

# Decentering European Intellectual Space

*Edited by*

Marja Jalava  
Stefan Nygård  
Johan Strang



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

# Contents

Notes on Contributors VII

- 1 At the Periphery of European Intellectual Space 1  
*Stefan Nygård, Johan Strang and Marja Jalava*

## PART 1

### *Reconsidering European Intellectual Space*

- 2 Facing Asymmetry: Nordic Intellectuals and Center–Periphery Dynamics 19  
*Stefan Nygård and Johan Strang*
- 3 From Periphery to Center: The Origins and Worlding of Ibsen’s Drama 43  
*Narve Fulsås and Tore Rem*
- 4 The Transnational Hierarchies and Networks of the Artistic Avant-garde ca. 1885–1915 65  
*David Cottingham*
- 5 Redefining Historical Materialism in the Peripheries of Marxism: Georges Sorel and Antonio Labriola between France, Italy, and Germany 88  
*Tommaso Giordani*

## PART 2

### *Negotiating the Center*

- 6 Repositioning Spain: The Political and Intellectual Involvements of Azaña and Ortega 117  
*José María Rosales*
- 7 Spatial Asymmetries: Regionalist Intellectual Projects in East Central Europe in the Interwar Period 143  
*Diana Mishkova*

- 8 **European Small-State Academics and the Rise of the United States as an Intellectual Center: The Cases of Halvdan Koht and Heikki Waris** 165  
*Marja Jalava and Johanna Rainio-Niemi*
- 9 **Practicing “Europe”: Georg Lukács, Ágnes Heller, and the Budapest School** 195  
*Emilia Palonen*

### PART 3

#### *Cold War Dynamics*

- 10 **Greece, Europe, and the Making of the Enlightenment in the Periphery** 221  
*Manolis Patiniotis*
- 11 **Europe, West and East, and the Polish Émigré Writers from *Kultura*: Five Stories about Asymmetry** 243  
*Łukasz Mikołajewski*
- 12 **Feminist Intellectuals: From Yugoslavia, in Europe** 269  
*Zsófia Lóránd*
- Index** 293

# Greece, Europe, and the Making of the Enlightenment in the Periphery

*Manolis Patiniotis*

## Introduction

It is difficult to say which came first, Greece or Europe. The established narrative has it that Europe was born from the classical Greek civilization, expanded by the Romans, and shaped during the Middle Ages to its current form. The origin of this narrative falls outside the scope of this chapter, as does the priority debate between Ancient Greece and the Middle Ages. The point is that around the time of the French Revolution, when Europe started becoming a self-conscious unity representing the culmination of civilization (a process that concluded in the colonial expansion), it yielded priority of existence to another cultural formation, which was recognized as the progenitor of its contemporary state. That the establishment of the Greek nation state was an immediate result of this acknowledgment is similarly not within the remit of my chapter, but it should be underlined that for obvious reasons Greek nationalism drew heavily upon this ideological background: Greece was the ancestor of Europe and as such deserved a distinctive place in World history.

Strange as it may sound, this narrative has stopped for some decades now to fuel the Greek national pride. It was replaced by a more complex one, which still has the dipole Greece–Europe at its center, but reverts the order of priority. This narrative focuses on the way(s) and the extent to which Greece was successfully incorporated into a Europe that was taken as a predefined cultural destination. When did Greece and the Greeks realize their connection with Europe? How fully did they embrace European values? How successfully did they accomplish the transition from a pre-modern state to the modern condition?

The historiographic approach that gave birth to these questions placed at the core of the new perception not the genealogy of Europe (and so antiquity) but the genealogy of modernity, and thus the Enlightenment. For the most part of modern historiography, the Enlightenment represents the constitutive act of modern European civilization, and the question under which circumstances every part of the World became part of this civilization represents the

constitutive act of history itself.<sup>1</sup> Greek historians adopted this approach during the stressful years after World War II by introducing the notion of Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment. Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment covers the last fifty years of “Turkocracy” and refers to the contact of Greek-speaking scholars with the *lumières*, which gradually led to the realization of Greece’s place in Europe and thus to the national uprising against the Ottoman rule. However, due to the long Ottoman presence and the cultural habits passed on to the young national state, and due to distortions and regressions induced by nineteenth-century attempts to consolidate the fragile national ideology, the transition to modern European condition remained as yet incomplete.

When the historiography of the Enlightenment rapidly changes,<sup>2</sup> it would be natural to question the structure and character of Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment,<sup>3</sup> but the discussion that follows has a different goal. It investigates the conditions under which this narrative emerged, the reasons it took root in the postwar Greek intellectual context, and the kind of cultural hierarchies it underpinned within the European intellectual space. This leads to the examination of a series of asymmetrical relations which unfold in time and, at a certain point, intersect, bringing to life entities and attitudes that shaped the Greek intellectual life after World War II. Such asymmetrical relations concern the dilemmas of modernity as experienced by the Greek society as a whole and by particular individuals in their bid to compromise local intellectual pursuits with the fluctuant international trends of the time. The asymmetries also pertain to the geopolitical tensions between centers and peripheries which arose from Cold-War national and transnational attempts to outline the borders of the Western World and to establish a hierarchical geography of the Enlightenment within it.

### The Scheme of the Enlightenment: Greece and Europe

In 1945, a forty-year old Greek scholar, Constantinos Dimaras (1904–1992), published a paper entitled “The French Revolution and the Greek Enlightenment

- 
- 1 Dipesh Chakrabarty, “Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History: Who Speaks for ‘Indian’ Pasts?” *Representations* 37, special issue: Imperial Fantasies and Postcolonial Histories (1992): 1–26.
  - 2 Dorina Outram, *The Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Lynn Hunt, and Margaret Jacob, “Enlightenment Studies,” in *Encyclopedia of the Enlightenment*, ed. Alan C. Kors (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).
  - 3 I did so in a first approach to the subject: Manolis Patiniotis, “Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment: In Search of a European Identity,” in *Relocating the History of Science: Essays in Honor of Kostas Gavroglu*, eds. Theodore Arabatzis, Jürgen Renn, and Ana Simões (Cham-Heidelberg-New York-Dordrecht-London: Springer, 2015).

around 1800.”<sup>4</sup> At the time Dimaras had not yet received his university degree, let alone his doctorate. However, he had studied at the School of Philosophy of Athens University and had also spent two years attending classes of Medicine. Throughout the 1930s he had been a rather conservative scholar with strong religious convictions. His main occupation was the history of Greek literature, which allowed him to make a living by writing press articles and delivering courses. The publication of the 1945 paper concludes a process of transformation which involved both his personal attitude and his professional commitments: the young Christian scholar turned to an indifferentist historian, and his focus shifted from literature to the history of ideas (or “of the consciousness,” as he preferred it).<sup>5</sup> In the article, the term “Greek Enlightenment” was introduced for the first time and has been the cornerstone of modern Greek historiography ever since.<sup>6</sup>

Three years later, in 1948, Dimaras published his seminal work *History of Neo-Hellenic Literature*,<sup>7</sup> where he suggested a periodization of the Greek history of ideas from 1600 to 1821, still in use. He divided the whole period into three phases. The first phase started around 1600 with the national and educational policy of Patriarch Kyrillos Loukaris and ended in 1669 with the end of the Ottoman expansion in the Greek-speaking regions of the Balkans. In the field of philosophy this period was characterized by a revival of interest in the study of nature and a synthesis between neo-Aristotelian philosophy and

4 Κωνσταντίνος Θ. Δημαράς, “Η Γαλλική Επανάσταση και ο Ελληνικός Διαφωτισμός γύρω στα 1800,” *Δημοκρατικά Χρονικά* 1, no 6 (July 23, 1945): 11–12.

