— . by Ferdinand Pajor (review)

Nikolas Papadimitriou

Journal of Modern Greek Studies, Volume 31, Number 1, May 2013, pp. 161-165 (Article)

Published by The Johns Hopkins University Press
DOI: 10.1353/mgs.2013.0009

Part III of the collection opens with a chapter by Valsamis Mitsilegas, which discusses the issues raised by the implementation of European Union criminal law measures in the Greek criminal justice system. In her commentary, Monica den Boer compares the Greek experience in this field with that of other member-states of the European Union. In the next chapter, Minas Samatas traces the history of surveillance practices, by linking contemporary developments, such as the impact of the 9/11 terrorist attacks and the measures employed during the 2004 Olympic Games, with Greece's authoritarian past. In his commentary, Kevin D. Haggerty stresses the importance of surveillance legacies in approaching the specific form that surveillance practices assume. Sophie Vidali's chapter addresses police and policing. In his commentary, Rob I. Mawby compares the Greek police to the continental European model and identifies various affinities. In the next chapter, Angelika Pitsela gives a historical overview of the regulation of juvenile delinquency and probation. In his commentary, John Muncie places the Greek experience in a wider context and insists that any comparative perspective must distinguish between policy as rhetoric, policy as codified, and policy as implemented. Charis Papacharalambous offers an overview of the adult judicial system by way of analyzing both the law in the books and the law in action. In her commentary, Nicola Padfield compares the Greek to the UK penal system in order to raise an important set of questions to be answered in future research. In the concluding chapter, Cheliotis examines the relationship between imprisonment and parole in the last three decades in Greece and identifies some of the causes of the growth of the former and the decline in uses of the latter. In his commentary, Roy D. King compares the Greek case with those of a number of other countries, lending support to the view that the Greek story about the complex relation between imprisonment and parole, far from being exceptional to Greece, is in fact internationally quite a familiar one.

Overall, the volume is a remarkable achievement in terms of scope, quality and ambition. In their Introduction, the editors emphasize that the overall goal of the publication is to stimulate further future research on crime and punishment in Greece from both a domestic and an international and comparative perspective. It is surely the case that this first important step puts any future research on firm ground.

Dimitrios Tsarapatsanis
University of Sheffield

Ferdinand Pajor. *Ερέτρια—Νέα Ψαρά. Το χρονικό μιας πολιτείας*. Trans. Dimitris Grigoropoulos. Athens: Melissa. 2010. Pp. 199. 158 illustrations (incl. maps, drawings, and photos). Hardcover €69.00.

Originally published as a research thesis (Pajor 2006) in the series *ERETRIA* issued by the Swiss School of Archaeology in Greece (heretofore SSAG), this study is now available to a wider audience thanks to its Greek re-publication in a concise, richly illustrated coffee-table version from Melissa Books, a publishing house with a long tradition of popularizing important architectural studies.

Pajor's study, however, is neither an archaeological treatise nor a purely architectural one. Rather, it is a quasi-historical account of how a new town came into being in the early stages of Greece's statehood, as a result of economic necessity, political considerations, and the aspiration of leading intellectuals (both Greek and Bavarian ones who accompanied king Otto I) to link the newborn nation-state with Classical antiquity. As such, it adds significantly to recent research on early town-planning in Greece under the impact of Neoclassicism (for references see "Πρόλογος" [Preface] by Alexandros Papageorgiou-Venetas), but also provides valuable material for study to those interested in the ideological uses of antiquity for the construction of Greek national identity (e.g., Yalouri 2001; Hamilakis 2007; Damaskos and Plantzos 2008).

The book begins with a methodological introduction (16–21) and continues with a review of the ancient history of Eretria (I. Ιστορική επισκόπηση [Historical review] 23–39) and the history of archaeological research (II. Η αρχαία Ερέτρια: ανακάλυψη και εξερεύνηση [Ancient Eretria: discovery and exploration] 40–65). Inhabited since the Final Neolithic (3500–3000 BC), Eretria evolved into a typical Greek *polis* in Archaic and Classical times (7th–4th c. BC). It continued to flourish in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, when many of the surviving monuments were erected. After that, the city started to decline, and by the early 6th c. BC, it was abandoned. The next reference to this area comes from Ciriaco de' Pizzicolli (Cyriacus of Ancona) who visited the site in 1436 and described visible monuments and inscriptions (44). Among the few European travelers who visited Eretria in the following centuries, the most extensive account comes from William Martin Leake (1805–1806), who described in detail its topography and "remains of antiquities" (46). In 1814, the first systematic recording and drawing of ancient monuments was made by a team of architects and antiquarians (46–51), providing a useful background for the subsequent planning of the modern town.

