SCRIPTA MEDITERRANEA

Volume XXIII 2002

CANADIAN INSTITUTE
FOR MEDITERRANEAN STUDIES
INSTITUT CANADIEN
D'ÉTUDES MÉDITERRANÉENNES

SCRIPTA MEDITERRANEA

Scripta Mediterranea is the journal of the Canadian Institute for Mediterranean Studies, an international learned society based in Canada and devoted to the study of all aspects of Mediterranean culture and civilization, past and present, with a special interest in interdisciplinary and cross-cultural investigation.

General Correspondence

The Editors,
Scripta Mediterranea,
Canadian Institute for Mediterranean Studies,
c/o Department of Spanish and Portuguese,
University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5S 1K7.

Cover by: Vinicio Scarci

Produced by: Legas, 3 Wood Aster Bay,
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, K2R 1B3.

ISSN 0226 8418

Scripta Mediterranea

Volumes XXIII, 2002

Contents

William Manning

THE DOUBLE TRADITION OF APHRODITE'S BIRTH AND HER SEMITIC ORIGINS

In contrast to modern religion, there was no "church" or religious dogma in the ancient world. No congress of Bishops met to decide what was acceptable doctrine and what was, by process of elimination, heresy. Matters of faith could be exceedingly complex and variable. The gods evolved over time and from place to place, dividing and diverging, so that many simultaneous beliefs were possible.

Most students of Greek mythology are familiar with the "pairing" of certain gods and goddesses in the pantheon. Zeus is associated with his wife Hera, and Apollo with his sister Artemis, for example. It is believed that this reflects the introduction of male Sky Gods by Indo-European invaders, which were allowed to co-exist with the Earth-Mother Goddesses already worshipped by indigenous populations. Some scholars believe that Posiedon and Zeus are manifestations of the same Indo-European deity brought to the Greek mainland by successive waves of immigrants. Other aspects of mythological duality include the presence of apparently contrasting attributes within the same deity, and the allocation of opposing aspects of the same activity to more than one God. The example most often cited is Athena, Goddess of Wisdom. While she was patroness of culture and learning, she was always depicted in armor and championed the "positive" aspects of war such as courage and loyalty. The grouping of these attributes would seem strange to us today. Most Classics students will immediately point out that it is Ares who was recognized as the God of War. While he and Athena shared patronage for war, Ares represented its "negative" aspects, carnage and brutality. What is lesser known is that Aphrodite was also shown wearing armor in many Greek cities, and was descended from Near Eastern goddesses of war as well as fertility. Even in her familiar role of "Goddess of Love" in Athens in the classical period, it was said that there were two goddesses called Aphrodite. This assumption is based on the existence of two traditions of her birth, and the reference in Classical sources to two goddesses with very different personalities — Aphrodite Ourania and Aphrodite Pandemos.

The story of the birth of Aphrodite Ourania, as told by the poet Hesiod, dates back to the overthrow of Uranus by his son Kronos.

Hesiod says that Kronos castrated Uranus with a sickle while he was mating with Gaea, the Earth Mother, throwing the genitals into the sea. White foam grew around the floating flesh, from which a goddess was formed. She drifted past Cythera, stepping ashore on Cyprus (8-9 [188-206]):

> "Gods and men call her Aphrodite, because she was formed in foam, and Cytherea, because she approached Cythera, and Cyprus-born, because she was born in wave-washed Cyprus..." (9 [195-199])

Aphrodite was thus born of a single divinity and was present at the separation of heaven, earth and sea, making her one of the oldest of the divinities.

