moroccans, the images of destruction that every battle leaves behind, life that continues despite and during the war, the personification of Madrid, the role of the Catholic Church, the atrocious joy of the fighters at the destruction, the frequent references to graffiti that are so indicative of what is going on and the extremely negative comments on foreign journalists who have come to Spain to cover the war.

On his 1936 journey to Spain, Kazantzakis carried with him the experience of his two earlier visits to the country. He often refers to them and compares the past with the present. For example, he is glad to discover that Spanish people have finally woken from their inertia, which is a positive result of the war: “Πολλοί διοικούσαν αποκλειστικά το σύγχρονον αντιιστητικόν σχήμα, πολλές παλαιότερες αγάπες μετέχονταν έναν στόχον τον οποίον τα άλλα κράτη συμπληρώνονταν με αυτόν μέσα. Οι ανεξάρτητες οικονομίες όπου τα πρόσωπα έπαιζαν την πρώτη φάση της πολιτικής, έχουν μετατραπεί σε περισσότερα κοινωμενικά συστήματα.” In his last report from war-torn Spain he also

47 “Δυστυχώς δεν αναπτύχθηκαν αποκλειστικά το σύγχρονον αντιιστητικόν σχήμα, πολλές παλαιότερες αγάπες μετέχονταν έναν στόχον τον οποίον τα άλλα κράτη συμπληρώνονταν με αυτόν μέσα.” (16 December 1936). For more information about the role of art, see Chapter 2 of this thesis.

48 Kazantzakis observes ordinary people of every category, namely men, women, elderly and children and tries to examine the impact the war has on them.

49 Nikos Kazantzakis, “ΤΙ είδε 40 μέρες εις την Ισπανία”, I Kathimerini, 24 November 1936, p. 1. What Kazantzakis had written six years earlier (23 May 1933) about the Spanish people who lived in
expresses his happiness at the change in the Spanish people, comparing them with how they used to be in the past: “Αλλάτε ο λαός τουτός διάβαζε με αδιαφορία τις φανφαρόνικες προκηρύξεις του Πρίμο ντε Ριβέρα.” […] “Τώρα –ευλογημένος ας είναι ο αποτρόπαιος αυτός πόλεμος!– ο ισπανικός λαός πήρε ευγένεια, γιατί έγινε εργάτης και συνεργάτης του μελλούμενου.”

Furthermore, when he visits Avila, Saint Teresa, who was born there and who was his main focus when he had visited the town again in 1933 is the last thing that comes to mind: “Όταν πρωτοήρθα στην Άβιλα, σε άλλους καιρούς, μονάχα αυτήν έβλεπα. Τώρα μονάχα μια στιγμή πέρασε από το νου μου και μονομαίς έσβυσε.”

The present is so intense, dramatic and dominant that: “Σήμερα ο νους δε μπορεί, δε θέλει να στραφεί πίσω και να δη.”

In conclusion, though Kazantzakis seemed to identify with Unamuno’s words “Δεν είμαι μήτε φασιστής μήτε μπολσεβίκος. Είμαι μόνος” and did not support any side in terms of active partisanship, it appears that he probably favoured the Nationalists. His aim of being impartial and telling the truth had been undermined both by his more or less explicitly positive comments on the Nationalists and by the total absence of positive comments on the Republicans. Kazantzakis could not be objective, as he only listened to the views of the Nationalists. Thus, while in the first part of the book it was he who believed in the usefulness of listening to two different points of view and trying to reach a conclusion, in the Spanish Civil War, Kazantzakis failed to listen to both sides. His personal testimony on the war was profoundly
influenced by the side to which he was accredited as a journalist. Thus, his writings on wartime Spain shed more light on Kazantzakis’ personality, thoughts and beliefs, because they spring from the things that attracted his attention and his reflections upon them, than they do on the struggle between the Republicans and the Nationalists.
Chapter 4

Comparing Kazantzakis: Ouranis and Papantoniou on Spain

Apart from Kazantzakis, two other Greek writers visited Spain at the same period, who also wrote down and published their impressions: Kostas Ouranis (1890-1953), who went to Spain in 1931, and Zacharias Papantoniou (1877-1940) who visited Spain in 1936, namely at the beginning of the Spanish Civil War. Like Kazantzakis, both Ouranis and Papantoniou had been applauded for their travel-writing and were considered (together with Spyros Melas)\(^1\) to have contributed to the establishment and development of modern Greek travel writing.\(^2\) In this chapter, I will endeavour to demonstrate how these two writers saw Spain, draw parallels between them and Kazantzakis and highlight the differences in the way the three writers presented Spain. In the following paragraphs, by comparison with Ouranis and Papantoniou, I aim to shed more light on Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain and contribute to a more comprehensive view of them.

Ouranis’ writings on Spain are included in the book Ἰσπανία (1954). The first part of the book entitled “Sol y Sombra” draws on Ouranis’ visit to the country in 1931. His impressions were first published in the newspaper Eleftheron Vima and afterwards in book form as Sol y Sombra, Μορφής και Τοπεία της Ισπανίας (Athens: Flamma, 1934). After his death, his wife Eleni Negreponti (better known under the

\(^{1}\) Spyros Melas visited Spain immediately after the end of the Spanish Civil War, in 1939 as correspondent of I Kathimerini. On 5 May 1939, Melas interviewed Franco. In this chapter I will not examine his texts on Spain, as Melas visited Spain in a different period, namely after the end of the Spanish Civil War.

pen name Alkis Thrylos) collected all his newspaper articles on Spain and published them in a book entitled *Ταξίδια· Ισπανία* (1954). The second part of the book is based on Ouranis’ writings on Spain after the overthrow of the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera and the establishment of democracy in Spain. The third part of the book contains Ouranis’ writings from other journeys to Spain and is entitled “Εντυπώσεις από άλλα ταξίδια στην Ισπανία”. The fourth part is dedicated to some intellectual figures and is entitled “Μορφές του πνευματικού κόσμου”.

