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Introduction. Hellenomania: ancient and modern obsessions with the Greek past.

Als ich dann am Nachmittag nach der Ankunft auf der Akropolis stand und mein Blick die Landschaft umfasste, kam mir plötzlich der merkwürdige Gedanke: Also existiert das alles wirklich so, wie wir es auf der Schule gelernt haben?!

In the afternoon after arriving, as I stood on the Acropolis and cast my view on the landscape, suddenly a strange thought came to me: so, does it all really exist as we have learnt at school?! (Freud 1936)

Hellenism, Romantic Hellenism, Hellenomania

Of all the obsessions with Greece’s past envisioned by the MANIA series, Hellenomania is the broadest and arguably the most complex. ‘Cretomania’ (the modern reception of and engagement with the Bronze Age/Minoan past in modern cultural practices), which formed the subject of our previous collection, emerged largely in the early twentieth century, after the spectacular archaeological discoveries made by Arthur Evans, Federico Halbherr and others at sites such as Knossos and Phaistos.1 Cretomania was also a phenomenon in which material culture took the centre stage, since the inhabitants of Bronze Age Crete have not (so far) bequeathed us any literary or historical texts to inform our understanding of their world.2 In the case of Byzantinomania the primacy of material culture is less absolute; as a historical phenomenon it also lasted considerably longer than Cretomania, since some forms and practices of reception of the Byzantine past (ranging from the collection of manuscripts and other objects, to the role of Byzantium in the rise of the Russian nation) are evident from medieval and Renaissance times.3 In both its duration and its complexity Byzantinomania is nevertheless more limited than Hellenomania, since the intense interest in Byzantine culture, including material culture, stretches back well beyond medieval humanism into classical

1 Momigliano and Farnoux (2017).
2 As the contributions to Cretomania show, however, many interpretations and responses to Minoan material culture have been influenced by modern readings of Greek and Roman literary texts that relate stories set in Bronze Age Crete.
3 For medieval and Renaissance collecting of things Byzantine see, for example, Cormack, and Jeffreys (2000); Drandraki et al. 2013. For the role of Byzantium for the emergence of Russia see, for example, Meyendorff (2010). For the emergence of a particular wave of ‘Byzantinomania’ in the early nineteenth century, when Byzantium began to be revisited, and revitalised, as a source of interest and inspiration for a variety of artistic and creative cultural practices, ranging from painting to art criticism, see Bullen (2003).
antiquity itself. The idealisation of ancient Greece in the cultural and educational ideology of many powerful and imperialistically active nations has, moreover, exported elements of Hellenomania across the globe.

Perhaps the most famous (indeed, notorious) appearance to date of the specific term ‘Hellenomania’ occurred three decades ago in the first volume of Martin Bernal’s *Black Athena* (1987). Bernal used the term to indicate the particular vision of a ‘pure’ and ‘original’ Greece that arose among European, especially German, classical scholars at the turn of the nineteenth century and was driven by romantic and racist notions of European and Christian (especially Protestant) superiority. In using the term to capture the particular quality of northern European engagements with Greece from the 1790s to the mid-nineteenth century, Bernal differentiated ‘Hellenomania’ from the conceptually distinct, yet historically related, phenomena of ‘Philhellenism’ and ‘Hellenism’. While Bernal followed standard terminology in using ‘Philhellenism’ to denote northern and western Europeans’ support of the Greeks in their 1820s struggle for independence from the Ottoman Empire, his ‘Hellenism’ had a longer genealogy and a twofold meaning. Bernal used it, first, to indicate certain currents of textual and historical scholarship originating in the early modern period and exemplified in the early eighteenth century by figures such as Bentley and Newton, who employed critical techniques to undermine those ancient sources that attested to the priority of Egyptian civilization. Second, ‘Hellenism’ (sometimes also ‘Romantic Hellenism’ or ‘Neo-Hellenism’) was his preferred term for that later eighteenth-century combination of scholarship with the Romantic longing for ‘small, virtuous and “pure” communities’ over great powers and empires popularised above all in relation to the (imagined) material culture of ancient Greece by Winckelmann, Goethe, and Humboldt.

Whether Bernal was aware of it or not, his twofold deployment of ‘Hellenism’ departed from prior use of the term, which had entered English in the early modern period with a range of

---

4 Bernal (1987), where Chapter VI (covering the period c. 1790-1830) and Chapter VII (covering the period c. 1830-1860) are respectively entitled Hellenomania 1 and 2. Though ‘race’ is the ideological category most extensively discussed in Bernal’s work and in responses to it, he also identified religious polemic as playing a crucial role in Hellenomania. See for example his characterisation the pivotal years 1815-1830 as ‘years of Romanticism and Christian revival’: Bernal (1987) 31.