5 Κωνσταντίνος Θ. Δημαράς, “Κ.Θ. Δημαράς: Δεν ενδιαφέρει η κορυφή αλλά οι μέσοι όροι,” interview by Βασιλική Κοντογιάννη, *Διαβάζω* 53 (1982): 54–62.

6 In the last years, there have been a number of alternative or diverging historical reconstructions of the period of Ottoman rule. Some works focus on economic interactions, mobility, and Greek diasporas in European commercial and cultural centers: Σπύρος Ι. Ασδραχάς, ed., *Ελληνική Οικονομική Ιστορία, 1Ε'-1Θ' αιώνας*, (Athens: Πολιτιστικό Ίδρυμα Ομίλου Πειραιώς, 2003). Other works reconsider the life of Orthodox populations within the social frame and power structures of the Ottoman state: Παρασκευάς Κονόρτας, *Οθωμανικές θεωρήσεις για το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο: Βεράτια για τους προκαθήμενους της Μεγάλης Εκκλησίας 17ος-αρχές 20ού αιώνα* (Athens: Αλεξάνδρεια, 1998). A third group revises the center–periphery dichotomy upon which the study of Greek science and philosophy had been based in traditional historiography: Μανώλης Πατηνιώτης, *Στοιχεία Φυσικής Φιλοσοφίας: Ο ελληνικός επιστημονικός στοχασμός τον 17° και 18° αιώνα* (Athens: Gutenberg, 2013). Notwithstanding such scholarly departures, however, both in academia and in public discourse the “Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment” retains its historiographical prevalence and is widely considered the precursor of the intellectual and political agitations that led to the establishment of the Greek nation state. For an overview, see Αντώνης Λιάκος, “Η νεοελληνική ιστοριογραφία το τελευταίο τέταρτο του εικοστού αιώνα,” *Σύγχρονα Θέματα* 76–77 (2001): 72–91.

7 Κωνσταντίνος Θ. Δημαράς, *Ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας: Από τις πρώτες ρίζες ως τον Σολωμό*, 7th edition (Athens: Ίκαρος, 1985 [1948 & 1949]).

Christian Orthodox theology. The term “religious humanism” used by Dimaras to designate this period suggests an affinity both with the Byzantine past (“Byzantine humanism”) and with the homonymous Renaissance intellectual current that was admittedly absent from Greek history.

The second phase, according to Dimaras, started in 1670 and ended one century later (1774) with a treaty between Russia and the Ottoman Empire that broadened and secured the economic privileges of the Greek-speaking populations. The period is known as the “Century of the Phanariots,” a name that reflects the increasing political impact of the social group of the learned noblemen of Constantinople. Phanariots, after having ascended the various lay offices of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, advanced themselves in the political hierarchy of the Ottoman Empire. Dimaras argues that their political program was inspired by the ideals of Enlightened Despotism. At the same time, they promoted an intellectual life receptive to the European—especially French—culture, becoming thus the first agents of modernization of the emerging Greek society.

The last phase started in 1775 and ended with the Greek War of Independence in 1821. According to Dimaras, this was the period of the “Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment” *par excellence*, characterized by the assimilation of the philosophical and scientific attainments of the European Enlightenment. Dimaras maintains that the progressive scholars of the time, seeking a rational foundation for the social life of the Greek populations of the Ottoman Empire, spread the ideas that gradually led to the great national uprising. Throughout this period, the acquaintance with the new scientific ideas played a significant role in eradicating superstition, promoting a firm belief in Reason, and reviving the connection of the “enslaved” Greeks with their ancestors.<sup>8</sup>

One could already notice that the tripartite scheme of Dimaras’s narrative involves an implicit comparison with Europe, establishing thus a relationship of *tentative transition*. In the first period, which was marked by the revival of Greek philosophical thought, the European prototype was represented by Renaissance Humanism. This prototype, however, could not be fully met because of the dominance of the Orthodox Church in the Greek intellectual context. In the second period, the Phanariot gentry represented the dynamism of the European patrons of the Enlightenment, but the emerging Greek society

8 The periodization presented here is clearly suggested by the structure of Δημαράς, *Ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας*. For further elaboration on “the scheme of the Enlightenment,” see the homonymous chapter in Κωνσταντίνος Θ. Δημαράς, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, 6th revised edition (Athens: Ερμής, 1993 [1977]).

could not fully profit from it, because the Phanariots themselves were unstable and politically regressive. The most important was the third period, when the “enlightened” Greek scholars discovered Europe at its best and realized that this was where their “Γένος” (“nation” in a pre-nationalistic sense) belonged. As noted by Paschalis Kitromilidis (one of the historians who claim Dimaras’s heritage), taking the perspective of the Enlightenment enabled Dimaras to abandon the linear account that aimed to secure the uninterrupted continuation from antiquity to the present, and recast the major narrative of Greek history. In the new context, historical research focuses on the processes of Europeanization of the Greek society and on the actors who played the most crucial role in bridging Greek society with the ideals of the emerging European modernity.<sup>9</sup> Here again, however, we have an incomplete project, in fact *the* incomplete project. The Enlightenment failed and the efforts to establish a liberal nation state were doomed due to distortions both inherent to Greek society and inherited by “Turkocracy.”<sup>10</sup>

In all the above cases, Europe is taken to represent the unquestionable culmination of modern civilization and, notwithstanding the unfulfillment of transition, the participation in its becoming bears witness to the cultural maturity of Greek society. Although Dimaras designated a peripheral status to Greek society, he assured its position on the unique path leading to European integration. In this respect, being in the periphery was not actually a drawback: although Greek society did not mark European culture with distinctive attainments, the fact that it was in a position to appreciate and, to certain degree, incorporate the intellectual patterns of the Enlightenment placed it in the vicinity of Europe.

### Enlightenment in the Periphery

How did a young convert intellectual come to change the major narrative of Greek history? Dimaras first came in touch with aspects of the Enlightenment through the work of an early nineteenth-century Greek-speaking scholar, Adamantios Korais (1748–1833). He was introduced to Korais in conjunction with

9 Πασχάλης Κιτρομηλίδης, “Συγκριτικές προσεγγίσεις στον Νεοελληνικό Διαφωτισμό,” in *Νεοελληνική Παιδεία και Κοινωνία. Πρακτικά διεθνούς συνεδρίου αφιερωμένου στη μνήμη του Κ.Θ. Δημαρά*. (Athens: Όμιλος Μελέτης του Ελληνικού Διαφωτισμού, 1995), 570.