Papantoniou’s writings on Spain constitute the greater part of his book *Ταξίδια* (1955), which was published after his death and drew on scattered newspaper articles published throughout his life. The texts are divided into two parts: the first part, entitled “Ισπανία”, consists of reports that concern several issues relating to Spain. In the second part “Η Ισπανική ζωγραφική”, the writer focuses on Spanish painting and his capacity as an art critic is revealed.

In order to acquire a deeper understanding of how the three writers dealt with their travels to Spain, it may be useful to identify how each of them saw travel in general. Both Kazantzakis and Ouranis felt the need to declare in prefaces to their texts what had urged them to travel and what made them write down and publish what they saw. From the prologue of Kazantzakis’ *Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία*, it can be understood that the author used to travel for three main reasons: to enrich his spirit...

---

3 Alkis Thrylos (a significant literary and theatrical critic) notes below the title of the second part of the book, “Μια ειρηνική επανάσταση στην Ισπανία”: “Από τις ανταποκρίσεις που γράφτηκαν άμα στην Ισπανία ανατρέπεται το καθεστώς και εγκαθιδρύθηκε η Δημοκρατία ξεχώρια όπως δεν έχουν προ πάντων πληροφορικό, επίκαιρο χαρακτήρα. Τον χαρακτήρα αυτόν δεν τον ήθελε ο Ουράνης να προβάλλει στα βιβλία του. Έλεγε: «Γράφω υποκειμενικά και όχι αντικειμενικά.» Οι ανταποκρίσεις που παράλειψε, επειδή ο τί προέζη α’ αυτές είναι τα γεγονότα κι όχι ο τρόπος με τον οποίο τα αντικρύσε ο συγγραφέας, δημοσιεύθηκαν, όπως κι αυτές που περιλαμβάνονται σε τούτο το μέρος, στο «Ελευθερον Βίθιον» την άνοιξή και το καλοκαίρι του 1931.”

4 Alkis Thrylos notes below the title of the third part of the book: “Ξεχώρισε όσες εντυπώσεις προκάλεσαν άλλα δέματα και μοτέβια, από κείνα που έφθασαν σε αρτιότερη μορφή στο Sol y Sombra”.
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through knowledge of the intellectual world of another country ("πνευματικὲς πειρατείες");

to react to a personal difficulty which was causing him pain ("ξεσπάσματα τῆς καρδιάς που πονούσε"),

and to satisfy his curiosity ("απληστία του ματιού που λαχτάριζε και βιάζονταν, προτού να σβήσει, να δει όσο μπορεί περισσότερο νερό και χόμα"). Travelling would enable him to overcome his proud ego and temper it "in the tormented itinerant army of Man". Each journey he made resulted from or resulted in an internal crisis. By writing down his impressions, he was not trying to create art; he was aiming to help other people on the same path to shorten their agony.

On the other hand, Ouranis saw travel as a way to escape from the anxieties, the problems and the routine of modern, everyday life. He did not travel to satisfy his curiosity or to acquire knowledge of the conditions of life of another nation and its characteristics. He aimed to discover the poetic and the picturesque element in the places he visited and was not interested in the topicality of his writings. What he wished to provide his readers with was a means of escape from modern life and its difficulties.

---

6 Ibid., p. 7. This brings to mind the long journey through Spain that Kazantzakis made by train at the end of December 1932, right after the death of his father and which filled him with sorrow.
7 Ibid., p. 7.
8 Nikos Kazantzakis, Spain, translated by Amy Mims, Berkeley: Creative Arts Book Company 1983, p. 11.
9 Nikos Kazantzakis, Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία, op. cit., pp. 7-8.
10 Ouranis’ view of travel and the reason why he published his writings can be found in the brief prologue to his travel book Γιαπθήνι Γξόκνη-Βνξηλέο Θάιαζζεο (Athens: Estia 1955). A similar view has been expressed by Ouranis in the prologue of his book Ταξίδια στην Ελλάδα (Athens: Estia 1949): "Δεν έχουν τίποτα τα documentaire, δεν εικονίζουν την Ελλάδα της εποχής των δύο πολέμων. Είναι εντυπώσεις καθαρά υποκειμενικές και, τις περισσότερες φορές, συναισθηματικές. Ο τόνος σ’ αυτές δεν είναι σε ο,τι είδα, αλλά στο τι αισθάνθηκα μορφητά σε ό,τι έβλεπα. Εκφράζουν τα «κινήματα» της ψυχής και της φαντασίας που μου προκαλούσαν τα μέρη που επισκέπτόμουν." (p.7)
If Kazantzakis was travelling mainly to satisfy his need for knowledge and Ouranis to escape from the difficulties of contemporary life, Papantoniou was more interested in discovering the distinct character of a civilization through the interpretation of its aesthetic forms. As director of the National Gallery of Greece from 1918, he had the chance to visit many European countries, either to buy pieces of art on the gallery’s behalf, or for his own spiritual development and to learn about the plastic arts in general. His view on travelling can be summarized in the following statement: “Το ταξείδι στη γένεση είμαι μικρό, είμαι μεγάλο, είμαι σαράντα ημέρων, είμαι μιας ώρας, είναι πάντοτε κατάκτησης νέων κόσμων. Τρεις πίθευξης γης, που δεν την εξέρχονται και την βλέπεις σήμερα, σου αποκαλύπτουν τόσα νέα πράγματα! Το να πας μακριά εξαρτάται από την διάθεση που έχεις να ονειρευόσαι. Είναι παλαιά αλήθεια ότι ο ανθρώπος έχει μέσα του το ταξείδι.”