6 Bernal (1987) 209-10, 212-223. At p. 213 Bernal approvingly quotes Pfeiffer’s (1976, 170) verdict on this generation: ‘A break was made with the Latin tradition of humanism and an entirely new humanism, a true new Hellenism, grew up. Winckelmann was the initiator, Goethe the consummator, Wilhelm von Humboldt, in his linguistic, historical and educational writings, the theorist. Finally, Humboldt’s ideas were given practical effect when he became Prussian Minister of Education and founded the new university of Berlin and the new humanistic gymnasium.’ For a different use of the term Neo-Hellenism see, Leontis (1995) 6 and below, note 18.
meaning including polytheism (in contrast to Judaism and Christianity), Graecism of language or rhetorical style, or (as in passages from the Septuagint and the New Testament) the adoption of Greek manners by certain constituencies of Diasporic Jews. Bernal’s addition of a maniac element was very likely intended to emphasise the unhealthy and obsessional character of nineteenth-century classical scholars’ preoccupation with pure Greek origins, and to undercut the association of ‘Hellenism’ with ‘intellect’ propagated at least since Matthew Arnold’s *Culture and Anarchy* (1869). Although he does not say so explicitly, it also seems likely that Bernal did not opt for the better-established ‘Graecomania’ (already attested by the early 1800s) because the Greek ‘Hellas’ – as opposed to the Latin ‘Graecia’ – seemed more suited to denote an obsession with purity, race, origins, and philology. Bernal claimed to have felt very ‘daring’ when he ‘coined’ the term. But the word was in fact not entirely new, since it appears at least as early as a 1961 issue of the medical journal *The Lancet*. Here too ‘Hellenomania’ described an obsession: in this case, with the use of obscure Greek terms to coin names for medical conditions.

Our own use of ‘Hellenomania’ originated from prosaic, even banal considerations: initial discussions and project planning of the MANIA series between Farnoux and Momigliano occurred in Greece and in (modern) Greek, a language in which the word *Hellas* and its derivatives present themselves as the obvious choice. But we also suggest that it is valuable to use ‘Hellenomania’ more reflectively, to encompass a longer and more variegated history than the one envisaged polemically by Bernal. This shares with Bernal’s usage the notion of a particularly charged response to an imagined, temporally and geographically bounded ideal of ancient Greece (usually, though not always, confined to the southernmost part of the Balkan peninsula and the islands of the Aegean Sea, and to the pre-Christian or even pre-Roman era), and indeed encompasses those currents of European thought and culture that Bernal denotes as ‘Romantic’ or ‘Neo-Hellenism’. As our volume shows, however, the phenomenon of Hellenomania is longer in duration than Bernal suggests, and does not always (though it does sometimes) involve a genetic discourse of origins. The categories of ‘Romantic Hellenism’ and ‘philhellenism’, which have already received a fair amount of

---

7 OED headword: ‘Hellenism’; biblical citations 2 Maccabees 4.13, Acts 6.1, 9.29 (the Authorized/King James translation is however ‘Grecians’).
8 The presentation of German Hellenism/Hellenomania as a disease also continues a trope introduced into Anglophone discussions of modern German cultural history as early as Eliza M. Butler’s *Tyranny of Greece over Germany* (1935).
9 Bernal & Moore (2001) 196: ‘I felt very daring when I coined the word “Hellenomania.”’ The word has not been included, as yet, in the Oxford English Dictionary (online) (consulted in March 2017).
10 Jackson (1961).
attention in cultural history and classical reception studies, emerge in our collection as two varieties of Hellenomania that one can compare and explore in relation to numerous others.\textsuperscript{11} With its broader reference, ‘Hellenomania’ allows us to examine the Romantic turn to Greece against the background of other significant receptions, including figures and movements against which Romantic figures reacted (Neoclassicism, the Baroque) as well as new movements (Aestheticism, Modernism), which succeeded and reacted against Romanticism in turn.

\textit{Waves and frequencies, purity and hybridisation}

It is worth reflecting on some further parallels between our working concept of ‘Hellenomania’ and that of ‘Hellenism’. Note, first, the not immediately obvious point that even in antiquity the terms ‘Hellas’ and ‘Hellenes’ already shared in something of the imaginative or ideal dimension of our ‘Hellenomania’. From their use in Homer to denote the inhabitants of a particular region of Thessaly (a subset of the contingents named in the Iliadic Catalogue of Ships as fighting under Achilles), their occurrence in a famous passage of Herodotus (8.144.2) that purports to report Athenian resistance to the Persian Mardonius before the battle of Plataea has become canonical in understandings of classical Greeks as possessing a shared cultural identity that coexisted with more particular loyalties (such as those of the polis).\textsuperscript{12} Though grounded in the ascription of some common ‘ethnic’ characteristics (such as language and religion) that cross polis boundaries, ‘to Hellenikon’ invoked by the Athenians is not coterminous with any historically existing political unit or entity.\textsuperscript{13} It was not until the formation of the short-lived First Greek Republic in the 1820s that any such unit staked a claim to independence and self-determination. The ‘idea’ of Hellas was nevertheless potent for Greeks, and history shows numerous points of return to more or less explicit notions of an idealised Greek past – from the \textit{Periegesis tes Helladas} of