10 Πασχάλης Κιτρομηλίδης, “Το όραμα του Κοραή για μια νέα Ελλάδα,” interview by Σπύρος Γιανναράς, newspaper *Η Καθημερινή*, May 16, 2011.



the commemoration organized by Korais's hometown for the centenary of his death and, a few years later, for the bicentenary of his birth. Apparently it is not coincidental that between 1933 and 1948 Dimaras underwent a radical change in his intellectual commitments, which made him a historian "of the consciousnesses," and Korais the hero of Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment.<sup>11</sup>

Korais was born in Smyrna to a family of merchants. When he was young he traveled to Amsterdam to support the family business network, but this did not turn out well. He came back and soon departed again, this time for educational purposes. He completed his studies at the Medical School of Montpellier University with a dissertation on Hippocratic Medical Art. Subsequently, he moved to Paris and became a publisher of Ancient Greek treatises. He spent the rest of his life in Paris and was an eyewitness (but not a participant) of the French Revolution. Gradually, he became a person of influence concerning the Greek political developments. He prefaced his editions with essays addressing the current situation of his nation, and developed an extended network of correspondents. Still, neither at this time nor later was Korais an indisputable authority. On the contrary, when he participated in the political discussions of his time and tried to pass directions to his contemporaries, he made both faithful adherents ("disciples") and bitter enemies. When he expressed his reservations about the premature beginning of the Greek Revolution he became a target. And when his contribution was posthumously assessed, the judgments heavily varied, as he was associated with such different projects as linguistic conservatism, atheism, bourgeois liberalism, socialism, and, of course, the transmission of the Enlightenment to the Greek intellectual life.<sup>12</sup>

However, Philippos Iliou, the historian who produced an extensive account of Korais's multiple re-appropriations throughout the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries, draws a paradoxical and rather arbitrary conclusion: All these conflicting images are, *of course*, far from real—they are mere caricatures. The findings of modern historical studies indicate that Korais was a radical and sometimes revolutionary intellectual who consistently tried to back up the establishment of a free nation state grounded on the most advanced principles of civil society. And these studies were particularly promoted thanks to Dimaras's decision to abandon his religious commitments and turn to the study

11 Εμμανουήλ Ν. Φραγκίσκος, "Ανανέωση και ώθηση των κοραϊκών σπουδών," in *Πενήντα Χρόνια Νεοελληνικής Παιδείας: Η παρουσία του Κ.Θ. Δημαρά στην επιστήμη των νεοελληνικών γραμμάτων* (Athens: Εταιρεία Σπουδών Νεοελληνικού Πολιτισμού και Γενικής Παιδείας, 1985), 42.

12 Φίλιππος Ηλιού, "Ιδεολογικές χρήσεις του κοραϊσμού στον εικοστό αιώνα," in *Δίημερο Κοραή: Προσεγγίσεις στη γλωσσική θεωρία, τη σκέψη και το έργο του Κοραή* (Athens: Κέντρο Νεοελληνικών Ερευνών Ε.Ι.Ε., 1984).

of Korais's biography as part of the broader field of the history "of collective consciousnesses."<sup>13</sup>

In fact, Iliou is right at least in this: thanks to Dimaras, Korais became a concrete subject of historical study (while he had simply been a debatable historical figure until then). When he first got involved with the centennial celebrations, Dimaras quietly started working on Korais's correspondence. This work had a transformative effect both on him and on Korais's standing. Leaving the period of incubation behind, Dimaras enumerated the priorities of historical research as follows: an extended search for every published or unpublished source related to Korais, a detailed list of all his letters, and the creation of a complete repository of works associating Korais with the Enlightenment. The purpose of this research line was to bring forth all the aspects of Korais's work and to establish him as receiver and transmitter of "the ideologies of his time; in other words, to provide the still Korais of the flat and static historiography with pace and expression and incorporate him in the history of ideas and consciousnesses."<sup>14</sup>

It is a clear case of co-construction. The historian (Dimaras), the historical actor (Korais), and the subdiscipline (Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment) were formed through the same process and, as they advanced, mutually legitimized one another. The history of Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment, as laid out by Dimaras and his followers, is a narrative which naturally leads to Korais. According to this narrative, in the early nineteenth century, all intellectual currents pointing to the direction of the forthcoming national uprising emanated from Korais's sphere of influence. All the progressive forces of the Greek society were inspired by his political thought and implemented his advice to "re-channel" the European attainments in philosophy and the sciences into the Greek intellectual life.<sup>15</sup> It is true that, scientifically or philosophically speaking, Korais was not as competent as other eighteenth-century scholars. Nor was he a really representative figure of his time, unlike Eugenios Voulgaris (1716–1806) or Iosipos Misiodox (1725/1730–1800). But his work and personality managed to express "all the dispersed but active proclivities of new Hellenism as we perceive it today." In this sense, he was the personification of *synthesis*, a concept which epitomized the process that shaped new Hellenism through the assimilation of a variety of cultural elements.<sup>16</sup> In Dimaras's eyes, Korais

13 Ηλιού, "Ιδεολογικές χρήσεις του κοραϊσμού," 146–47.

14 Φραγκίσκος, "Ανανέωση και ώθηση των κοραϊκών σπουδών," 44.

15 Δημαράς, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, 106–19 and 301–89.

16 Βενετία Αποστολίδου, "Το Παλαμικό παράδειγμα στην Ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας. Υποθέσεις εργασίας," in *Επιστημονική συνάντηση στη μνήμη του Κ.Θ. Δημαρά*, ed. Τριαντάφυλλος

was for the Greek nation what Voltaire had been for the French: the beacon of the Enlightenment.

### A Search for National Identity: Dilemmas of Modernity

What was the intellectual environment Dimaras emerged from? He matured and was intellectually shaped in the 1920s and the 1930s, and in this sense, his personal journey and transformations typify the ambivalent intellectual quests of the interwar period. The social, economic, and political consequences of the second Industrial Revolution (1870–1918), combined with pervasive feelings of insecurity and social disorientation as a result of World War I, had given rise to a variety of critical discourses that sought to make sense of what was collectively experienced as the unbearable contingency of liberal modernity. The movement of modernism developed on this ground. It was fed by aesthetic investments, theoretical quests, technocratic ideals, and hygienic projects, and was inspired to a great extent by the Promethean power of technology and intending to a “new beginning” (*Aufbruch*) that would dismiss chaos, ambiguity, and the lack of meaning. However, this search for a new beginning did not prefigure the political character of the envisioned “organized” modernity: the whole spectrum of solutions from the liberal to the authoritarian end, often crowded in the discourse of a single person, or within the limits of a single political program, was called into play.<sup>17</sup>

The context from which Dimaras emerged was no exception. Greek modernism comprised a disparate aggregate of political and intellectual programs, and it is not by accident that the period ended with the fascist regime of Ioannis Metaxas in 1939. However, although these projects were different in many aspects, they shared some important common features: the pursuit of modernization and progress, on the one hand, and the need to reassert the Greek national identity in the new context, on the other. Dimaras was associated with the so-called “Generation of the ’30s,” a loose group which consisted primarily of poets and painters, but also of essayists, novelists, architects, and theater people. They represented the movement of modernism in the Greek

---

E. Σκλαβενίτης (Athens: Κέντρο Νεοελληνικών Ερευνών Εθνικού Ιδρύματος Ερευνών, 1994), 135.

17 Βασίλης Μπογιατζής, *Μετάωρος Μοντερνισμός: Τεχνολογία, ιδεολογία της επιστήμης και πολιτική στην Ελλάδα του μεσοπολέμου (1922–1940)* (Athens: Ευρασία, 2012), 29. For the notions of “restricted” and “organized” modernity, see Peter Wagner, *A Sociology of Modernity: Liberty and Discipline* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994).

intellectual life during the interwar period and right after World War II. The major issue the “Generation of the ’30s” tried to tackle went under the name “Hellenism” and was the heritage of nineteenth-century efforts to consolidate the Greek national identity. In the late 1850s, a professor of the University of Athens, the historian Constantinos Paparrigopoulos had produced an account which incorporated the Byzantine period into Greek history, securing thus an uninterrupted continuation of the Greek nation from early antiquity to the present. Paparrigopoulos’s novelty was not as much that he attempted to connect modern Greeks with their ancient ancestors—this had already been endeavored by European classicists and *philhellenes*—<sup>18</sup> but that he invented a living subject which substantiated this relationship. This subject was “Hellenism,” and Greek history ever since became a narrative of the adventures and successive metamorphoses of this subject under different historical circumstances.<sup>19</sup>