If we start with the themes they develop in their travel books on Spain, it can be observed that, just like Kazantzakis, Papantoniou, as a distinguished art critic, was mainly interested in the literature, music, architecture, painting and sculpture of Spain. There is not an article on Spain that does not have at least one reference to art.

11 Zacharias Papantoniou, “Μικρά Ταξειδια”, To Asty, 28.8.1906. Another definition of travel had been given by Ouranis, in a lecture he gave in 1933, in which he emphasized the importance of the traveller’s personality and cultivation: “Το ταξείδι, είναι περίπου σαν τα ισπανικά χόνια, σα τα ποιήματα, όπως παρατήρησε κάποιος, δεν βρίσκει κανείς να φαίνεται παρά ότι φέρνει μαζί του. Μπορεί ένας ανθρώπος να κάνει το πιο μακρινό, το πιο γραφικό, το πιο όρατο ταξείδι, το ταξείδι που προσφέρει τις περισσότερες ευκαιρίες (γιατί απλώς και μόνο ευκαιρίες προσφέρει το ταξείδι) για το θάμβος, την εξάρτηση, τη χαρά, τη γοητεία και τη συγκίνηση. Η απάντηση του θα είναι μηδαμία στην ψυχή του ανθρώπου αυτού αν ο ίδιος αυτός είναι ένας κοινός και ασθεντός, ψυχικός και πνευματικός, ανθρώπος, -όποιος μηδαμίας θάνατη η απόδοσή και του πιο περίφημου Σεραντιμάρους, αν εκείνος που κρατάει στο χέρι του το δοξάρι δεν έχει την ίδια φύση, -και την καλλιέργεια, ενός θρησκευόντα.” (Petros Charis, Ελληνικές Πεζογραφίες, Estia: Athens 1979)

For Papantoniou art is always a prominent theme of his travel writings on Spain, around which other themes are developed: Spanish people and their characteristics (external and internal), political and historical references, tourism and landscapes. Ouranis also makes many references to art; however, the reader will also find many historical references in Ouranis’ book, which are limited both in Kazantzakis’ and in Papantoniou’s writings on Spain. Furthermore, Ouranis’ lyricism is revealed in his descriptions of the various landscapes he sees and it seems that he notices them more than Kazantzakis or Papantoniou. Moreover a love of nature had always been one of the characteristics of the Symbolists and Ouranis was a Symbolist.

Unlike Kazantzakis, Papantoniou was not interested in discussions with ordinary people or writing down their views. He is a distant observer, who endeavours to reach his own conclusions through what he has read and what he sees in front of him. Thus, at various times, he endeavours to identify the characteristics and the personality of Spanish people: “Το εκρηκτικό ήταν πάντα χαρακτηριστικό της ψυχολογίας του Ισπανού. […] Ο Ισπανός είναι άνθρωπος των ακρότατων άκρων.”

Or elsewhere: “Η ροτή προς τις ακρότητες, η έλλειψης αποχώρωσεων στα συναισθήματά του, ο εκρηκτικός του χαρακτήρας, φέρνουν τον Ισπανό προς το φανατισμό.” According to Foteini Keramari, Papantoniou was influenced by Hippolyte Taine in the way he described the psychology of the Spanish people in relation to geography and their political, social and historical conditions. The same

---

14 Ibid., p. 84.
15 Foteini Keramari, O Ζαχαρίας Παπαντωνίου ως πεζογράφος, op. cit., p. 122. Hippolyte Taine was the most important representative of French positivism in the 19th century. The three defining factors (la race = the race, le milieu = the place and le moment = the moment) that are delineated by Taine in his book Histoire de la littérature anglaise (1863-1864) are employed by Papantoniou for the description of Spanish psychology in relation to geography and political, social and historical conditions. The influence of Hippolyte Taine in Papantoniou’s travel writings was first observed by I.M. Panagiotopoulos, whose views were included in his preface to Papantoniou’s Ταξιδιά.
scholar has shown that both Kazantzakis and Papantoniou describe an image of a Spanish woman praying. However, they use it in different ways: Kazantzakis highlights the difference between the passion in the appearance of Spanish women and the passion they express when they pray. On the other hand, Papantoniou deals with the subject in a more aesthetic way; the image of the praying woman urges him to leave the world of realism and recall a character in a poem by Alfred de Musset, which is incarnated in front of his eyes in the form of the Spanish woman at prayer.