Homer, writing in the Iliad at around the same time, gives us a completely different impression of the circumstances surrounding Aphrodite's birth:

> "...and now bright Aphrodite fell at the knees of her mother, Dione, who gathered her daughter into her arms' fold." (*Iliad* 138 [V.370-371])

> "Then the daughter of Zeus, Aphrodite, answered her..." (*Iliad* 299 [XIV.193])

In the Odyssey, Aphrodite is still the daughter of Zeus and Dione, but Homer has Demodokos recite a story of Ares

> "...lusting after the love of sweet-garlanded Kythereia. She had lately come in from the house of her father, the powerful son of Kronos." (*Odyssey* 128 [VIII.288-290])

This is interesting. The son of Kronos is Zeus. Aphrodite's birth is not only associated with a later generation of gods, but is the result of the sexual union of two parents: an Olympian god and a Titan. But note how Aphrodite is referred to, in the same sentence, as Kythereia - which obviously corresponds to Hesiod's "Cytherea". In the same episode, when she is released by Hephaistos,

> "Aphrodite, lover of laughter, went back to Paphos on Cyprus, where lies her sacred precinct and her smoky altar..." (*Odyssey* 130 [VIII.362-363])

Again, we remember that Cyprus is the island where the Goddess first came ashore according to Hesiod.

During the Classical Period, Plato wrote a story called the Symposium. The setting for the narrative is a banquet attended by a

small group of very famous friends who are engaged in a lively discussion on, among other things, the subject of love. One of the participants, Pausanias, introduces the concept of Aphrodite and her dual nature:

> "For we all know that Love is inseparable from Aphrodite... as there are two goddesses there must be two Loves. And am I not right in asserting that there are two goddesses? The elder one, having no mother, who is called the heavenly Aphrodite —she is the daughter of Uranus; the younger, who is the daughter of Zeus and Dione— her we call common..." (309 [180d])

Pausanias goes on to explain that Aphrodite Ourania represents pure spiritual love while Aphrodite Pandemos represents physical love.

Other Classical sources seem to be in general agreement that Aphrodite came to Greece by way of Cythera and Cyprus. The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite opens:

> "Muse, tell me about the deeds of Cyprian Aphrodite, the golden goddess...all these are touched by beautifully crowned Cythera." (150 [1-5])

In his History, Herodotus relates that the most ancient temple of Celestial Venus (Latin for Aphrodite) was at Ascalon, in Syria. It inspired two similar temples in Cyprus and Cythera to be built by the Phoenicians (41 [1.105]). Pausanias, in his Description of Greece, relates that the first people to worship Aphrodite were "... the Assyrians, and next to them the inhabitants of Paphos in Cyprus and the Phoenicians of Ascalon in Palestine. The Cytherians learnt the worship from the Phoenicians." (21 [1.14.7]) Athenaeus introduces an intriguing twist to the plot, as he describes how many of Aphrodite's sanctuaries in the Greek world were inhabited by temple prostitutes. They were known to practice sexual rites in Magnesia, Samos and Corinth. He writes: "These women were dedicated to pray to Cypris, with Heaven's blessing" (97 [XIII.573e]). One man, offering a sacrifice at the Corinthian temple of Aphrodite, begins his prayer: "O Queen of Cyprus! Hither to thy sanctuary Xenophon hath brought a troupe of one hundred girls to browse, gladdened as he is by his vows now fulfilled." (99 [XIII.573f]) Note again the reference to Cyprus.

Even the Roman poet Ovid, when he relates the story of Pygmalion in the Metomorphoses, sets the location of the tale in Cyprus. Pygmalion's bride, thanks to Venus (Aphrodite), has a son named Paphos (232 [X.270-297]). As we have seen, Paphos is the city where Aphrodite's temple was built, copied from a Phoenician predecessor. A subsequent story in the same work, that of Adonis, also takes place on

Cyprus. Mention is made that "[t]he goddess of Cythera...ceased to visit seagirt Paphos..." (239 [X.529-532]), when she fell in love with Adonis.

To summarize the facts so far, Aphrodite is generally associated with the islands of Cythera and Cyprus and is frequently worshipped through the participation of temple prostitutes. Only one source, Homer, asserts that she is the daughter of Zeus and Dione — and then in the same sentence calls her Kythereia! This brings us back to the story of how she sprang from Uranus' genitals near Cythera, which seems to be in agreement with all the other Classical sources. Homer is known to have altered mythology when it suited his purpose. A well-known example is his replacement of Chiron the centaur (Morford & Lenardon 396) with Phoenix (Homer Iliad 210 [IX.438-443]) as the tutor of Achilles in the Iliad because it better suited the plot. In addition, Homer generally avoided the fantastic and grotesque in his mythological allusions. The castration story would certainly qualify. (Reinhold 102) It is also possible that the epithet Pandemos was intended simply to confer Olympian status on this foreign goddess; to adopt her as a Greek goddess "of the people" (Kerenyi 68).