\textsuperscript{11} See, e.g. Marchand (1996), Wallace (1997), Güthenke (2008), Tziovas (2014a). In this volume, ‘Romantic Hellenism’ is represented in the papers by Harloe, focusing on Winckelmann (who is sometimes cast as a significant ancestor of Romantic Hellenism, but sometimes an adherent to an earlier Neoclassical aesthetic, against which the Romantics reacted) and Jenkyns, who includes discussion of Keats and Hazlitt’s responses to the Elgin Marbles.

\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Iliad} II. 683-4: ο’ τ’ ἐλήφε Φθίην ἡς Ἐλλάδα καλλιγόναικα,/Μυρμιδόνες δὲ καλεῦντο καὶ Ἑλλῆνες καὶ Ἀχαιοί (‘those who possessed Pthia and Hellas with its beautiful women/ and were called Myrmidons and Hellenes and Achaïans). On the other hand, the formula Ἐλλὰς καὶ μέσον Ἀργος (‘Hellas and midmost Argos’) appears to denote the whole of Greece. See Sherratt (2010). For a meditation on Herodotus 8.144 in relation to the theme of Hellenism see Zacharias 2008 (in an edited volume that contains many other papers relevant to our theme).

\textsuperscript{13} For some theoretical discussions of ethnicity, see Jenkins (2008) and, with reference to the ancient world, Jones (1997) and Hall (2002).
the Greek-speaking Pausanias (very likely from Lydia) during the high Roman Empire, to the ‘Renaissance’ of Byzantium under the Paleologoi and the cultural activities and exhortations of those Byzantine Greeks who arrived in Italy in the later fifteenth century in promoting ancient learning as a stimulus for a new crusade. The actors and political motivations are diverse, but the idea of a longed-for recovery of a lost and more glorious past predominates.\(^\text{14}\)

Such Hellenisms all accord ancient Greece a certain normative status, as in the ancient usage of the term *Hellenismos* to denote proper style in written or spoken Greek.\(^\text{15}\) Yet in modern scholarly discourse ‘Hellenism’ has also carried a second meaning, which is again associated with eighteenth- and nineteenth-century scholarship: this time in the figures of J.G. Herder and J.G. Droysen. Here, it denotes that period of the fusion of Greek and ‘Oriental’ cultures in the centuries after Alexander the Great’s conquests that, in Anglophone contexts, is usually known as the ‘Hellenistic’ world. In a classic paper, Arnaldo Momigliano explored how Droysen’s use of the term ‘*Hellenismus*’ equivocated between a relatively straightforward, political meaning (‘the constitution of a system of states in which Oriental natives were governed by a Greco-Macedonian aristocracy’) and a never-fully-fleshed-out, cultural- and world-historical meaning according to which it denoted ‘the intermediary and transitional period between classical Greece and Christianity… a cultural movement which produced a new synthesis of Greek and Oriental ideas’.\(^\text{16}\) As Momigliano points out, the evolutionary aspects of this second, cultural meaning attest to the never-entirely-*aufgehoben* Hegelianism of Droysen’s thought.\(^\text{17}\) It is nevertheless a notion of Greek culture founded upon syncretism or hybridization rather than purity, and is evolutionary rather than simply nostalgic.

This ambivalence between notions of restoration, return and purity on the one hand, and hybridity, evolution and synthesis on the other, also affects a third modern discourse of Hellenism relevant to our volume, this time concerning the role of ideas of ancient Greece in shaping identities in the modern Greek state. A powerful critical current in contemporary Greek scholarship casts certain forms of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Hellenism and philhellenism operative in modern Greek nation-building as Western European concepts and idealisations imposed upon the Greek population and as a form of ‘crypto-colonialism’ of

---

\(^\text{14}\) On the Paleologian period as the ‘last Byzantine renaissance’ see Runciman (1970); on Byzantine Hellenism and its transformation in Italy see, respectively, Kaldellis (2007) and Lamers (2015); on Greekness, Hellenicity and Hellenism see e.g. Gourgouris (1996); Hall (2002); Hamilakis (2007 and 2009); Kitromilidis (2013).

\(^\text{15}\) As in Strabo, see Zacharia 2008: 1.