The pressing question for the Greek modernists of the 1930s was: what was the position of Hellenism in a changing world and an unforeseeable future? Reclaiming the past and engaging with the future was, of course, the major concern of modernity at large. But the Greek case displayed significant particularities. During the 1920s Greece experienced a huge influx of Greek-speaking populations from Asia Minor as a result of the population exchange between Greece and the young Turkish Republic (1922–1928). This situation called for a fresh look over the ideological premises of Greek national identity. The classicist symbolism of the Greek (physical and intellectual) landscape did not suffice to incorporate the new populations who were more familiar with an Ottoman context reminiscent of the pre-nationalistic era. If they were to be integrated into the national body, the identity of “new Hellenism” under Ottoman domination should be carefully and systematically revised. If they were to be Greeks among Greeks, in other words, it should be convincingly

18 The idea of Europe as a concrete (and indeed superior) cultural reference was gradually shaped throughout the eighteenth century, and replaced the earlier notion of Christendom. A significant part of this process was establishing Ancient Greece as the origin of European civilization and claiming its heritage. This incited the rediscovery of Greece through travels to the Orient. The travelers projected on the natural landscape and the human figures reflections of the antiquity, establishing a connection between the then present state of the Greeks and their presumed glorious past (Νάσια Γιακωβάκη, *Ευρώπη μέσω Ελλάδας. Μια καμπή στην ευρωπαϊκή αυτοσυνείδηση, 17ος–18ος αιώνας* (Athens: Βιβλιοπωλείον της Εστίας, 2006)).

19 Αντώνης Λιάκος, “Προς επισκευήν ολομελείας και ενότητος: Η δόμηση του εθνικού χρόνου,” in *Επιστημονική συνάντηση στη μνήμη του Κ.Θ. Δημαρά*, ed. Τριαντάφυλλος Ε. Σκλαβενίτης (Athens: Κέντρο Νεοελληνικών Ερευνών Εθνικού Ιδρύματος Ερευνών, 1994), 183–84.

explained how Greeks could *generally* exist in the Ottoman context during the last centuries.

Eighteenth-century Greece was to a great extent an ideological product of European colonialism. Without being a colony itself, it was a hybrid formation, familiar and exotic at the same time. Beyond any doubt, it represented the ancient source of European civilization, while it also was the part of Europe most contaminated by “oriental barbarism.” This conflicting character of the young Greek state and its ambiguous placement between East and West played a significant role in the discussions about the Greek identity throughout the nineteenth century. The preferred answer was that Greece belonged to the broad European family, but it was not an unproblematic solution. If Greece were to play a role in the modern world, it should define *the way* it belonged to Europe. A whole century after the establishment of the Greek nation state, the Europeanization of Greece was primarily perceived as an act of imitation involving the danger of alienation from essential qualities of the national character.<sup>20</sup> Thus, an important task for the Generation of the 1930s was to promote cultural mutuality and to show that Greece was tied to Europe not as an external body or as a newcomer, but as an intrinsic constituent of European civilization.<sup>21</sup>

The solution to this problem could not rest solely on the modernization of tradition. It demanded a radical re-invention that would reassert its originality and authenticity. This was achieved by appealing to the “archetypal” qualities of Greek identity. Tradition was simply a set of historical forms, whereas archetypal values represented the diachronic cultural mark of a people. By employing archetypal values, interwar scholars aimed to overcome the persistent ethnocentric perceptions of the past and get involved with their contemporary cultural developments as equal partners. Thus, they foregrounded the term “Hellenicity” and assigned to it the status of an aesthetic category.<sup>22</sup> Hellenicity

---

20 The renouncement of imitation has been a recurrent theme in Greek history: since the Great Schism (1054) every contact with western values or ideas has been met with skepticism and suspicion. The implicit idea is that western values are incapable of substantiating and expressing eastern spirituality which informs Greek identity. In this respect, imitation involves the danger of surrender to materialism, utilitarianism, and “primitive individualism,” which are strangers to Greek culture (see: Χρήστος Γιανναράς, *Ορθοδοξία και Δύση στη Νεώτερη Ελλάδα* (Athens: Δομός, 1992) and, especially, Χρήστος Γιανναράς, *Η Ευρώπη γεννήθηκε από το “σχίσμα”* [= *Europe was born out of the “Great Schism”*] (Athens: Ίκαρος, 2015).

21 Δημήτρης Τζιόβας, “Ελληνικότητα και γενιά του ’30,” *Cogito* 6 (2007): 8–9.

22 “Ελληνικότητα”: Evidence suggests the term was first introduced to Greek language in 1851 and into literary criticism in 1860 (Δημήτρης Τζιόβας, *Ο μύθος της γενιάς του Τριάντα. Νεοτερικότητα, ελληνικότητα και πολιτισμική ιδεολογία* (Athens: Πόλις, 2011), 288).

was not a measurable substance, but an intuitive perception and a relative historical reality. It incorporated the diachronic qualities of the Greek soul, which were expressed in different ways under different historical circumstances, but remained a source of inspiration and a universal aesthetic paradigm. Scholars and artists sought to emphasize the mythological and atmospheric dimension of these qualities. The aestheticization of the Greek landscape and particularly of the Aegean Sea is a most typical example of this intellectual approach.<sup>23</sup>

It is interesting that Dimaras is absent from all accounts about interwar Greek intellectual life. And he is rightly so, as he was still engaged with his mystical and idealist pursuits and thus quite distant from modernist attempts to re-evaluate Greek cultural identity. It was at that time, though, that Dimaras took the decisive turn which led him to recasting the dominant narrative of Greek history. The modernists drew on Hellenicity as a set of diachronic and universal values that would allow Greeks to participate in their contemporary intellectual exchanges as equal partners. Along this line, they felt free to appropriate the latest developments in literature, poetry, and painting, but they also promoted the Greek qualities as indispensable constituents of modernity. Greek was modern: the two Greek poets who were awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature (George Seferis in 1963 and Odysseas Elytis in 1979) were by no chance members of the “Generation of the ’30s.” At the same time, though, Greek modernists retained a basic feature of ethnocentric historiography. They sought to ensure the idea that the Greeks had been the chosen people from the beginning of time and that the innermost features of their culture represented a transcendental frame of reference for western civilization at large. Dimaras, however, turned to Paparrigopoulos’s notion of Hellenism, focusing on the history of “new Hellenism” in particular. He was not so much interested in singling out Greek culture as to associate modern Greek identity with a secure and stable context, which could not be found within Greece. This context was Europe: The Greeks were intrinsically connected with the “European people” because the values of classical Greek civilization lay in the foundations of Enlightenment Europe. “Through the humanism of the classics, which shaped European civilization, Dimaras sought to establish that the Greek tradition was an inseparable part of the common European tradition, in other words that the Greeks should at last realize that they were Europeans and conversely, that the Westerners should gain access to Neo-Hellenic science [sic].”<sup>24</sup>

23 Τζιόβας, “Ελληνικότητα,” 8; Τζιόβας, *Ο μύθος της γενιάς του Τριάντα*, 293–313.