In chapter III (Η επανίδρυση πόλεων στην Ελλάδα μετά τον αγώνα της ανεξαρτησίας και ο σχεδιασμός της νέας Αθήνας [The re-establishment of towns in Greece after the War of Independence and the planning of the new city of Athens] 66–77), Pajor summarizes the situation in Greece concerning the establishment of new urban settlements shortly after the declaration of Independence (1827). Special emphasis is laid on the planning of Athens by Stamatios Kleanthis, Eduard Schaubert, and Leo von Klenze (1831–1834), whose work became a reference work for future projects. Chapter IV (Το σχέδιο της Ερέτριας/Νεων Ψαρών του 1834 [The plan of Eretria/Nea Psara] 78–97) describes the planning of a new settlement at the site of ancient Eretria, named *New Psara* because it was meant to house refugees from the island of Psara, which had been destroyed by the Ottoman navy in 1824. The planning of the new town was commissioned in 1834 to Schaubert and the topographer J.B. Beck, who drew an entirely new topographical plan of the site so precise that it is still used for archaeological research (52). Chapter V (Η εφαρμογή του σχεδίου πόλης της Ερέτριας/Νέων Ψαρών [The implementation of the urban plan of Eretria/Nea Psara] 98–105) describes the difficulties that arose during implementation—among others, fiscal strains, speculation in real estate prices, the unhealthy conditions of marshy Eretria, and the fact that the old inhabitants of Psara, trained as they were in seamanship and commerce, were reluctant to leave the thriving harbor of Ermoupolis, Syros, where they had meanwhile settled.

The next two chapters describe the development of the new town, focusing on urban planning, streets, plazas, and public buildings (VI. Η πολεοδομική εξέλιξη της

νέας πόλης [The urban development of the new town] 106–123) and on Neoclassical architecture both for public and private structures (VII. Τα ιστορικά κτίσματα της Ερέτριας/Νέων Ψαρών [Historical buildings of Eretria/Nea Psara] 124–157). It is in those chapters that students of architecture and urbanism will be mostly interested, although they may have to seek the original publication for a full photographic documentation of Eretria's historical buildings, as compiled between 1994 and 2005 (Pajor 2006, vol. II, 37–87)

The last chapter presents for the first time in full the master plan of Eretria, as drafted in 1975–1976 by an interdisciplinary seminar at the Department of Architecture of the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich (VIII. Το ρυθμιστικό σχέδιο («μελέτη κατευθυντηρίου σχεδίου») της Ερέτριας (1975–1976) [The master plan of Eretria, 1975–1976] 158–173). Although the Greek volume contains only a small selection of the 31 plans published in the original (Pajor 2006, vol. II, Dok. 6), this is still a significant contribution, as the master plan represents a rare effort by archaeologists, architects, urban historians, and planners to treat the past, present and future of a town in combination—demonstrating, at the same time, the limitations of an intellectual project that was never implemented.

The book ends with the author's concluding remarks (IX. Τελική θεώρηση [Final conclusions] 174–179) and an epilogue by Pierre Ducrey, former director of the SSAG (180–184). Appendices include Schaubert's complementary memorandum to the 1834 Eretria plan (186–188) and an 1845 letter from the "Committee of the Psara settlers" to the Ministry of Internal Affairs in which they present the demands on which they condition their relocation to the new town (189–191). This is only part of the archival documentation available in the original study (Pajor 2006, vol. I *passim*)

But why Eretria? As summarily explained by Pajor (66–68), the young Greek state, initially under Ioannis Kapodistrias and later under Otto I, son of the Bavarian king Ludwig I, tried to build a viable infrastructure by establishing new towns that would become centers of economic activity and attract Greeks living abroad. At the same time, it was necessary to find solutions for populations who had lost their homeland during the war. Coupled with the expressed desire of politicians and intellectuals to link the new political entity with ancient Greek tradition, these factors led, along withthe restructuring of existing towns (Tripolis, Argos, Nauplion, Aigion, Patras, etc.), to the establishment of entirely new settlements in sites with strong Classical backgrounds that nevertheless were more or less uninhabited (or at least in no residential use) by that timesites such as Sparta, Piraeus, Eretria, and New Corinth (one could also add Athens to this list, since the modern capital, then a small provincial town, had been devastated during the war). The employment of bright architects bred in the Neoclassical ambient of the Berlin Academy of Architecture (for brief biographies, see pp. 69–74) led to the adoption of innovative ideas on town planning, which expressed the spirit of late-eighteenth century enlightened monarchies combined with an idealized perception of Greek antiquity, as formulated by European academics, travelers, and antiquarians (67–69).

As Pajor explains, Neoclassicism was positively received by Greek intellectuals as a kind of "counter-loan," which would allow for the revival of the idea of the *city* (άστυ) in the place where it was first born—thus reinforcing (alongside archaeology itself) the role of antiquity for the collective imaginary of the nascent nation. The Greek state continued to construct ideological links with antiquity even in much later times, e.g., in the 1950s

when the roads of Eretria were named (or renamed) after important figures of ancient history and myth (108–111).