So if there was one Aphrodite, who was born of Uranian foam and came to Greece by way of Cyprus and Cythera, how do we explain Plato? Even a superficial reading of the Symposium should convey the obvious, that his "drawing room" conversations are not intended to be taken at face value. I doubt that many scholars accept the premise that they actually took place as described. Even if they did, Plato's circle of followers represented a small social elite whose views were not necessarily those of the average Athenian citizen, and in his choice of metaphors he was under no obligation to adhere to any modern standard of historical or theological accuracy. Plato staged these hypothetical verbal interchanges and put words in the mouths of his characters in order to give voice to his philosophies and present different points of view for the reader to consider. There is no evidence that the views credited to Pausanias represent the views of the real-life Pausanias (assuming that he was really there) or of Plato or of his contemporaries for that matter. I believe that Plato was simply using two familiar epithets for Aphrodite as a metaphor for his idea of two types of love; that in a civilized society a distinction can be made between spiritual love on one hand, and physical satisfaction and procreation on the other. We misunderstand completely if we assume that he meant this to be taken literally. Unfortunately, some later scholars have done precisely that, using Homer's "creative" alteration of Aphrodite's genealogy as confirmation.

According to Herodotus, Aphrodite came first to Cythera and next to Cyprus on her way to the Greek mainland. Pausanias and Herodotus

say that her worship was brought to the Aegean by the Phoenicians. Do the ancient sources have anything to say about where the goddess's worship came from before that? Herodotus gives us a clue. In his description of Babylonian culture, he describes how each woman once in her lifetime, must go to the temple of Venus (Aphrodite) and serve as a temple prostitute (74-75). He closes with "A custom very much like this is found also in certain parts of the island of Cyprus" (75). We have already noted how temple prostitutes were present in the temple of Aphrodite at Corinth by the time of Pausanias. Should we look for the origins of Aphrodite in the Near East?

It is not difficult to detect the antecedents of Aphrodite in the Semitic fertility goddesses known to exist in the ancient Near East. The most ancient of these was the Sumerian goddess Inanna, a goddess of fertility and agricultural prosperity. The ancients equated fertility, the recurring seasonal cycles and the regeneration of crops with human reproductive capability and therefore sexuality. The writings about Inanna feature "...a full and frank eroticism..." (Friedrich 14) but she is never maternal. (Friedrich 50) She was also the patroness of prostitutes as well as the Goddess of War. Inanna's qualities were assimilated into the Akkadian/Babylonian goddess Ishtar, who "...conspicuously patronizes carnal love in the Gilgamesh Epic..." (Friedrich 16). She was also attended by prostitutes and courtesans. There were many regional and local variants of this goddess. The Phoenician/Canaanite Ishtar seems to have evolved into three characters: the Hebrew Astarte or Esther, and the Canaanite Anat and Asherah, who were later fused into one goddess, Astoroth. Their principal defining features appear to have been their identification with sexuality and warfare (Friedrich 16-18). There is reason to believe that temple prostitution or sexual relations with priestesses were a feature of the worship of both Astarte and Astoroth (Friedrich 19). As previously noted, Herodotus credits the spread of temple prostitution *associated with the worship of Aphrodite* to the Phoenicians who disseminated it to Cythera and Cyprus. It is later present as a distinctive feature of Aphrodite's worship and ritual in Corinth and many other Greek cities as well. Another especially convincing piece of evidence of Aphrodite's Near Eastern origin is her association with the morning and evening star. Ourania simply means Celestial or Heavenly. Her predecessors: Inanna, Isthar, Anat Astarte, and Asherah all bore some variation on the title "Far Shining" or "Queen of Heaven" as well as as being associated with the planet Venus. They shared the seemingly contradictory attributes of Goddess of Love and Bringer of Victory, along with a number of ritual elements besides temple prostitution, such as the burning of incense and the sacrifice of doves. There are striking parallels between Aphrodite's lover Adonis and Astarte's consort Tammuz, and both were occasionally