24 Λουκία Δρούλια, “Κ.Θ. Δημαράς: Από τη Θεωρία στην Πράξη,” in *Επιστημονική συνάντηση στη μνήμη του Κ.Θ. Δημαρά*, ed. Τριαντάφυλλος Ε. Σκλαβενίτης (Athens: Κέντρο Νεοελληνικών Ερευνών Εθνικού Ιδρύματος Ερευνών, 1994), 19. It is indeed interesting that Dimaras’ enterprise coincides with Theodore Besterman’s (1904–1976) attempt to revive Voltaire and

Dimaras was not primarily concerned with the uninterrupted continuation of the Greeks from antiquity to his days, as was Paparrigopoulos, but he was indeed concerned with the awakening of the national self-consciousness of the “enslaved” Greeks during the last decades of the eighteenth century. This awakening stemmed from the contact of Greek intellectual life with the Enlightenment. People traveling west and ideas traveling east helped Greeks realize that they were heir to the very same values which flourished in the atmosphere of the Enlightenment, but could not find a proper grounding in their own society. And it was this double awareness, motivated by the paradigm of the European (and particularly the French) Enlightenment—the awareness of their own heritage and of the unfulfillment of their historical mission because of the Ottoman rule—that activated their reflexes and led to the Greek War of Independence.

As a (rather peculiar) consequence, the nation state that resulted from the Greek Revolution was a “nation of the Enlightenment,” as a historian put it recently.<sup>25</sup> Dimaras’s major achievement was that he answered the question of modernity by merging the fate of “new Hellenism” with the fate of Europe. And the period during which this merging had happened was the Enlightenment.

### Analogies: Crafting the Historiographical Background

An important feature of Dimaras’s synthesis is that the Greeks are no longer the chosen people. They comprise a part of a broader anthropological group that

---

recast Enlightenment’s narrative around Voltaire’s personality and work: Francesco Cordasco, *Theodore Besterman, Bibliographer and Editor: A Selection of Representative Texts* (Metuchen, NJ & London: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1992). Although Dimaras was not directly connected with Besterman, the Greek “Club for the Study of the Greek Enlightenment” was one of the first members of the International Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies founded by Besterman. Moreover, Dimaras’ attempt to re-evaluate the contribution of Adamantios Korais bears significant similarities to Besterman’s Voltairean project. In this sense it seems that although Dimaras primarily addressed the Greek audience, he was part of a post-WWII project aimed at reclaiming Enlightenment’s heritage on the basis of a liberal narrative.

25 Άγγελος Ελεφάντης, “Το έθνος του Διαφωτισμού,” in *Κοινωνικοί Αγώνες και Διαφωτισμός: Μελέτες αφιερωμένες στον Φίλιππο Ηλιού*, ed. Χρήστος Λούκος (Heraklion: Πανεπιστημιακές Εκδόσεις Κρήτης, 2007); see also Άλλη Κυριακίδου-Νέεστορος, *Η θεωρία της ελληνικής λαογραφίας. Κριτική Ανάλυση* (Athens: Εταιρεία Σπουδών Νεοελληνικού Πολιτισμού και Γενικής Παιδείας, Σχολή Μωραΐτη, 1978), 36–39 and Γιώργος Καραμπελιάς, “Μετακένωση-Μεταφορά-Δημιουργία,” *Άρδην* 27 (September–October 2000): 37–40.

represents the utmost cultural accomplishment of modern history. Because “Europe is quite something; no matter how much we extend our consciousness in order for our affection and responsibility to include human presence everywhere in the world; Europe is a reality which has not yet exhausted its content and whose historical destiny keeps occupying our minds. There is indeed something which is a European people.”<sup>26</sup> Thus, although the Greeks are no longer the first, they have always been among the first by hereditary right; and the events of their recent history, *the history of new Hellenism*, show how they came to rediscover their natural position among Europe’s peoples after a long period of self-alienation. Dimaras gave up the leading role of Greek culture in exchange for a steady orbit in the European heaven.

Dimaras was a hard worker. Starting with Korais, he found, edited, and published a great deal of sources which attested to the historical reality of Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment. He also introduced another key figure, the Bucharest-based Phanariot scholar Dimitrios Katartzis (c. 1730–1807), who functioned as a bridge between Greek scholarly quests and the attainments of the Enlightenment.<sup>27</sup> Dimaras also employed bibliometric and statistical methods in order to document the sweeping changes in the Greek intellectual life between 1750 and the War of Independence. Indeed, he considered this aspect of his work as a paradigmatic expression of the “scientific” spirit he and his colleagues brought to modern Greek historiography.<sup>28</sup> And, above all, he employed analogy in order to show that the developments leading to Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment were inherent in the Greek society.<sup>29</sup> In this approach,

26 Κωνσταντίνος Θ. Δημαράς, “Επιλεγόμενα,” in *Περιηγήσεις στον ελληνικό χώρο*, eds. Λουκία Δρούλια, Αικατερίνη Κουμαριανού, Εμμανουήλ Ν. Φραγκίσκος, Παναγιώτης Μουλλάς, Γιώργος Π. Σαββίδης, Άλκης Αγγέλου (Athens: Όμιλος Μελέτης Ελληνικού Διαφωτισμού, 1968), reprinted in *Κ 11* (2006): 6; see also on p. 9.

27 Katartzis’s pervasive influence is characteristically depicted in a 1966 newspaper article where Dimaras stressed the importance of the *Encyclopédie* for the developments that led to Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment. “I don’t know of more examples at the moment, but Katartzis considered it a blessing that he was able to get hold of a copy of the *Encyclopédie* at a certain point. [...] For all the other [Europeans] this work was a means of education, but for the Greeks it was a prerequisite for reclaiming their position within the congregation of European peoples, an essential tool for gaining their liberty” (Κωνσταντίνος Θ. Δημαράς, “Η Έγκυκλοπαιδεία,” in *Κ.Θ. Δημαράς, Σύμμικτα Α: Από την παιδεία στην λογοτεχνία*, ed. Αλέξης Πολίτης (Athens: Σπουδαστήριο Νέου Ελληνισμού, 2000 [May 27, 1966]), 259–60).

28 Δημαράς, “Δεν ενδιαφέρει η κορυφή αλλά οι μέσοι όροι,” 68.

29 Δημήτρης Γ. Αποστολόπουλος, “Οι πηγές της έμπνευσης ενός ερμηνευτικού σχήματος: Ο ‘Θρησκευτικός Ουμανισμός,’” in *Επιστημονική συνάντηση στη μνήμη του Κ.Θ. Δημαρά*, ed. Τριαντάφυλλος Ε. Σκλαβενίτης (Athens: Κέντρο Νεοελληνικών Ερευνών Εθνικού Ιδρύματος Ερευνών, 1994), 73–74.



the contemporary Greek society was divided into three groups, each of them representing a different aspect of Enlightenment dynamics, as was the case with contemporary French society. The clergy with established and pervasive power represented for the most part the reaction to the new intellectual developments.<sup>30</sup> The Phanariots with their secular, princely lifestyle and political aspirations corresponded to the patrons of the Enlightenment. They employed the principles of Enlightened Despotism as officers of the Sublime Port and supported the influx of the new intellectual trends, but turned reactionary when they realized the actual political dynamics of the new ideas as a result of the French Revolution.<sup>31</sup> And the emerging bourgeoisie represented the agent of the Enlightenment *par excellence*. The newly established commercial groups of the Balkans envisioned their future in a modern liberal society, and thus offered unconditional support to the ideals of the Enlightenment.<sup>32</sup> Indeed, they embodied a deeper and even more organic connection with the ideals of the Enlightenment as it was outlined by Korais: as the *middle* class, they were naturally inclined to value moderation, which enabled them to choose the *via media* in the political and ideological debates of the time.<sup>33</sup>

### Institutions of the Enlightenment: The Local and the Global

The overwhelming intellectual production of Dimaras and his colleagues established Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment as an indisputable historical fact. But it has overshadowed another dimension of Dimaras's activity, which actually contributed immensely to the prevalence of his historiographic scheme: institution building. Very early on, in a series of newspaper articles, Dimaras had outlined the general lines of a research project aiming at the study of Greek scholarly life during "Turkocracy." He described the intellectual tasks which should be undertaken for Neo-Hellenic studies to be established and the "national census" required for the consolidation of Greek national consciousness. He suggested the foundation of new institutions, the publication of new journals, and the establishment of scientific societies. The "national census"

30 Φίλιππος Ηλιού, *Τύφλωσον Κύριε τον Λαόν σου. Οι προεπαναστατικές κρίσεις και ο Νικόλαος Πίτακολος* (Athens: Πορεία, 1988 [1974]).