Though Papantoniou writes about Spain in 1936, when the country was at the start of a civil war, he only makes brief references to the war and often uses it as a means of discussing other issues. One example of this can be found at the beginning of his travel writings on Spain: “[…] Δίλαη όκσο αδύλαην ζηελ ηξαγσδ ία ηεο Ηζπαλίαο λα κελ αλαγλσξίζσκελ έλα ηζπαληθό ραξαθηήξα. Ο ιαόο απηόο ξίρηεθε ζηνλ εκθύιην πόιεκν κε ηα θπιεηηθά ηνπ γλσξίζκαηα, ηνλ εξστζκό θαη ην θαλαηηζκό καδί, ηελ αθνβία θαη ηελ αγξηόηεηα, έηζη ώζηε δσληαλεύνπλ θαη παίδνπλ ζην δξάκα νη ςπρνινγηθέο παξαηεξήζεηο πεξί ησλ Ηζπαλώλ, πνπ εδώ θαη ιίγεο εκέξεο ζα πεξλνύζαλ γηα ςπρξά θαηαζθεπάζκαηα ηνπ ζπνδαζηεξίνπ.”

Then he describes the characteristics of Spaniards. It is quite surprising, given the time at which he is writing that Papantoniou does not make any political comments on the war, does not express views in favour of one side or the other and seems to express anguish only in respect of the fate of the art works of Spain. The chapter “Βόμβεο και προσευχές” is indicative of this tendency in Papantoniou. From the title the reader expects to learn some details about the events, the victims and the whole situation of the civil war. However, the bombardment of Barcelona functions as a pretext for the writer to speak about the town’s past beauty and its history. At the end of the chapter, he recapitulates

16 Zacharias Papantoniou, Ταξίδια, op. cit., p. 79.
Barcelona’s most important monuments and expresses his anguish at their fate. At this point, Papantoniou resembles Kazantzakis, who, in the middle of the Spanish Civil War, was visiting the places where El Greco’s paintings were located, to see if they had remained intact. Furthermore, it seems that, like Ouranis, Papantoniou was not interested in the topicality of his writings. He focused on the past and not on the present situation of the country he was visiting.

In Ouranis’ Spain, although one can trace various contemporary comments and political references (especially in the second part of the book), there is a sense that the author was inviting the readers to explore Spain’s past. Ouranis seems to be more interested in the country’s past than in its present situation. As he mentions in the prologue of “Sol y Sombra”, Spain is a country where the past survives in the present. Hence, it seems ideal for Ouranis, who was generally known to be a “lover of the past”.

It is also interesting to identify the methods and techniques the three writers use to present their material. Kazantzakis usually begins with an event or a fact, which prompts a train of thought and associations and makes him contemplate and try to find answers to the questions that emerge. He tends to present both the past and the present images of the places he visits. He makes brief or long interpolations in order to speak either about issues evoked by what he sees or about more general issues. Furthermore, he draws parallels between Spain, Spanish people and affairs and other countries he

---

17 At the beginning of the chapter “Βόμβεο και προσέγγιση”, Papantoniou refers to the wisdom of Homer who cursed civil war in the ninth rhapsody of the Iliad; hence, one could argue that Papantoniou condemns the Spanish Civil war, but without taking sides or commenting on the multitude of tragic events and their consequences.
18 An example of a political reference is the comment Ouranis makes about a positive consequence of Rivera’s dictatorship: the development of tourism in Spain (p. 219)
19 He has been characterized as “παρελθοντολόγη” by Annta Panaretou in the Introduction to her five-volume work Ελληνική Ταξιδιωτική Λογοτεχνία, op. cit., volume 1, p.98.
has visited (especially Russia). Ouranis’ method, on the other hand, is a blend of description, narrative and comparison. He frequently uses comparisons in his book: he tends to compare what he sees in Spain with other countries (especially Italy and sometimes Greece). Moreover, he tends to compare every place he visits for the first time with the previous place he had been to. He draws parallels between artists, writers, works of art and religions. Sometimes he even compares his first impression of a place or a monument with a more recent one. Ouranis, who has been credited with being an ironist,\textsuperscript{20} sometimes becomes ironic in his travel writing and even at his own expense. Finally, in various descriptions and incidents that occur during his travels, Ouranis reveals a sense of humour that entertains and somehow relaxes the reader. A very good example of this is the chapter “Δον Πάολο Κάνδαρα και Παλιέρες Ισπανός Απεμπεινές”, in which he makes fun of the incidents that take place and creates a really pleasant tone in his text.

Papantoniou too, using description and narrative, manages to make the presence of the subject come alive in a given place. Though he does not seem to invent imaginary events in his factual narrative like Kazantzakis, the element of imagination is not totally absent. For example, when he visits the house of El Greco in Toledo, as soon as he enters the building, he starts to imagine the painter in it and, in a way, he is transported back to El Greco’s era: “Γυρίζομε, διάφοροι προσκυνηταί, στα δωμάτια, βγαίνουμε στον κήπο, ανεβαίνουμε τη σκάλα και κοιτάμε απ’ τα παράθυρα και τα μπαλκόνια, εκείνα που θα κοίταζεν αυτός. Δε μιλεί κανένας στον άλλον. Περπατούμε σιγά, για να μην παράξευμε τις συνομιλίες του με τον Παραβιτσίνο και τον Γκόγκορα. Σχεδόν ακούμε τις γκρίνιες του με τη γριά του υπηρέτρια και το γέρο