shown as bearded fertility goddesses. It cannot be overemphasized that the characteristics that Aphrodite shared with her Near Eastern predecessors —and the later Roman goddess Venus— argue in favour if a direct line of descent (*Aphrodite Urania*). Furthermore, Hesiod's story linking the goddess to Cythera and Cyprus coincides, in a symbolic way, with what is known about Phoenican trading and settlement patterns in the eastern Mediterranean.

Expanding on the association with the planet Venus, Maggie Mccary notes that the erratic pattern of the morning and evening star alternately rising in conjunction with the moon and setting in conjunction with the sun may explain why the ancients saw Aphrodite as both a celestial goddess and goddess of the underworld. Her association with an older moon goddess during her celestial phase linked her with the tidal cycles and hence her connection with the sea. The violence of her birth through interaction betwen the elements air (masculine) and water (feminine) through violent agitation (foam) indicates that she was born from both love and violence, and could be a goddess of love and vengeance (Mccary).

The story of Aphrodite Ourania's birth contains celestial, sea, creation and death imagery that marks her as a goddess of great antiquity. Some scholars have attempted to explain her as the neolithic Great Mother goddess who survived, largely unaltered for thousands of years until the classical period. This argument is based on perceived common denominators and similarities among names that emerge from pre-history. Unfortunately, they are speculative and do not explain all the known facts, and so are not generally accepted. We are on safer ground when we note the obvious immediate descent of Aphrodite from the Semitic Near Eastern warrior and fertility goddesses due to the obvious similarities. The mother and sea goddess aspects, among others, were more likely reintroduced into her character in Palestine, a region known as a cross-cultural "melting pot" and disseminator of ideas, and on her journey from one Phoenician colony to the next through the Aegean islands to Greece.

Deborah Boedeker argues that Aphrodite is actually of Indo-European origin while admitting "[i]n certain aspects of cult and iconography, the similarities between Aphrodite and the Great Goddess, especially Astarte, are not to be disputed" (5). She then proceeds with a complex etymological dissertation in which she attempts to establish that the name Aphrodite could have evolved from any one of many known Indo-European as well as Near Eastern phrases (6-14). This game of "scholarly word-association" is not convincing. Despite the complexity of her argument, the fact remains that similarities are inevitable because many goddesses were descended, directly or indirectly, from the Great Mother and were worshipped by many people speaking many lan-

guages. The human voice can produce only a limited number of sounds. It would be astounding if there were not innumerable words and phrases that could conceivably have been corrupted into something that sounds like Aphrodite, but the author has not managed to prove that it was not a Semitic name. Ms. Boedeker also feels that the assimilation of Aphrodite into Greek culture could not have taken place on Cyprus because the Phoenicians did not settle there until after 1000 B.C., by which time the goddess was well established in Greek religion (1-2).

Paul Friedrich disagrees:

> "Since there unquestionably was much trade contact and cultural exchange between Phoenicians and Greeks... 1400-1150...one can reasonably assume considerable cross-fertilization of religious imagery, and the specifics of Ishtar and Aphrodite make this assumption virtually mandatory." (51)

It should be noted that Mr. Friedrich is arguing for a *primarily* Near Eastern origin for our subject, as opposed to a *purely* Near Eastern origin. Obviously cultural assimilation does not take place in a vacuum, and influences can be assumed from many sources including Indo-European.

While not disputing the great antiquity of Aphrodite, W. Burkert points out that she appears not to have been mentioned in Mycenaean linear B tablets; therefore she must have been introduced into Greek religion from outside the Greek world following the Bronze Age. He acknowledges a direct link to Ashtoreth and hence her long history in the Near East:

> "It is possible that the name Aphrodite itself is a Greek form of western Semitic Ashtorith, who in turn is identical with Ishtar." (152, *Aphrodite Urania* n.17)

If so, it must have seemed significant that "aphoros" was the Greek word for "foam." The Greeks were fond of puns and double meanings. Surely that had to mean *something*!