31 Κωνσταντίνος Θ. Δημαράς, *Ιστορικά Φροντίσματα Α' Ο Διαφωτισμός και το κορύφωμά του* (Athens: Πορεία, 1992), 78 and 123–24; Δημαράς, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, 7–10, 222–24, 263–82 et al.

32 Δημαράς, *Ιστορικά Φροντίσματα Α'*, 200–01; Δημαράς, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, 27–28, 154, 310–14 et al.

33 Δημαράς, *Ιστορικά Φροντίσματα Α'*, 129.

involved, among other things, biographies of the leading figures of the pre-Revolutionary era, catalogs of books and journals, records of Greek schools in the period, lists of scientific and philosophical translations which channeled European thought into the Greek intellectual life, etc. Above all, Dimaras stressed the need for an “organization comprised of a large number of properly trained researchers provided with all means necessary for the intensive performance of their work.”<sup>34</sup>

All this in 1942. The envisioned organization came to life in 1958. Dimaras was instrumental in its establishment and became its first executive director. The context from which this organization emerged, however, was quite complicated and brought into play a number of unlikely actors. After World War II, Dimaras got involved with the Ministry of Coordination, which was responsible for planning and supervising the reconstruction works. While at the Ministry, Dimaras developed a close relationship with two key figures, the architect Constantinos Doxiadis (1913–1975) and the economist Ioannis Pesmazoglou (1918–2003), who were instrumental in re-planning postwar Greek urban and economic life. Both were internationally active to achieve their goal: Doxiadis attended conferences in many countries and participated in international summits on postwar reconstruction projects; Pesmazoglou served in various executive positions at the Ministry and the Bank of Greece, and in 1958 coordinated the inauguration of the negotiations between Greece and the European Community.

In the early 1950s, Dimaras, who was already the director of the newly founded State Scholarship Foundation, started discussing with Pesmazoglou a plan concerning the establishment of a national research center that would address the “needs” of the country. According to unpublished documents of the time those needs had basically to do with the creation of modern research infrastructure, the development of a scientific overview that would enable the rational handling of public affairs, and the consolidation of national consciousness.<sup>35</sup> However disparate, all these priorities came under the umbrella of “modernization.” Pesmazoglou took the lead and started a series of contacts that secured the consent of those around King Paul, the participation of Leonidas Zervas (1902–1980), a United States-based Greek chemistry professor, as supervisor of the center’s scientific branch, and the financial support by national and international funds. There is no doubt that Dimaras and Pesmazoglou had a strong vision of the role of the center in the recovering Greek society. So

34 Δρούλια, “Από τη Θεωρία στην Πράξη,” 17.

35 Τριαντάφυλλος Ε. Σκλαβενίτης, “Ιστορικό σχεδιάσμα για την ίδρυση και την πορεία του ΕΙΕ,” in *Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών, 1958–2008: Ίδρυση – πορεία – προοπτικές*, ed. Τριαντάφυλλος Ε. Σκλαβενίτης (Athens: Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών, 2008), 13–14.

did Zervas, who saw an opportunity for his country to create a robust scientific infrastructure similar to the German and American institutions where he had been working for years.<sup>36</sup> And it was indeed this harmonious fusion of demands coming from the humanities and the natural sciences that helped the vision come true. However, the crucial catalyst to this development was funding.

To make a long story short, the center was finally established under the name of the Royal Research Foundation thanks to generous American funding, primarily from the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations. Zervas, who was in New York at the time, contacted the officials of the two foundations and, to his surprise, received positive answers and encouragement. According to his account, the two institutions worked closely with the State Department and had a clear picture of the situation. They were aware that the survival of the “free world” depended not only on attracting the scientific elite to the United States, but also on supporting native initiatives in other countries for the sake of advancing the sciences and especially the humanities. Apparently for the same reason, the largest amount of money came from the unspent allowance of the American aid. Pasmazoglou's short stay in the United States in the winter of 1954–55 under an Eisenhower Fellowship scheme helped him broaden his circle of contacts, which in combination with his position in the Bank of Greece enabled him to negotiate the channeling of this money to the creation of the center. This was practically the only way for the initiative to be accomplished, as the state resources were scarce. Thus, on the very same day that the establishment of the Royal Research Foundation was announced (October 10, 1958), the American ambassador visited King Paul to hand him a donation letter of 100,000,000 drachmas in order for the United States to be associated with this “valuable and much wanted” initiative.<sup>37</sup> Some years later, in 1964, the American mission provided 50,000,000 more for the construction of the Foundation's building, which was undertaken by Constantinos Doxiadis and his associates.<sup>38</sup>

Thus, the circle closed with Dimaras as executive director of the first board of the Foundation, Doxiadis as the architect of its building, and Pasmazoglou as an influential member of the board. Of course, many more people played important roles in the realization of the project and, especially, in the smooth coupling of the sciences with the humanities in the new and unprecedented context. But the rest of the story of the Royal (and later National Hellenic)

36 Σκλαβενίτης, “Ιστορικό σχέδιασμα,” 15–16.

37 Σκλαβενίτης, “Ιστορικό σχέδιασμα,” 20–21.

38 Τριαντάφυλλος Ε. Σκλαβενίτης, ed., *Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών, 1958–2008: Ίδρυση – πορεία – προοπτικές* (Athens: Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών, 2008), 301.

Research Foundation falls outside the scope of this chapter. What is important from our perspective is that the first institute of the new Foundation was the Center for Neo-Hellenic Research devoted to the study of “new Hellenism” (1960). Dimaras, who undertook its direction as soon as he resigned from the position of executive director (1962), recruited and trained a significant number of promising historians, whose mission was to unearth and file all the documents testifying to the contact of “new Hellenism” with the West, and especially with the European Enlightenment. As he had planned 20 years earlier, he organized the publication of biographies and correspondences and edited himself or supervised the edition of the unpublished papers of the major figures of Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment.<sup>39</sup> His major aim was to establish the study of “new Hellenism” as an autonomous discipline disengaged from the ethnocentric fixation with antiquity and the glory of the ancestors.