\textsuperscript{20} See the chapter “Κώστας Ουράνης” in Petros Charis, Έλληνες Πεζογράφοι, vol. 1, Athens: Estia 1979, pp. 229-255.
In Papantoniou’s writings on Spain, description does not play a dominant role, as it is interwoven with judgments, contemplation and lyrical elements. Imagery and metaphors are significant, because they enable him to convey his impressions of his contact with the outside world. Papantoniou also uses the techniques of comparison and contrast, especially when he describes landscapes or the characteristics of Spanish people. Humour, irony, epigrammatic aphorisms and contemplative judgments make his texts more attractive to the reader and relieve the monotony that may be caused by the descriptive parts. Papantoniou is generally a restrained writer, as he expresses his admiration and emotion (especially for works of art) but in a measured tone. Finally, as I. M. Panagiotopoulos has shown in the preface to Papantoniou’s book, another element that one can detect in Papantoniou’s texts on Spain is the unexpected. For example, when he refers to the (almost dry) river Manzanares in Madrid, to which both Kazantzakis and Ouranis refer, rather unexpectedly, Plato comes to his mind: “Ο Μαλζαλάξεο κπνξεί λα παξεγνξεζή αθνύνληαο πσο ππάξρεη ζ” έλα κέξνο ηεο γεο πνηακόο πνπ ιέγεηαη Ηιηζόο. Αυτός δεν είναι μόνο ξερός, μα γέλασε και τον Πλάτωνα!”

As far as their writing styles are concerned, it seems that each of the three travellers has his own unique way of presenting his material. Thus, Kazantzakis gives the impression of talking to himself rather than to the potential readers. His tone is that of confession and the reader sometimes has the feeling that s/he is following a

21 Zacharias Papantoniou, Ταξιδία, op. cit., p. 165.
22 Tellos Agras has also referred to Papantoniou’s humour as one of his basic characteristics, which is apparent especially in his pre-war texts: “Το χορόμορ του Παπατζώνιου είναι πρώτ’ απ’ όλα αστραπιστό’ όταν το παρατέλη, το κατανάλωσε σε σχέσεις και αγαθικά, και, σε γραμμές παράταση, διάρκεια ν’ απεικονίστη σε σύμπλεγμα μαζί της γιατί μαζί της ανεξοκατεβαίνει.” (Tellos Agras, Κριτικά, Volume III, Stergiopoulos (ed.), Athens: Ermis 1981, pp. 162-3)
23 Foteini Keramari, Ο Ζαχαρίας Παπατζώνιος ως πεζοπόρος, op. cit., pp. 110-112.
stream of consciousness. On the other hand, Ouranis addresses the reader very frequently. The frequent use of the second person plural is evidence of this: Apostrophes like “Μην πείτε πως σας απασχολώ μ’ ένα θέμα χωρίς επικαιρότητα, μ’ ένα θέμα από καρό μου εξοντωτικά!” and questions like “Τι σας λέει;” are common in his book. Sometimes he also uses the expression “Ο αναγνώστης…”, something that also demonstrates his concern as to the people who were going to read the book. Papantoniou’s style of writing is also different from that of Kazantzakis. Like Ouranis, Papantoniou is interested in his future (mainly Greek) reader, something that he admits in one of his articles: “Γράφω για το κοινό –αυτό είναι το καθήκον μας– και όχι για τον εαυτό μου”. Papantoniou also addresses the reader, though not as frequently as Ouranis. Furthermore, by using the first person plural, he invites the readers to share his own experience: “Ας φανταστούμε μπροστά στη γλυπτική αυτή του πάθους τον άνθρωπο του πάθους, τον Ισπανό, όχι το σημερινό, μα εκείνον του 16ο αιώνα […]” and “Ας τον συλλογιστούμε, μπροστά στις Παναγίες των σπαθών και των αγωνίων […]”. Using the second person, singular or plural, he advises: “Διώκε το λοιπό βόμβο των στίχων του Όγκου, τίναξε από πάνω σου ό,τι άκουσες, ό,τι διάβασες γι’ αυτή. Τίναξε τη σκόνη των οδηγών, την τέφρα των εντυπώσεων του άλλου, μείνε μπροστά της αγράμματος, χαζός και παρθένος –κοίταξέ την.”

26 Ibid., p. 156.
27 Zacharias Papantoniou, Ταξιδιά, op. cit., p. 243. The sentence that follows justifies his interest in the Greek audience: “Στις ελληνικούς οικογένειες, τους οποίους η συνεργασία έφτασε και η διαδικασία δεν υπολόγιζε ότι θ’ αμφισβητήθηκε συμβατικά από κοινόν, μπορούμε να εμπιστευτούμε το νέο πάνω.”
28 Ibid., p. 188.
29 Ibid., p.120. In this part, it is possible that Papantoniou is above all addressing himself and then the reader. Moreover, later in the book, in the section “Ανδαλουσία” Papantoniou admits: “Αδύνατο να γλιτώσουμε από ένα καλό συγγράμα. Θα δώσουμε την Ανδαλουσία που είδας και τη γνώση που είδες. Ο Πρόσφερος Μεριμμέ εξουσιάζει τον Τουρισμό της Ισπανίας από το 1830.” (p. 126) As can be understood from Papantoniou’s travel writings, he was a writer who had read a lot about the place he
While reading the impressions of these three writers on Spain, one notices that all of them are based on other sources. Thus, Kazantzakis draws both on oral and on written accounts. As mentioned in the second chapter of this thesis, he appears to discuss things with ordinary people (especially peasants and soldiers) and write down their views. Moreover, he refers to many significant Spanish personalities and, sometimes, quotes their words. He mainly draws on: philosophers (Francisco Giner de los Ríos, Spinoza, Loyola), Spanish celebrities (Saint Teresa, Christopher Columbus and Don Juan) and Spanish intellectuals (Joaquín Costa, Ángel Ganivet García, Miguel de Unamuno y Jugo, José Ortega y Gasset, Antonio Machado, Ramón María del Valle-Inclán y de la Peña, Azorín, Pío Baroja y Nessi and Miró).