\(^\text{17}\) Momigliano (1970).
Greece, to use Michael Herzfeld’s term, by Western European powers. Ideas and ideals about Hellas formulated by northern and western European classicists and philhellenes were effectively imposed on, but also simulated by, the modern Greeks, in an era of German, British and French political, economic and cultural hegemony. In a familiar discursive structure that is also manifest, for example, in Eurocentric and Christian representations of ancient Hebrew culture, Western ideals of ‘classical’ Greek antiquity entailed the denigration, in more or less subtle ways, of modern Greeks as inferior to their classical ancestors. Such idealisations have had had long-term cultural and intellectual reverberations: to use the words of Artemis Leontis, the Western ‘modern fetish for the ancient, the defunct, and the exotic operates at the expense of the contemporary Greek world, which has been struggling to control interpretations of the past’, and is often marginalised or entirely excluded.

Such discursive and colonial Hellenism has returned with a vengeance in the visual and verbal rhetoric employed during the recent (and on-going) ‘Greek Crisis’: the economic and political predicament of the modern Greek state in the aftermath of the global financial crisis of 2007-2008. Over the past decade, mainstream rhetorical and visual narratives produced both within and outside of Greece have frequently portrayed its twenty-first-century citizens as inferior to both other Europeans and their more illustrious ancestors in a manner that recalls the chauvinistic tropes of early Western travellers’ impressions of Greece, while also purporting to remind the European Union and the rest of the world of their debt to ancient Hellas. To give just one example, a government employee participating in a 2010 strike action against proposed austerity measures was reported in international media as saying, ‘We

---

18 Herzfeld (2002). For notions of Western cultural colonialism in modern Greece see, e.g. Leontis (1995); Gourgouris (1996); Tziovas (2014a), all with further bibliography. Leontis (1995), in her influential work, has discussed various Hellenisms and their relationships, such as Hellenism (as the quixotic enterprise of the study of Hellas; Philhellenism (as the non-Greek sympathy for modern Greeks, particularly their fight for emancipation from Ottoman rule); ‘Neohellenism’ (as the ideology of a Hellenic national culture that emerged after Greece became an independent state) and ‘Hellenic Hellenism’ (i.e. Giorgos Seferis’s coinage of the phrase ‘Ellinikos Ellenismos’, to indicate the development, by contemporary Greeks, of a modern Hellenism of Hellenic aesthetic values – an Hellenism that was both rooted in the soil of Greece, but also inspired by a long tradition that extended well beyond the physical boundaries of Greece, and could even draw some inspiration from Western European Hellenism). For western and ‘indigenous Hellenism’, see Hamilakis (2007) and also below.

19 For the parallel point about modern Western scholarship on Hebraic antiquity see Hess (2002).

20 Leontis (1995) 224. A recent example of this Greek marginalisation is the book on the Parthenon by Mary Beard (2002), which includes references to many Western travellers, and even to the Turkish traveller Evliya Çelebi, but largely overlooks Greek views.

21 For the ‘Greek Crisis’ and related developments, such as the ‘December events’ of 2008, see, for example, the numerous articles published in Journal of Modern Greek Studies vol. 28, no. 2, October 2010. See also Yalouri’s ‘afterword’ in this volume.

22 On the twenty-first-century rhetoric of disparagement and its similarity to earlier narratives see, e.g., Lalaki 2016.
feel humiliated and we understand that things cannot remain the same as they were before … but we gave the world democracy, and we expect the European Union to support us’. This comment shows the double-bind in which such comparisons place contemporary Greeks: whether the emphasis in invocations of ancient Hellas is placed on past glory or present failure, in either case they are deprived of elements of their own culture and agency.

This recent (and on-going) caricaturing of Greece and its past in international media has underlined the relevance of a number of significant and innovative works by Greek authors, who – often with explicit reference to postcolonial theory and criticism – have attempted to ‘decolonise’ Hellenism, examining how modern Greeks have both reappropriated and strategically deployed the ancient past in ways that go beyond replicating the stereotypes and obsessions of traditional Hellenist discourse. For example, Yannis Hamilakis has argued that Western Hellenism in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries at first overshadowed a more local idea of national identity based on Romiosyni, but was transformed in the mid- to late nineteenth century, especially thanks to the historian Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos, into an ‘indigenous Hellenism’, which stressed ties with classical Greece but also incorporated multiple other Greek pasts – ancient (Archaic, Classical), Macedonian, medieval, and modern. This ‘indigenous’ Hellenism, which united classical antiquity and Orthodox Christianity through Byzantium, was nonetheless heavily shaped by Western (and especially German) scholarship, from ideas of Herderian-Hegelian spiritual continuity (Volkgeist) to Droysen’s Hellenism. Hamilakis’s work has largely focused on archaeology and material culture, and other scholars too, such as Eleftheria Yalouri, Argyro Loukakis, Dimitris Damaskos and Dimitris Plantzos (to give a few prominent examples), have paid particular attention to these as agents in the construction of the new Hellenic nation and its identity, especially through processes of restoration, sacralisation, and commodification as well as more physical,