We may quite safely suggest that Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment, as a milestone of the history of “new Hellenism,” would never have existed if it had not been accommodated in the proper institutional context. This perspective brings us to a peculiar realization, however: the house of Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment was a monument of the Cold War. There is no doubt that the original conception of Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment belonged to Dimaras, but the shaping of the historiographic framework was a process that involved a variety of factors transcending the initial conception. Postwar Greece was the furthest eastern limit of the “free world” and needed to reassert its allegiance to the values of liberal democracy and the free market, while the “free world” needed to clearly define its limits, especially in the turbulent vicinity of the Balkans. In the eighteenth century, when Europe invented itself as heir to the classical civilization, it simultaneously invented Greece as a kind of motherland from which this civilization radiated and affected all other nations. In the wake of the Cold War, Greece was reinvented, not as the origin of western civilization this time, but as always present within it, as a faithful and unwavering host of the Enlightenment. In this sense, the institutional context within which Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment settled represents much more than a mere academic affirmation of an ambitious research project.

## Conclusion

The creation of Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment can be seen as the intertwining of four different threads.

---

39 Σκλαβενίτης, “Ιστορικό σχέδιασμα,” 23–24.

The first has to do with the ambitions and the intellectual quests of a young scholar who gradually disengaged himself from his religious commitments and tried to find his way through the conflicting intellectual projects of interwar modernism. At a certain point he came across the voluminous correspondence of Korais and the need to unearth the intellectual and political contribution of the controversial thinker.

The second thread originates in the collective desire of Korais's compatriots to promote their local hero at national level. By assuming that the contribution of Korais was instrumental in establishing the modern Greek state, the people of the remote island of Chios sought to reassert their local society's integration into the national body.

The third thread relates to postwar recovery plans. Of course, both national and international projects intertwined here, but what is more important for our story is that a group of liberal bourgeois scholars took advantage of the circumstances to promote the creation of a broad research infrastructure for the sciences and the humanities. Their vision to secure a position for Greece in the developed world by appropriating the standards of western modernity turned out to be a crucial contribution to the conceptualization of Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment.

The fourth thread crucially pertains to the support provided by the United States for the establishment of the Royal Research Foundation. The Americans squarely acknowledged the importance of developing strongholds of the "free world" in native contexts. This is particularly true in Greece, which represented one of the frontiers of the Western World, detached from the European mainland and surrounded by communist countries. These strongholds involved advanced research in the natural sciences, but also and at times particularly in the humanities. It is indeed interesting that there were complaints on the part of the Ford Foundation that not enough social research had been conducted with the provided funds.<sup>40</sup>

Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment was shaped by all these factors—personal, local, national, and transnational—at a time when Europe reinvented itself as the homeland of freedom, and the Enlightenment as the consummation of the intellectual ideals, civilizational patterns, and civic practices that characterized the "free world." The slaughtered and dismembered Europe of World War II became a transcendental symbol of unity, culture, and democracy: the Europe of the *lumières*. The historiography of the Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment sought to establish that Greece had belonged to this Europe since its inception, as it shared the original values of the Enlightenment and the Greek nation state was built upon its liberal principles.

---

40 Σκλαβενίτης, "Ιστορικό σχεδιάσμα," 25.

What is Enlightenment, then? The implicit assumption in this chapter is that in order to answer the question we need to look at the periphery. Studying the eighteenth-century intellectual landscape from the standpoint of the European peripheries enables us to unveil a number of asymmetrical relations underlying an assumedly homogeneous European Enlightenment. Strange as it may sound, at least in the case of Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment it was the local version that engendered the global vision. Even more so, the Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment was constructed not as a copy of a global prototype, but along with the prototype. This does not mean that the two are equivalent or different moments of the same process. On the contrary, between the prototype and the local version there is an inherent and unbreakable hierarchy. The local, being by definition more diversified and complicated, will never attain the heights of the austere and idealized prototype. And it is in this particular sense that the Enlightenment will always be an incomplete project; and the history of the local will always be the history of an incomplete transition.<sup>41</sup>

## References

- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. "Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History: Who Speaks for 'Indian' Pasts?" *Representations* 37, special issue: *Imperial Fantasies and Postcolonial Histories* (1992): 1–26.
- Cordasco, Francesco. *Theodore Besterman, Bibliographer and Editor: A Selection of Representative Texts*. Metuchen, NJ & London: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1992.
- Hunt, Lynn, and Margaret Jacob. "Enlightenment Studies." In *Encyclopedia of the Enlightenment*, edited by Alan C. Kors, vol. 1, 418–30. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Liakos, Antonis, and Hara Kouki. "Narrating the Story of a Failed National Transition: Discourses on the Greek Crisis, 2010–2014." *Historein* 15, no. 1 (2015): 49–61.
- Liakos, Antonis. "The Canon of European History and the Conceptual Framework of National Historiographies." In *Transnational Challenges to National History Writing*, edited by Matthias Middell and Lluís Roura i Aulinas, 315–42. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Outram, Dorina. *The Enlightenment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

---

41 Antonis Liakos and Hara Kouki, "Narrating the Story of a Failed National Transition: Discourses on the Greek Crisis, 2010–2014," *Historein* 15, no. 1 (2015): 49–61; see also Chakrabarty, "Postcoloniality" and Antonis Liakos, "The Canon of European History and the Conceptual Framework of National Historiographies," in *Transnational Challenges to National History Writing*, ed. Matthias Middell and Lluís Roura i Aulinas (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

- Patiniotis, Manolis. "Origins of the Historiography of Modern Greek Science." *Nuncius* 23 (2008): 265–89.
- Patiniotis, Manolis. "Neo-Hellenic Enlightenment: In Search of a European Identity." In *Relocating the History of Science: Essays in Honor of Kostas Gavroglu*, edited by Theodore Arabatzis, Jürgen Renn, and Ana Simões, 117–30. Cham-Heidelberg-New York-Dordrecht-London: Springer, 2015.
- Wagner, Peter. *A Sociology of Modernity: Liberty and Discipline*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Αποστολίδου, Βενετία. "Το Παλαμικό παράδειγμα στην *Ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας*. Υποθέσεις εργασίας." In *Επιστημονική συνάντηση στη μνήμη του Κ.Θ. Δημαρά*, edited by Τριαντάφυλλος Ε. Σκλαβενίτης, 127–38. Athens: Κέντρο Νεοελληνικών Ερευνών Εθνικού Ιδρύματος Ερευνών, 1994.
- Αποστολόπουλος, Δημήτρης Γ. "Οι πηγές της έμπνευσης ενός ερμηνευτικού σχήματος: Ο 'Θρησκευτικός Ουμανισμός'." In *Επιστημονική συνάντηση στη μνήμη του Κ.Θ. Δημαρά*, edited by Τριαντάφυλλος Ε. Σκλαβενίτης, 71–77. Athens: Κέντρο Νεοελληνικών Ερευνών Εθνικού Ιδρύματος Ερευνών, 1994.
- Ασδραχάς, Σπύρος Ι., ed. *Ελληνική Οικονομική Ιστορία, ΙΕ'–ΙΘ' αιώνας*. 2 vols. Athens: Πολιτιστικό Ίδρυμα Ομίλου Πειραιώς, 2003.
- Γιακωβάκη, Νάσια. *Ευρώπη μέσω Ελλάδας. Μια καμπή στην ευρωπαϊκή αυτοσυνείδηση, 1705–18ος αιώνας*. Athens: Βιβλιοπωλείον της Εστίας, 2006.
- Γιανναράς, Χρήστος. *Ορθοδοξία και Δύση στη Νεώτερη Ελλάδα*, Athens: Δομός, 1992.
- Γιανναράς, Χρήστος. *Η Ευρώπη γεννήθηκε από το "σχίσμα"*. Athens: Ίκαρος, 2015.
- Δημαράς, Κωνσταντίνος Θ. "Η Γαλλική Επανάσταση και ο Ελληνικός Διαφωτισμός γύρω στα 1800." *Δημοκρατικά Χρονικά* 1, no 6 (July 23, 1945): 11–12.
- Δημαράς, Κωνσταντίνος Θ. "Κ.Θ. Δημαράς: Δεν ενδιαφέρει η κορυφή αλλά οι μέσοι όροι." Interview by Βασιλική Κοντογιάννη. *Διαβάζω* 53 (1982): 52–74.
- Δημαράς, Κωνσταντίνος Θ. *Ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας: Από τις πρώτες ρίζες ως τον Σολωμό*, 7th edition. Athens: Ίκαρος, 1985 [1948 & 1949].
- Δημαράς, Κωνσταντίνος Θ. *Ιστορικά Φροντίσματα Α'. Ο Διαφωτισμός και το κορυφωμά του*. Athens: Πορεία, 1992.
- Δημαράς, Κωνσταντίνος Θ. *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, 6th revised edition. Athens: Ερμής, 1993 [1977].
- Δημαράς, Κωνσταντίνος Θ. "Η 'Εγκυκλοπαιδεία'." In *Κ.Θ. Δημαράς, Σύμμικτα Α': Από την παιδεία στην λογοτεχνία*, edited by Αλέξης Πολίτης, 258–60. Athens: Σπουδαστήριο Νέου Ελληνισμού, 2000 [May 27, 1966].
- Δημαράς, Κωνσταντίνος Θ. "Επιλεγόμενα." In *Περιηγήσεις στον ελληνικό χώρο*, edited by Λουκία Δρούλια, Αικατερίνη Κουμαριανού, Εμμανουήλ Ν. Φραγκίσκος, Παναγιώτης Μουλλάς, Γιώργος Π. Σαββίδης, Άλκησις Αγγέλου, Athens: Όμιλος Μελέτης Ελληνικού Διαφωτισμού, 1968. Reprinted in *Κ* 11 (2006): 5–20.