Ouranis also incorporates various written accounts in his narrative. He refers to foreign travellers (whether named, like Maurice Barrès, Théophile Gautier and Prosper Mérimée, or unnamed), historians, travel guides (he names only one of them, the “Οδηγός της Ισπανίας”), chronicles (the only one he names is the “chronicle of Seville”), poets (Rilke, Keats, Verlaine, Poe, Baudelaire, Cavafy), writers (Ponson du Terrail, Cervantes, Pirandello, Unamuno, Wasserman, Andersen, Molina, Irving [who wrote a book about the Alhambra]), Zorilla (to whose poem “Don Juan” he dedicates a whole chapter [“Ο «Δον Ζούαν»” quoting part of his own translation), art critics (Antoine de Latour, Pacheco), philosophers (Ortega y Gasset), Spanish celebrities (Saint Teresa and Christopher Columbus) and even a scientist (the Spanish ophthalmologist Beritens). He also quotes part of Columbus’ will. Ouranis often was going to visit. His readings mainly included the literature of the country he would visit and other travellers’ accounts and it was absolutely normal that he should have been influenced by them. All three writers speak with admiration of Saint Teresa and stress her significance, dedicating an important part of their text to her. Ouranis places her among the greatest classic writers of Spain and draws parallels between her diary, which he characterizes as “a Bible of love”, the Song of the Songs and Letters to a Portuguese nun.
refers to “others” who had spoken or written about Spain, whom he does not name or characterize and whose opinions function as introductions to a subject on which he will then express his own view. In his book there are also some brief oral accounts from the ordinary people he met during his trips.

A similar pattern is followed by Papantoniou. Papantoniou’s Spain includes a vast range of written accounts, but oral accounts are almost absent. He draws on or simply refers to French travellers (Gautier, Hugo, Quinet, Dumas, Sand, Delacroix, Barrès), other unnamed travellers, contemporary Spanish intellectuals and poets (Ganivet, Unamuno, Barine), other important personalities (Saint Teresa, Napoleon, Cervantes, Columbus), foreign poets (Schiller, Baudelaire, Laborde, Mérimée), philosophers (Spenser, Weber, Bergson, Schopenhauer, Kierkegaard), earlier writers (Seneca, Suetonius), chroniclers, an academic (Madariaga) and a historian (De Avila). He even refers to a statistic about Spanish illiteracy to justify his arguments on the decline of Spain and to the proceedings of a trial of 1582 in order to shed light on some aspects of Theotokopoulos’ life. As can be understood, Papantoniou is well aware of the sources on Spain; he has studied them in depth and incorporated them smoothly into his text. They constitute irrefutable accounts that Papantoniou frequently uses as supporting evidence for his own opinions.

References to other travellers, loans and repetitions of the same information transferred from one traveller to another are an intrinsic part of travel writing.  

31 Papantoniou quotes his translation of a whole poem by Théophile Gautier entitled “Monks of Zurbarán” as evidence of the impact that one art (painting) has on another (poetry).
32 Papantoniou writes: “Τνωστή εκλεκτή λογογράφος και παλιά συνεργάτης του Figaro”.
33 Madariaga was a Spanish professor at the University of Oxford, a contemporary of Papantoniou.
Hence, I consider it important to make more detailed reference to the use of texts by other travellers. References to other travellers are very common in Ouranis’ and Papantoniou’s texts on Spain but are almost totally absent from Kazantzakis’ writing. Ouranis not only refers to other travellers (most of whom are not named) and quotes parts of their texts, but he also appears rather critical of them: “Διάφοροι βιαστικοί κ’ επιπόλαιοι ταξιδιώτες, διασχίζοντας τα πουέμπλος της Καστίλιας και βλέποντας άργους ανθρώπους μπροστα στα καλύβια τους ή κάτω απ’ τις καμάρες τους «αγιουνταμέντο» –της Δημαρχίας–, τους χαρακτήρισαν, στις εντυπώσεις τους, τεμπέληδες. «Οι Ισπανικοί χαρικοί», γράφουν, «έχουν κληρονομήσει από τους Αραβες κατακτητές μια περιφάνεια και μια ραθυμία που τους κάνουν να νιώθουν απέχθεια για την εργασία. Τη θεωρούν πιο εξευτελιστική από τη ζητιανιά…»”

And a little later on he comments: “Αλήθεια, μόνο όποιος δεν ξέρει τους όρους της ζωής τους μπορεί να πει πως είναι άργοι από υπερηφάνεια και ζητιάνοι από προτίμηση.”