---


sensorial experiences of the Greek past.27 A significant recent multi-disciplinary volume edited by Tziovas28 (which includes a section on material culture) has also examined the role notions of ancient Hellas/Hellenism has played in shaping modern Greek culture and its institutions, exploring how the Greek past has been ‘constructed, performed, (ab)used, Hellenized, canonized, and ultimately decolonized and re-imagined’.29

Although our volume has ended up with a more northern and western European focus than we had originally planned, it aims to engage with and complement the works mentioned above.30 If Greece’s most prominent recent experience on the world stage has attested to the continuing power of colonial forces and rhetoric, works of critical and post-colonial scholarship have also recognised how (modern) Greek ideas have been shaped in dialogue (agonistic as well as eirenic) with Western narratives, whether in simulation or critical reaction. The Greeks’ long history as both agents and subjects of colonisation, the unique role that their ancient past has played in shaping Christian, European, and Western notions of cultural identity, and the impact of those notions, in turn, on the genesis of the modern Greek state, mean that ‘Western’ and ‘indigenous’ discourses are interrelated all the way down. As the aforementioned studies have shown, for Greece (as well as other nations) coming to terms with various constructions of the Greek past cannot involve the erasure of such entanglements: any reckoning must confront Western discourses in their full complexity as well as providing counter-narratives.

These reflections, as well as the breadth of topics spanned in our book, suggest that while Hellenomania has been with us since antiquity, it has proved particularly potent or intense at particular times and places. For this reason, although we flirted with various ways of conceptualising ‘Hellenomania’ (including Freud’s model of the return of the repressed and the notion of a virus that mutates), we have found the figure of a wave the most apt for the phenomenon under study in this book, since it reflects the fact that Hellenomania has both traversed space and time and varied in intensity and duration. The dichotomy between Hellenomania as a historicist and ‘purist’ Greek ideal associated with the return to a

27 See, e.g. Yalouri (2001); Loukaki (2008); Damaskos and Plantzos (2008); see also Hamilakis 2014.
28 Tziovas (2014a)
29 Tziovas (2014b) 1.
30 Several of the scholars named above were invited but unable to participate in the symposium that led to this collection; others attended and participated in the symposium discussions but were unable to contribute to this volume. Some other recent works on Greece that pay attention to material culture include Goldhill (2002, 2011), Prettejohn (2012), and those mentioned in footnotes to the next section below.
classicised and originary past and as a creative synthesis of Greek, Roman, and Christian traditions is addressed in a number of chapters: there are elements of it in the contributions of Macintosh, Jenkyns, Salmon, Leoussi, Lambrinou, and Solomon and Galiniki. Taken together, the papers cast light on how certain ideas about the ancient Greek past have become transnational phenomena through repetition and reinvention, and how Hellenomania’s longevity and internal bifurcation have enabled it to span a number of wider cultural narratives, from antiquarianism to modernism, nation-building to universalism, and even Mediterraneanism.31

**Hellenomania and the material culture turn**

Along with the other volumes in the MANIA series, our collection aims to contribute to the study of the dynamics and intersections between Greece’s material past and modern cultural practices. In particular we aim to explore how, on the one hand, archaeological discoveries and engagement with material culture have catalysed innovation and self-reflection, as in Freud’s famous encounter with the Athenian Acropolis referred to in our epigraph.32 We also aim to explore how modern innovations, such as new artistic movements, media (e.g. cinema) and visual practices and disciplines (e.g. architecture, connoisseurship) have changed the ways in which modern subjects have viewed and experienced the Greek past. The idea of the series originated from a desire to shift some of the focus in reception studies from textual evidence to material culture. While reception studies has been one of the fastest-growing subject areas in Classics over the last few decades, until recently – and with the honourable exception of studies of ancient theatre in modern performance – the balance of activity has been on literary or philosophical topics in which visual or material culture has played only a fairly minor role.

This relative neglect seemed to us remarkable, given that ancient Greece’s centrality in modern classical studies has informed the foci of reception studies from the start. It appears even more remarkable if one considers that Greek material culture has arguably had a wider reach than literature and philology: for objects (from neoclassical buildings to paintings, tableware, and even dress) are not only embedded in everyday life, but also require less

---

31 On Mediterraneanism see, e.g. Herzfeld (1984 and 2005). On the tension between universalist and ethnically particular Hellenomanias see especially Leoussi in this volume.