One especially imaginative theory suggests that Aphrodite's warrior goddess aspect is a memory of the worship of Inanna by Amazons who once inhabited Asia and the Near East. A more likely theory is that since prehistoric times, young women accompanied armies and used songs and chants to encourage and taunt young warriors during battle and uttered shrill war cries to un-nerve the enemy. (*Aphrodite Urania* n. 78; Roberts 40) As late as the siege of Constantinople in 1451 A.D. a large group of women behind the Arab soldiers sang "if you are victorious we will reward you; if you lose we will foresake you." The asso-

ciation between female sexuality and lust for battle may have ancient origins for that reason.

What about the duality of Aphrodite Ourania and Aphrodite Pandemos? It is a common feature of many of the Olympian gods and goddesses that they were often given epithets to indicate local or regional variations or particular aspects of their personalities. The same goddess who evolved into a matronly symbol of love, marriage and beauty at Athens was the object of a fertility cult and worshipped with sexual rites and imagery as a patroness of prostitutes at Corinth. In this capacity she was Aphrodite Gentrix or Aphrodite Nymphia. She was depicted in armour —like Athena— and worshipped as Aphrodite Enoplios, a goddess of war, at Sparta (Kerenyi 78). She was also depicted armed in Cyprus, Thebes and Smyrna (Seltman 84) as well as Cythera (Cary *et al* 67). At Argos she was called the "Bringer of Victory." (Saltman 84) These roles much more closely resemble her predecessors in the Near East, where Ishtar and Astarte were goddesses of carnal love, war and fertility. Sometimes she was Venus Genetyllis (Patroness of Childbirth). In other places she was Aphrodite Melaina/Melainis (Black/Dark One), Aphrodite Androphonos (Killer of Men), Aphrodite Anosia (the Unholy), Aphrodite Tymhorychos (the Grave-digger), Aphrodite Epitymbidia (She Upon the Graves) or Aphrodite Persephaessa (Queen of the Underworld) — obviously having absorbed the character of an earlier goddess of death. In another place she was Aphrodite Pasiphaessa (the Far-shining) which may associate her with an earlier moon-goddess, (Kerenyi 78-81) but as we have seen, her worship often involved celestial imagery that connected her with comets, meteors and solar symbolism in addition to the planet Venus. As Aphrodite Pelagia, a marine deity depicted with fishing net and cockle shell imagery, she was appealed to as the protector of sailors and shipping. There were many other epithets, which were added to the list as the worship of Aphrodite absorbed the cults of earlier goddesses or was altered to suit local needs.

As the Athenians came into contact with other areas of Greece and became more dominant, they encountered variations of Aphrodite that more closely resembled their own patroness Athena. Athena began to absorb many of Aphrodite's former attributes: in particular her association with weaving, wisdom and her warrior aspect. The myth of Athena taking her loom away from Aphrodite was likely intended to explain this transfer of responsibilities. As befits a goddess of wisdom, Athena sprang fully grown from the head, rather than the genitals, of her single divine parent Zeus. What remained of Aphrodite was the spiteful, lazy promiscuous minor goddess that we are most familiar with.

During the First Punic War (264-241 B.C.) The Romans recaptured the temple of Aphrodite at Mount Eryx in Sicily (formerly a Phoenician

temple of Astarte) from the Carthaginians. Since both the Romans and the local Elymi believed themselves descended from the Trojans through the temple's builder Aeneas, a temple to Venus Ericyna was built on the Roman capitol to ensure victory during the Second Punic War (218-201 B.C.), but without the "sacred prostitution" of the original. Julius Caesar later claimed descent from Aeneas, whose mother was Venus, so she became the patroness of the emperors of Rome. Her identity as goddess of fertility and warfare was preserved as Venus Aphrodisias and Venus Victrix (Moon).