A technique that Ouranis often employs is to present what others have said and written on a specific town or Spanish subject and then to express his own views on it. The highpoint of his use of this technique is found in the chapter entitled “Το Τολέδο που δεν βλέπουν οι περιηγητές". In this chapter, Ouranis highlights the two most common mistakes made by travellers: firstly to visit a place having already

---


35 In fact, Kazantzakis refers only once to Barrès (“Ο Μπαξέο ευρήκε, με ολίγην καλήν θέλην, την κοκαρήν του στο Τολέδο και μαζί του ολό το πλήθος των ορασιοθείων, που ζητεί καταφύγιον εις τα περισσόμενα," in Nikos Kazantzakis, “Τολέδο, η ζακουσμένη πατρίς του Γκρέκο”, Eleftheros Typos, 24 December 1926, p. 1) and to Gautier’s Ταξίδι στην Ισπανία, which he characterizes as “περιήμην” and from which he quotes one phrase that relates to El Greco (In Nikos Kazantzakis, “Ο Θρύλος και η Ζωή του Γκρέκο”, Eleftheros Typos, 25 December 1926, p. 1). Panagiotis Matalas has compared Kazantzakis’ and Barrès’ journeys to Sparta and Toledo in his “Ταξίδια ενάντια στην παροχή: ο Μπαξέο και ο Καζαντζάκης στη Σπάρτη και το Τολέδο”, Πρακτικά Νίκου Καζαντζάκη, Χανιά 1998, pp. 61-81.


37 Ibid., p. 30.
formed a notion of it in their own mind and, secondly, to be in a hurry. He gives advice as to how travellers should behave and suggests a different path that will reveal the real beauty of Toledo. Elsewhere, Ouranis becomes even harder on other traveller-journalists: “ [...] κ’ είμαι ο πρώτος που βρίσκει κομικός τους δημοσιογράφους εκείνους, οι οποίοι –όπως είπε κάποιος–, με το να μιλήσουν με τον πρωθυπουργό μας χώρας, μ’ έναν αμαξά και με τον ξενοδόχο τους, νομίζουν πως ξέρουν αρκετά για να διερμηνεύσουν το εθνικό αίσθημα της χώρας αυτής.”

As mentioned above, Papantoniou mainly refers to the French travellers Gautier and Barrès. However, he also quotes the words of other travellers, whom he does not name. Like Ouranis, he does not only refer to them or quote their writings, but he also assumes a critical stance towards them. For example, when he speaks about the “Court of the Lions”, “the masterpiece” of the Alhambra, before presenting his own view of it, he says: “Την έχουν περιγράψει όλοι, την έχουν διηγηθεί όλοι και την έχουν καταστρέψει όλοι.”

In conclusion, it has been argued that Kazantzakis is the traveller-thinker and Ouranis the traveller-poet while Papantoniou could be called the traveller-art critic. However oversimplified these characterizations might be, they give a notion of how

---

38 This view is also expressed later in the book and more specifically in the chapter “Η όρα των πάτων στην Κόρδοβα”; “Στην Ισπανία δεν πρέπει να βιάζεται κανείς να σχηματίσει γνώμη.” (Ibid., p.123)

39 At this point, it can be argued that Ouranis was implicitly referring to Kazantzakis, who expected to see Toledo the way El Greco had painted it. However, Ouranis also fell into the same trap; in the chapter “Σ’αναζήτηση της Δημοκρατίας” in the second part of his book, Ouranis wonders: “Μα που, επι τέλους, είναι, διερευνώμεστε, η «φιλογράφη» Ισπανία που ονειρεύονται οι τουρίστες, και οι σκηνές της ζωής, οι τόσο γραφικές και πολύχρωμες, που ζωγράφισε ο Γκόγια και οι καστανιέτες και η Κάρμεν με τα στυλιανά μαόνα μαλλιά και το μεγάλο προκλητικό ρόδο στα δόντια; [...]” (Ibid., p.228)

40 Ibid., p. 279.

41 Zacharias Papantoniou, Ταξιδιά, op. cit., p. 122.

42 The characterization of Kazantzakis and Ouranis comes from Sachinis, and more specifically from the section “Οι ταξιδιωτικές εντυπώσεις” of his book Η σύγχρονη πεζογραφία μας (1971). The characterization of Papantoniou is a conclusion I have drawn after consulting various studies on him and mainly the section “Ο Ζαχαρίας Παπαντονιάς ως ταξιδιώτης” in the book Ο Ζαχαρίας Παπαντονιάς ως πεζογράφος by Foteini Keramari (2001) and the prologue to Papantoniou’s Ταξιδιά entitled “Ο ταξιδιώτης”, written by I.M. Panagiotopoulos.
each writer approaches the subject “Spain”. Thus, though all of them deal with the
significant issues and personalities of Spain like bull-fighting, the Spanish
personality/psychology, Spanish religion, the Arab past on the one hand and Saint
Teresa, El Greco, Goya, Christopher Columbus and Don Juan on the other, they each
seem to do it in their own, unique and distinctive way. Their personality influences
the way they write, the way they deal with what they see and the way they present
their material. Furthermore, the country itself has a different impact on each of them.

Finally, I tend to believe that though each of them had his own, divergent view
of travel, they all premised Spanish literature and art as their main concern. The
differences in their methods, their techniques and their style reveal three different
authors, who managed to write literary texts about similar subjects while leaving their
own, clear mark on them. The use of oral and written sources gave their texts
credibility and revealed the fact that they all were well-informed and cultivated
travellers who visited Spain with their own preconceptions but also with a desire to
overcome them. Thus, Kazantzakis’, Ouranis’ and Papantoniou’s writings
undoubtedly added to the depiction of Spain in the period between 1926 and 1936.
Conclusion

The contemporary resurgence of interest in travel writing on a worldwide scale and the simultaneous lack of scholarly research on travel writing in Greece offer a challenge to young researchers. In this context I have chosen Nikos Kazantzakis as my subject because, though best known for his novels, he was also a prominent figure in Greek travel writing. With an output of five travel books and numerous travel pieces published in various Athenian newspapers, Kazantzakis deserves to be noticed, not only as the author of the novels that established his world-wide fame, but as a significant travel writer as well.