32 For an interesting recent discussion of Freud on the Acropolis see Leonard (2012) 177-216.
specialist knowledge to access and engage with than do literary texts. Greek material culture has, moreover, played a crucial role in shaping perception and understandings of the ancient world even within the field of specialist classical and historical scholarship: it is even arguable that the influential distinction between an authentically ‘Greek’ and a more generic ‘Greco-Roman’ antiquity, which emerged into scholarly orthodoxy in the generation after Winckelmann, was based primarily on new appreciations and analyses of ancient material objects rather than literary or other texts. The importance of material culture and of materiality is, moreover, increasingly recognised, and recent scholarly work in fields ranging from anthropology to history and philosophy attests to the desire to break down the artificial dichotomies between people and things, texts and objects, the literary and the visual.33 Things, people, and words are entities with porous boundaries, entangled in webs of relationships that give meanings to each other.34 This growing appreciation has found expression in labels such as the ‘material turn’ and ‘material-culture turn’, and is illustrated by the voluminous literature in many different disciplines that examines engagements with materials and materiality, their agency and affective presence as well as in the emergence of interdisciplinary work.35

This appreciation is beginning to be reflected in recent trends in classical reception studies, especially in new works focusing on Pompeii and the reception of antiquity in film.36 They are accompanied by a growing body of work on museums, collecting and exhibitions as significant forms of modern reception of the antique; on early modern antiquarianism; and on heritage in the context of imperialism.37 Tziovas’s aforementioned recent volume also includes a short section on ‘material culture’, containing four essays (on archaeology, tourist photography, staging of Greek tragedy, and the modern Olympic Games) that share a focus on materiality and the construction of (modern) Greek identity.38 These both advance the agenda set by Hamilakis, Yalouri, and other scholars mentioned above and suggest other avenues for research, some of which are explored in our volume.

33 For seminal books showing the increasing importance of materiality in several disciplines also e.g. Latour (2005); Miller 2005; Ingold 2007; Hodder (2012). See also Yalouri (this volume).
34 Cf. Hodder (2012) 1-14 (with further references).
35 For ‘material turn’ and ‘material-culture turn’ see e.g. Bennet & Joyce (2010) and Hicks (2010), respectively. See also references in previous two notes and Yalouri (this volume).
36 For Pompeii see, e.g., Hales & Paul (2011); Gardner Coates, Lapatin & Seydl (2012); for films see, e.g., Paul (2013), Michelakis (2013), Nikoloutsos ((2013).
37 For modern receptions of the antique see, for example, Coltman (2006), Nichols (2015), as well as the earlier volume by Pomian (1987). For early modern antiquarianism, see, for example, Heringman (2013), Harloe (2013). For heritage in the context of imperialism, see, for example, Swenson and Mandler (2013).
38 Tziovas (2014a).
*Hellenomania* seeks to expand discussion of the reception of Greek material culture beyond these areas and to open it out towards a wider arena of creative cultural practices. While our contributors discuss a variety of the more traditional arts – from architecture to stage and costume design, painting, sculpture, dance, cinema, and literature – they also draw attention to craft techniques and multimedia poetic performance, and cover themes such as family history and self-fashioning in everyday life (see especially the complementary chapters by Leontis and Sikelianos). Although we aim at redressing the balance between textual and material receptions, we also hope, as hinted above, to underline the rich entanglements between words and objects, real and ideal, flesh and spirit, the Hellenic and non-Hellenic.

**Themes and structure of volume**

Ultimately, then, in our volume Hellenomania is used not in the narrower and polemical sense defined by Bernal, but in a way closer to some current definitions of Egyptomania (as well as Cretomania and Byzantinomania), namely a desire and obsession expressed through ‘a borrowing, of the most spectacular elements, from the grammar of ornament that is the original essence of ancient … art; these decorative elements are then given a new life through new uses … [where] artists must “re-create” them in the cauldron of their own sensibility and in the context of their times, or must give them an appearance of renewed vitality, a function other than the purpose for which they were originally intended’. These borrowings and revitalisations are not limited to the traditional arts, but involve material culture and its materiality more generally and encompass a wide variety of cultural practices, including art and architecture, craftsmanship, fashioning of the self and the body, and practices of *askesis* and culture.

We highlight how different waves and frequencies of Hellenomania may be prompted by new archaeological discoveries (whether display in public and private collections or excavations, from the arrival of the Elgin/Parthenon marbles in London, to the discovery of the Tanagra figurines, and even the excavations of Pompeii and Herculaneum, which also prompted new imagining of Greece). But we also show how they may relate to changing tastes, fashions, and priorities in the present, and how new technological possibilities and mechanical reproductions (from theatre to cinema, from black & white to colour representations, and
from stillness to movement) have affected the ways in which the Greek past is experienced, represented, and conceptualised.