So instead of alluding to two Aphrodites, Plato (if he were a historian and not a philosopher) might better have left us with one of two apparently contradictory assertions. He could have said that there were not two Aphrodites, but many Aphrodites; Ourania and Pandemos being simply the two most prominent epithets in Athenian culture. At the same time he could have said that all these epithets belong to one great Aphrodite who, allowing for influences from other cultures, is a direct descendant of the Great Near Eastern Fertility goddesses who found a home on Mount Olympus.

Aviation Museum
Canada Science and Technology Museum Corporation

Works cited:

Aphrodite Urania. <www.aeonjournal.com/articles/aphrodite/aphrodite.html>

Athenaeus, *The Deipnosophists,* Vol. 7, Gulick, C. (trans.), London: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Boedeker, Deborah Dickmann. *Aphrodite's Entry into Greek Epic,* Netherlands: Lugduni Batavorum E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1974.

Burkert, Walter. *Greek Religion,* Cambridge: 1985.

Cary *et al* (ed.). *Oxford Classical Dictionary,* London: Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1961.

Friedrich, Paul. *The Meaning of Aphrodite,* Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Herodotus, *History*. Rawlinson, G. (trans.), New York: Tudor Publishing Company, 1936.

Hesiod, *Theogony,* M.L. West (trans.). Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Homer, "Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite", *Classical Mythology,* Morford, M. and Lenardon, R. 4th ed., White Plains, New York: Longman Publishing Group, 1991.

Homer, *Iliad,* R. Lattimore (trans.). Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Homer. *Odyssey,* R. Lattimore (trans.), New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965.

Kerenyi, Carl. *The Gods of the Greeks*, London & New York: Thomas and Hudson, 1951.

Mccary, M. *The Birth of Aphrodite*, <www.mythandculture. com/academic/aphrodite.html>

Moon, Beverly. *Aphrodite, Ancestor of Kings*, <www.oupusa.org/sc/0195121309/0195121309_01.pdf>

Morford, M., Lenardon, R. *Classical Mythology*, White Plains, New York: Longman Publishing Group, 1991 (4th ed.).

Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, M. Innes (trans.). London: Penguin Books, 1955

Pausanias, *Description of Greece*, Vol. 1, Frazer, J. (trans.). New York: Biblo and Tannen, 1965.

Plato, "Symposium", *The Dialogues of Plato*, Vol. 1, Jowett, B. (trans.). New York: Random House, 192

Reinhold, Meyer. *Past and Present, The Continuity of Classical Myths*, Toronto: Hakkert, 1972

Roberts, J., *The Earliest Semitic Panthenon*, Baltimore, 1972

Seltman, Charles Theodore. *The Twelve Olympians and Their Guests*, London: Max Parrish, 1956

Roberta Morosini

BOCCACCIO AND THE MEDITERRANEAN LEGEND ABOUT VIRGIL THE MAGICIAN AND THE CASTLE OF THE EGG IN NAPLES WITH A NOTE ON MS STROZZI 152, *FILOCOLO* IV 31 AND *DECAMERON* X 5.

"Bien savez que Virgiles fist grant merveille, quant il assist deus chastiaus seur deus oés en mer" ("You know that Virgil did/ a great wonder, when he built two castles on two eggs in the sea"), says Adenet Le Roi, referring to the magic foundation of Naples. Adenet was a minstrel who traveled throughout Italy and visited Sicily and Naples, while following the Flemish knight Guido di Dampierre to the crusade in 1270. Coming across this passage in his Cleomadés, I started wondering about the legend of the so-called Castle of the Egg, still visible in the bay of Naples. According to legend, the castle was built on an egg by Virgil, who spent "diu et suavissime" ("a long and very pleasant interlude") in the city of Naples, according to Vergilii Vita Donatiana (28), and was buried between the cities of Pozzuoli and Posillipo in his chosen place: at the opening of the cave of Posillipo, which the legend also says he created in one night. With the help of two thousand demons, he excavated the hill tracing the course of the stars, connecting Naples to Pozzuoli to make the lives of those traveling between them easier.