A distinguished place in Kazantzakis’ travel writings is reserved for his writings on Spain, a country to which he journeyed four times in the course of his life and about which he wrote eighty-seven travel pieces, parts of which were included in the book Ταξιδεύοντας-Ισπανία. What differentiates Kazantzakis’ texts on Spain from his writings on other countries is mainly the fact that in Spain the author had the chance to experience major historico-political changes, such as the transition from the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera to democracy under Azaña and then the collapse of that democratic state and the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War. In addition, it seems that Kazantzakis felt some sort of brotherhood towards the Spaniards (something he based mainly on what he termed their common African background), something not observed in his attitude to other nations. Last but not least, Kazantzakis’ third journey to Spain (1936) coincided with his entering a new state, which he called “freedom”. And, bearing in mind the significance of the word “freedom” in Kazantzakis’ life and
The aim of this thesis has been to make a close, critical and comparative reading of Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain as a whole, namely both the newspaper material and the book. For this purpose, I have endeavoured to trace the differences that are detected between the texts on Spain published in the newspapers Ελεφθερός Τύπος and Ι Καθημερινή and the book Σαμηδεύνληαο - Ηζπαλία. In this way, I have demonstrated how in some cases Kazantzakis changed his mind on certain issues or even preferred to “whitewash” his image of Spain. Furthermore, I aimed to explore what Kazantzakis was focusing on throughout his journeys and pinpoint the themes that occur and recur in his writings on Spain. Hence, it seems that art and people were his primary interests and that he was more reflective than descriptive in his narratives, especially as he moved from the newspaper articles to the book.

Kazantzakis’ attitude towards the Spanish Civil War, which he covered as a war-correspondent for Ι Καθημερινή, was another aspect of my critical reading of the author’s writings on Spain. It is apparent in these texts that, though Kazantzakis aimed to remain impartial while covering the Spanish Civil War, he did express some sort of affinity for some representatives of the Nationalist side, like Franco and the Falangists.

Through Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain the reader gets a notion of Spanish art and literature, Spanish characteristics and the historical and political conditions of a particular period. In the same vein, through Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain not only is a country being revealed, but an author as well. His three journeys over a ten-year period (1926-1936) reveal, for instance, his attraction to everything new and his love
of constant change; his attraction to Franco’s Fascism is an example of that. Furthermore, through his writings on Spain, Kazantzakis appears as an author to be full of contradictions. The most representative example of that is the fact that on his 1933 journey to Spain he compares Saint Teresa with Rosa Luxembourg, while on his 1936 journey to the country he characterizes Franco as “νγο Θηρέσιο του καρφη μαζ”.¹

In addition, Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain should not be viewed separately from the rest of his oeuvre, since they are closely related to it. Hence, it would be an omission not to note that Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain echo to a great extent his Ασκητική and, at the same time, the journeys to Spain provide the author with images, ideas, symbols and experiences he will employ in his later works. Though Kazantzakis’ Spanish experience did not generate the writing of another book (like his Russian journey that gave rise to Τόντα Ράμπα, the trip to Palestine which deeply influenced the creation of his novel O Τελευταίος Πειρασμός and the journey to China that generated the novel Ο Βραχόκηπος), it offered him two figures that would deeply stimulate him: Don Quixote and El Greco. The former is the “Καπετάν Ένας” of the twentieth rhapsody (Y) of the Kazantzakean Οδύσεια (“La Ombra”, according to him) and one of the leaders of the souls. The latter is the one to whom Kazantzakis narrates his story in the account of his life: the well-known Αναφορά στον Γκρέκο.

Moreover, in his reflections on Spain one can find the author’s views on several issues. Thus, in his writings on Spain Kazantzakis appears as an advocate of war; only through a conflict between the two opposing sides in Spain (the rebels and the reactionaries), he claims, can something new emerge. Furthermore, the reader is

informed about Kazantzakis’ view on religion; as I have already demonstrated, while in Spain, Kazantzakis seems to condemn the Christian religion and admire Islam. In his writings on Spain, Kazantzakis expresses his view on art and on art’s ultimate goal, which is the salvation that derives from achieving unity among people, animals, past, present, life and death.

In addition, by comparing Kazantzakis’ work with that of Ouranis and Papantoniou, who also visited the country during the same period, I have attempted to illuminate other aspects of Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain, such as the methods and techniques he employed, his style and the sources he drew on. After comparing the three authors’ writings on Spain, I concluded that, though all deal with more or less similar themes, each of them presents his material in his own, unique way, which is related to his own distinct personality. This enables me to confirm what I. M. Panagiotopoulos has rightly said: “Η ταξιδιωτική εντύπωση δίνει τον άνθρωπο διαμέσου του τόπου και τον τόπο διαμέσου του ανθρώπου.”

My close, critical and comparative reading of all Kazantzakis’ writings on Spain, namely both the newspaper articles and the book Σαμηδένληαο-Ηζπαλία, has prompted me to assert the need for a new and more comprehensive edition of the book, namely one that will include all Kazantzakis’ texts from Spain. Furthermore, I believe that all Kazantzakis’ travel pieces (journalistic accounts and books) deserve a closer reading that will go beyond stressing their literary value and highlight the usefulness of these texts as cultural, historical and political documents. Finally, a more comprehensive study of his travel pieces would spotlight another aspect of

---

Kazantzakis (that of the travel writer) and would contribute to a more holistic view of this influential author.
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