It would be impossible for a single volume to provide comprehensive coverage of such a long-lasting and variegated phenomenon. In the following chapters we present a series of intriguing and varied modern examples, spanning the seventeenth century (Macintosh) to the present day (Sikelianos). They have been selected to illustrate the pervasiveness of Greek ideals across times and places and to indicate some of the junctures at which Hellenomania has proved especially potent. The sections into which the volume is divided in one way reflect a periodisation of Hellenomania; in another way, however, they cross-cut chronological changes, highlighting significant preoccupations and themes that recur throughout Hellenomania’s history.

Our collection of papers begins with a section (‘Hellenomanias from early modern to modernism’) that examines sources and derivations of Hellenomania from the Baroque and pre-Romantic periods, to the early twentieth century. Although covering more canonical material than the following sections (Winckelmann, Keats, Ruskin, Pater), it also extends discussion to less familiar figures (Burney) and moments (the Baroque stage), and sets the scene for the illustrations of successive waves of Hellenomania explored in subsequent papers. Chapter 1, by Fiona Macintosh, brings out the importance of reception of ancient material culture to early modern technological innovation and the idea of the unity of the arts by focusing on the ground-breaking scenography of Inigo Jones, who was active in a period when the neat distinction between Greek and Roman had not yet emerged. Chapter 2, by Katherine Harloe, focuses on Winckelmann: a scholar who must surely find a place in any collection on ‘Hellenomania’, because of his status as a father figure within the disciplines of history of art and classical archaeology and his undeniable role in stimulating the later eighteenth-century European craze for the Greek. Harloe focuses upon a persistent tradition, starting with Diderot in the 1760s, of portraying Winckelmann himself as a fanatic, maniacal, and quixotic figure, whether this is construed positively as evidence of his passionate devotion to ancient Hellas, or negatively as either a failure of scholarly objectivity or a character flaw that contributed to his brutal and untimely death. Chapter 3, by Richard Jenkyns, surveys English literary responses to Greek material culture in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (from Keats and Hazlitt to MacNeice), highlighting how the Parthenon
marbles’ arrival in London disturbed or complicated Winckelmannian notions of Greek beauty.

The next two sections group chapters that bear witness to recurring themes, exploring tensions between conceptions of Greece as real and ideal, between imagination and experience, ancient abstraction (whiteness, death, stillness) and modernity (colour, life, movement). Section Two (‘Ideal and real structures of Hellenomania’) collects contributions that focus on appropriations of ancient Greek material culture in the built environment – mostly architecture – and examine how modern designers and builders have responded to and adapted ancient Greek traditions. In Chapter 4, Frank Salmon discusses classicizing British architecture in the period c.1751-1851, demonstrating how literary sources and a certain, powerful conviction of the ideal proportions of Greek ‘art’ affected the allegedly empirical measurement and recording of classical Greek monuments by Stuart, Revett and their followers. In Chapters 5 and 6, which complement each other closely, Athena Leoussi and Lena Lambrinou explore how idealisations of ancient Greek physicality, freedom and democracy influenced not only the architecture of public buildings in Europe and North America, but also the very bodies of individual citizens. This section concludes with a chapter by David Watkin (7), which provides an overview of contemporary British architecture inspired by ancient Greece and sets it in the context of earlier ‘Greek Revivals’.

The third section (‘Hellenomania comes to life – colour, movement, and the body’) explores challenges to traditional representations and idealisations of ancient Greece though the transformative power of colour, movement, and the (gendered) body. Chapter 8, by Charlotte Ribeyrol traces how the accumulation of material evidence concerning the polychromy of ancient Greek statues and temples, and particularly the discovery at Tanagra of ancient Greek figurines bearing traces of originally bright colours, helped Victorian artists to break away from a purely philological approach to Greek antiquity and produce different ‘translations’ of Greek ideas. These translations were not just between one language and another, but also from text to image and from one visual medium (sculpture) to another (painting). By showing how earlier pictorial representations of female figures by Whistler and Moore prepared the ground for the enthusiastic nineteenth-century reception of recently unearthed Tanagra figurines, Ribeyrol also illustrates the two-way traffic between artistic and scholarly receptions. Pantelis Michelakis’s chapter (9) also addresses colour and movement, examining how the invention of cinema and the emergence of certain forms of modern dance at the end
of the nineteenth century mark a significant juncture (one might even call it a ‘sensorial and ephemeral turn’) in the conceptualisation and experience of ancient Greece in the modern world. He offers a fascinating contextual discussion and analysis of the ‘Grecian dance’ scene in Charlie Chaplin’s film *Sunnyside*: a Greek fantasy presented as a dreamlike and temporary escape from the frantic rhythms of modern life or, in Michelakis’ words, the ‘corporeal catastrophe of modernity’.  