The Cleomadés, a fourteenth-century Old French novel, recounts the magic origin of Naples, a city founded on two castles by the sea, and includes a long passage on the Neapolitan Castle and the legends circulating in Naples about Virgil as a magician and healer:

> Bien savez que Virgiles fist/grant merveille,/quant il assist deus chastiaus/ seur deus oés en mer/ et si les sot si compasser/que qui l'un des oés briseroit/tantost li chastiaus fonderoit/ ou ens en ovoit l'uef brisié./ Encor dist on que essaié/ fu d'un des chastiaus, et fondi, /a Naples le dist on ainsi;/ encor est la l'autres chastiaus, qui en mer siet et bons et biaus,/s'i est li oés, c'est veritas/seur quoi li chastiaus est fondés ("You know that Virgil did/ a great wonder, when he built two castles on two eggs in the sea/and he hid them so well/that if one of them broke/the castle would collapse into the sea/ People say also that one of the two broke, and disintegrated into the sea/ at least that is what is said in Naples;/ the other castle is still there,/beautiful and

> strong on the sea,/ if we can still see it, that means it is all true,/ what are the foundations of the castle" [vv. 1649-62])[1].

The editor of the *Cleomadés*, Albert Henry, believes that Adenet did not stay long in Naples, and this city was for him simply "un gîte d'étape": he arrived on the evening of 20 February 1271 and left the next morning (662). Information about Guido and Adenet's journey is to be found in *Les Grosses Parties*, written by Makel, Guido's notary. More than a report of expenses for the crusaders, it documents Adenet's journey in Italy, including Sicily, Trapani, Calatafimi, Alcamo, Termini, Caltavuturo, Polizzi, Gangi, Nicosia, Troina, Randazzo, Taormina, Messina Catona, Seminara (in Calabria), Monteleone (now Vibo Valentia), Nicastro, Martirano, Cosenza, Tarsia, Trebisacce, Rocca di Nieto, Policoro, Scanzano, Torre di Mare, Matera, Gravina, Barletta, Foggia, Troja, Benevento, Acerra, Napoli, and many central and northern cities from Florence to Aosta. Makel already speaks of the *Chastellain de l'uef* (n 477), without mentioning its relationship to Virgil.

Surprisingly, many intellectuals and men of the clergy, scholars of the caliber of John of Salisbury, talk about Virgil as a magician and a thaumaturge, helping the city of Naples. Passing through Naples in 1160, John of Salisbury heard and noted that Virgil helped to clean the city's air, infected by numerous flies, by making a bronze fly under the influence of a constellation. Among the clergy, besides Jacopo, from Varazze's accounts a few years after Salisbury's report, Bishop Corrado of Querfurt, Arrigo VII's chancellor in 1194, wrote to another ecclesiastic in Hildesheim of a glass bottle that he had seen containing a miniature model of Naples. This account is similar to the widespread legend about the Castle of the Egg that recounts how Virgil put an egg through the tight neck of a carafe, which he then put into a cage that hung under the castle. The destiny of Naples was to be linked forever to the egg.

Accounts of Virgil the magician and healer in the city of Naples can also be found in thirteenth-century historical accounts, such as the *Otia Imperialia* (1211), written by Gervasio of Tilbury, a professor in Bologna. Even a philosopher like Alekandre Neckam wrote in a book of natural history about a golden leech made by Virgil to disinfect the city from the dead animals left in the ditches, as did many others: twelfth-century poets Pietro D'Eboli and Cino da Pistoia and Antonio Pucci in the fourteenth century. All the legends related to Virgil the magician and healer, especially for the benefit of the city of Naples, are compiled in Domenico Comparetti's *Virgil in the Middle Ages* and, more recently,

---

[1] Translation in English is mine unless otherwise noted. About Adenet's visit to Naples, see also Sabatini 36; Henry 661-74.

Dattilo's *Castel dell'Ovo. Storie e leggende di Napoli*, a study that focuses on the legends related to the Castle of the Egg[2].