Pajor goes one step further, trying to analyze (albeit briefly) the various reasons for the incomplete implementation of the original Eretria plan. As possible causes, he lists its over-ambitious character, the inability of the Greek state to support the sustained development of well-planned cities, and lack of correspondence with the economic structure of the area, among others (172, 173, 175–176). Here, one feels that the explanatory framework is too narrow. Notwithstanding the importance of structural or "technical" problems, one would expect a more critical stance towards the "Neoclassical project" as a whole. Earlier research has identified discrepancies between Neoclassical architecture and the ideological needs of the emerging bourgeoisie in nineteenth century Greece, traced differences in its application and reception between large urban centers and smaller towns, and stressed that it was primarily used at an official level as a symbol of state power and national ideology (e.g., Bastea 2000; Biris and Kardamitsi-Adami 2004). Such parameters receive limited attention in the study. More important, the author hardly explores the consequences of the sudden break with the "Ottoman past" brought about by Neoclassical morphological principles. This break was not only ideological; it was also material, and meant the abrupt shift from traditional types of architecture and town organization (e.g., houses with internal courtyards, open markets, public baths, cemeteries in the surrounding of churches and mosques, fortification walls, etc.) to new forms of buildings and urban planning transplanted from central Europe to Greece with very little concern for adaptation (Biris and Kardamitsi-Adami *op. cit.* 29–50, 73–74, 126–128; Conference proceedings 1985). What significance this rupture in memory and social/cultural practice had for the eventual failure of the Neoclassical experiment is a question that demands far more systematic investigation (see for example, Yerolympos1996). Explanations centered on the structural inability of a formerly Ottoman province to incorporate western modes of organization run the risk of reproducing Orientalist stereotypes, and certainly fall short of current post-colonial discourses, which stand critically against the idea that the transition to modernity in Greece could be materialized exclusively upon the basis of an exogenous perception of (and attraction to) an idealized ancient past (see Panourgiá 2004).

It is for this reason that Pajor's study cannot be classed as a historical but rather only as a quasi-historical treatise. Despite such deficiencies, however, it is an impressive and highly interesting volume, which adds significantly to our understanding of social and ideological developments in the formative decades of Greece's statehood, and will be certainly used as a reference in future works on town planning and the reception of antiquity in that period. Last but not least, its inclusion in the *ERETRIA* series is suggestive of a gradual realization—both by professionals and the public in Greece—of the historicity of archaeological practices and the political dimension of archaeological work.

Nikolas Papadimitriou
Museum of Cycladic Art, Athens
npapad@cycladic.gr

REFERENCES

Bastea, Eleni
2000 *The Creation of Modern Athens. Planning the Myth.* Cambridge: University Press.

Biris, Manos and Kardamitsi- Adami, Maro
2004 *Neoclassical Architecture in Greece*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum.

Conference proceedings
1985 *Νεοελληνική Πόλη. Οθωμανικές Κληρονομιές και Ελληνικό Κράτος*, Αθήνα: Εταιρεία Μελέτης Νέου Ελληνισμού.

Damaskos, Dimitris and Plantzos, Dimitris, editors
2008 *A Singular Antiquity: Archaeology and Hellenic Identity in Twentieth century Greece.* Athens: Benaki Museum.

Hamilakis, Yiannis
2007 *The Nation and its Ruins: Antiquity, Archaeology and National Imagination in Greece.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pajor, Ferdinand
2006 *Eretria—Nea Psara. Eine klassizistische Stadtanlage über der antiken Polis* (*ERETRIA Ausgrabungen und Forschungen* XV), vol. i–ii (Ph. D. diss.): Lausanne.

Panourgiá, Neni
2004 "Colonizing the Ideal: Neo-classical Articulations and European Modernities." *angelaki* 9: 165–180.

Yalouri, Eleana
2001 *The Acropolis: Global Fame, Local Claim.* Oxford: Berg.

Yerolympos, Alexandra
1996 *Urban Transformations in the Balkans (1820–1930). Aspects of Balkan Town Planning and the Remaking of Thessaloniki.* Thessaloniki: University Studio Press.

Georgios N. Soutsos. *Alexandrovodas the Unscrupulous* (1785). Introduction and translation Anna Stavrakopoulou. Istanbul: The Isis Press. 2012. Pp. 123. Paperback $15.00

The recent publication of Georgios Soutsos's satirical comedy *Alexandrovodas the Unscrupulous*, translated into English and prefaced by Anna Stavrakopoulou, introduces a fascinating yet little-known work of the Modern Greek repertoire to a broader international audience. The fact that the present edition appears in Istanbul, where the work was orginally composed and read, constitutes in itself an important event. On the one hand, Soutsos's *Alexandrovodas* is a testimony to the vitality of the Phanariot literary activities in the late-eighteenth century. On the other, however, the circumstances of its composition and original circulation underscore the relative precariousness of Phanariot letters at the time, which partly accounts for the fact that important works like *Alexandrovodas* only truly became an object of study for scholars of Modern Greek literature in the last few decades. Soutsos's play, written in 1785, was never performed and only existed