- Δρούλια, Λουκία. “Κ.Θ. Δημαράς: Από τη Θεωρία στην Πράξη.” In *Επιστημονική συνάντηση στη μνήμη του Κ.Θ. Δημαρά*, edited by Τριαντάφυλλος Ε. Σκλαβενίτης, 13–20. Athens: Κέντρο Νεοελληνικών Ερευνών Εθνικού Ιδρύματος Ερευνών, 1994.
- Ελεφάντης, Άγγελος. “Το έθνος του Διαφωτισμού.” In *Κοινωνικοί Αγώνες και Διαφωτισμός: Μελέτες αφιερωμένες στον Φίλιππο Ηλιού*, edited by Χρήστος Λούκος, 85–95. Heraklion: Πανεπιστημιακές Εκδόσεις Κρήτης, 2007.
- Ηλιού, Φίλιππος. “Ιδεολογικές χρήσεις του κοραϊσμού στον εικοστό αιώνα.” In *Διήμερο Κοραή: Προσεγγίσεις στη γλωσσική θεωρία, τη σκέψη και το έργο του Κοραή*, 143–207. Athens: Κέντρο Νεοελληνικών Ερευνών Ε.Ι.Ε., 1984.
- Ηλιού, Φίλιππος. *Τύφλωσον Κύριε τον Λαόν σου. Οι προεπαναστατικές κρίσεις και ο Νικόλαος Πίγκολος*. Athens: Πορεία, 1988 [1974].
- Καραμπελιάς, Γιώργος. “Μετακένωση’-Μεταφορά-Δημιουργία.” *Άρδην* 27 (September–October 2000): 37–40.
- Κιτρομηλίδης, Πασχάλης. “Το όραμα του Κοραή για μια νέα Ελλάδα.” Interview by Σπύρος Γιανναράς, newspaper *Η Καθημερινή*, May 16, 2011.
- Κιτρομηλίδης, Πασχάλης. “Συγκριτικές προσεγγίσεις στον Νεοελληνικό Διαφωτισμό.” In *Νεοελληνική Παιδεία και Κοινωνία. Πρακτικά διεθνούς συνεδρίου αφιερωμένου στη μνήμη του Κ.Θ. Δημαρά*, 567–77. Athens: Όμιλος Μελέτης του Ελληνικού Διαφωτισμού, 1995.
- Κονόρτας, Παρασκευάς. *Οθωμανικές θεωρήσεις για το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο: Βεράτια για τους προκαθήμενους της Μεγάλης Εκκλησίας 17ος-αρχές 20ού αιώνα*. Athens: Αλεξάνδρεια, 1998.
- Κυριακίδου-Νέστορος, Άλκη. *Η θεωρία της ελληνικής λαογραφίας. Κριτική Ανάλυση*. Athens: Εταιρεία Σπουδών Νεοελληνικού Πολιτισμού και Γενικής Παιδείας, Σχολή Μωραΐτη, 1978.
- Λιάκος, Αντώνης. “Προς επισκευήν ολομελείας και ενότητας: Η δόμηση του εθνικού χρόνου.” In *Επιστημονική συνάντηση στη μνήμη του Κ.Θ. Δημαρά*, edited by Τριαντάφυλλος Ε. Σκλαβενίτης, 171–99. Athens: Κέντρο Νεοελληνικών Ερευνών Εθνικού Ιδρύματος Ερευνών, 1994.
- Λιάκος, Αντώνης. “Η νεοελληνική ιστοριογραφία το τελευταίο τέταρτο του εικοστού αιώνα.” *Σύγχρονα Θέματα* 76–77 (2001): 72–91.
- Μπογιατζής, Βασίλης. *Μετέωρος Μοντερνισμός: Τεχνολογία, ιδεολογία της επιστήμης και πολιτική στην Ελλάδα του μεσοπολέμου (1922–1940)*. Athens: Ευρασία, 2012.
- Πατηνιώτης, Μανώλης. *Στοιχεία Φυσικής Φιλοσοφίας: Ο ελληνικός επιστημονικός στοχασμός τον 17° και 18° αιώνα*. Athens: Gutenberg, 2013.
- Σκλαβενίτης, Τριαντάφυλλος Ε. “Ιστορικό σχέδιασμα για την ίδρυση και την πορεία του ΕΙΕ.” In *Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών, 1958–2008: Ίδρυση – πορεία – προοπτικές*, edited by Τριαντάφυλλος Ε. Σκλαβενίτης, 12–51. Athens: Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών, 2008.
- Σκλαβενίτης, Τριαντάφυλλος Ε., ed. *Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών, 1958–2008: Ίδρυση – πορεία – προοπτικές*. Athens: Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών, 2008.



Τζιόβας, Δημήτρης. “Ελληνικότητα και γενιά του '30.” *Cogito* 6 (2007): 6–9.

Τζιόβας, Δημήτρης. *Ο μύθος της γενιάς του Τριάντα. Νεοτερικότητα, ελληνικότητα και πολιτισμική ιδεολογία*. Athens: Πόλις, 2011.

Φραγκίσκος, Εμμανουήλ Ν. “Ανανέωση και ώθηση των κοραϊκών σπουδών.” In *Πενήντα Χρόνια Νεοελληνικής Παιδείας: Η παρουσία του Κ.Θ. Δημαρά στην επιστήμη των νεοελληνικών γραμμάτων*, 39–47. Athens: Εταιρεία Σπουδών Νεοελληνικού Πολιτισμού και Γενικής Παιδείας, 1985.