Leontis’ and Sikelianos’ chapters (10, 11) are linked by the figure of Eva Palmer Sikelianos, American heiress, first wife of the poet Angelos Sikelianos, and initiator with him of a modern revival of the Delphic Festivals. The two festivals the couple organised, in 1927 and 1930, aimed at reviving a Delphic ideal of peace and harmony, and included theatrical performances, concerts, dance, athletic contests, and exhibitions of folk art. Leontis explores how Eva Palmer Sikelianos made her own body a vessel of Greek reception by designing, weaving and wearing a style of dress inspired by ideas of ancient Greek simplicity. Her experimental (indeed, anachronistic) recreations of ancient Greek clothing, and her attempt to persuade Greek women to follow in her footsteps, were her own idealistic antidote to European crypto-colonialism and industrialism, a way of rejecting machine-made garments and reviving classical timelessness. Eleni Sikelianos’ chapter (which should be read in conjunction with her audio-file) is inspired by the utopian vision of her great-grandparents, Eva and Angelos, in reviving the Delphic Festivals. In her poetry the ancient Greek past acts as a vehicle both to explore her own family history and to reflect upon the impossibility of recovering it, as well as to ask broader questions about time, destruction, and the environment which mark her work, in both content and media, as a product of late modernity. Winkler’s chapter (12) returns to issues of real and ideal, stillness and movement, and translation from one medium (sculpture) to another (cinema) by discussing incarnations and transformations of the famous Venus de Milo in various films, especially *One Touch of Venus* (1948), starring Ava Gardner.

Our volume starts with Inigo Jones and a period when the neat distinction between Greek and Roman familiar to eighteenth- and nineteenth-century scholarship had not yet been fully articulated. It ends, in something of a ring-composition, with two papers that query those boundaries. The two chapters that make up the fourth and final section (‘Beyond
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Hellenomania?) bring our investigations into the present, offer a glance at the future, and focus on the homeland of Hellenomaniac discourse: contemporary Greece. Chapter 13, by Esther Solomon and Styliana Galiniki, indicates how fascination with the material culture of ancient Greece might move beyond the pure obsessions of classicizing Hellenism by tracing the reception history of a group of Roman statues (the Incantadas of Thessaloniki), which have sometimes been claimed as essentially ‘Greek’, but have in reality been significant for and appropriated by many different peoples. By drawing attention to this blurred and hybrid example, they reopen the possibility of a Greek past (and present) that is far from ‘Hellenomaniac’ in Bernal’s sense. In addition to offering a critical commentary on the other papers, Eleana Yalouri’s afterword explores the potential ramifications of emergent Hellenomaniac discourses evident in Greece today. She reflects upon documenta 14, an art exhibition taking place from April-September 2017 in Athens (and June - September 2017 in Kassel), and the product of collaboration between the Hellenic Ministry of Culture and a German arts organisation. In her analysis of this exhibition Yalouri does not fail to find some old tropes of Hellenism recycled; yet she also detects some very new, and rather different, ‘translations, appropriations and aspirations’. Both her analysis (ironically, perhaps, the outcome of a German initiative) and her decision to use the term ‘Graecomania’, for what may be current and future waves or mutations of Hellenomania, point, once again, to a growing interest in hybridity rather than purity.

Thus, as our collection illustrates, comparing waves of Hellenomania across time and space allows one to observe the recurrence of an imagined and idealised Greece as an alternative to the present, as a catalyst for contemporary criticism and change, whether on an individual or socio-political level. An imagined ancient Greece has repeatedly functioned as an ideal ‘other’ in the context of historical actors’ aspirations either to understand the genesis of their own present or to exchange that present for something as imagined better (non-Roman, non-medieval, non-Baroque, etc.). Studying Hellenomania allows us to explore how the content of this image has been constructed, challenged, and reinvented; how tensions and dynamics between the ideal and the real, the pure and the synthesised or hybrid, recur across individual, local, national, and international boundaries; and extend beyond a concern with ancient material objects themselves to new and creative Hellenomaniac experiments with the built environment and even the human body.

41 See below, p. XXXX
Do the example of the *Incantadas*, and the present-day interest in hybridity evident in contemporary presentations of the ancient world in the spheres of both scholarship and cultural heritage, indicate that the type of Hellenomania that casts Greece as a locus of idealised purity set against modern times is now dead and gone? Such a conclusion would, we suggest, be premature. The various engagements explored in our collection reveal that uncovering the history of Hellenomania is not merely excavating the past, but exposing a living tradition, which diversifies and mutates. Perhaps it is even more appropriate to say that Hellenomania moves like a wave, in ebbs and flows. New hybrids and mutations are possible, just as new surfs breaking on the seashore may bring returns but also new admixtures from the deep:

*Full fathom five thy father lies.*
*Of his bones are coral made.*
*Those are pearls that were his eyes.*
*Nothing of him that doth fade,*
*But doth suffer a sea-change*
*Into something rich and strange.*
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