Considering how popular this one legend related to the Castle of the Egg is among intellectuals and ordinary people, I wondered about the impact it would have on Boccaccio's imagination. Did Boccaccio know the legend, and if he did, what was his reaction? Already during his Neapolitan years, Boccaccio used to condemn the "fabuloso," that in the Genealogia will be categorized as the fourth type of fabula.

I found no mention of the Castle of the Egg in Boccaccio's writings until the day I came across Francesco Sabatini's quick reference to the manuscript Laurenziano Strozzi 152. The Laurenziano Strozzi kept in the Biblioteca Laurenziana in Florence is an illuminated exemplary of Jacopo Alighieri's commentary on *The Divine Comedy*. Maybe — Francesco Sabatini (75) and Alessandra Periccioli Saggese (49-67; nn 67-68) suggest— the Strozzi 152 is one of the illuminated manuscripts of the Divine Comedy, like the codex of the Arsenal in Paris, written elsewhere and only illuminated in the middle of the fourteenth century in Naples or by Neapolitan artists. Besides some illuminations of scenes from Dante's poem, the Strozzi 152 contains glosses and notes in Neapolitan dialect and, at the foot of the page, some signatures, names of Neapolitans, and verses in Latin on the Castle of the Egg that have been attributed to Boccaccio and Pietro Piccolo da Monteforte. On the basis of Boccaccio's defense of poetry and, in particular, his reaction to the "fabuloso," together with the relationship he established with Pietro and the possible dates when he and Pietro could have written those verses in Naples, I reached the conclusion that Boccaccio knew the legends but he would ignore them. Attributing those verses to a collaboration between Boccaccio and Pietro Piccolo da Monteforte creates a Middle Ages as mythical as the fanciful legend itself!

Adenet's verses on Virgil in Naples deserve mention, since they offer a singular version of the Castle of the Egg legend. According to Adenet, there used to be two castles (vv.1649-62). One of them collapsed into the sea, because the egg on which it was built broke. Adenet is definitely the first to offer this variation. Adenet's verses are also unique, because, for 200 verses, he concentrates more on Virgil's activity in Naples than in Rome; the obverse was typically true at that time. Apart

---

[2] Comparetti believes that the legend linking Virgil to the Castle of the Egg started circulating only in the fourteenth century and not before. However, as Makel's report shows, Adenet is not the first in the fourteenth century to narrate the story of the castle built on a egg, attributing it to the poet Virgil. Henry (662n1) argues against Comparetti and John Webster Spargo ("Virgil the necromancer," Studies in Virgilian Legends) that, as Makel's 1270 report shows, documents predating the fourteenth century mention the Castle of the Egg. For more bibliography and insights into the reception of the legend related to Virgil the magician in Naples, see Tassinari and Izzo.

from Makel's report, before the *Cleomadés*, the *Image du monde de maître Gossouin* documents the magic origin of the city founded on an egg, just as Adenet describes it. Here, as well as in Makel's report, Virgil is not associated with the legend of the Neapolitan castle:

> Si fonda une grant cité/ sur un uef/par tel poesté
> Que quant aucuns l'uef remuoit,
> Toute la cité en croloit,
> Et com plus fort le croloit on
> Tant croloit plus tout environ
> La vile et en haut et en plain. ("A great city was founded/ on a egg/ so powerful/that if somebody removed the egg,/the entire city would fall" [1:179])[3].

A strictly Neapolitan text gives a full account of the legends about Virgil the Magician that were circulating: the *Cronaca di Partenope*,[4] or *Croniche de la inclita Città de Napole*. Written after the *Cleomadés*, in the kingdom of Robert of Anjou, the *Cronica* refers to all the magic powers attributed to Virgil: the healing herbs of Montevergine that treat the illnesses of men ("Infirmità delli huomini"); a bronze horse that guarantees health to all the horses in Naples; an arrow that was launched against the volcano Vesuvio; the magical construction of the therapeutic baths in Pozzuoli and the uses of their healing steam. Finally, the anonymous author does not fail to mention the castle on an egg that determines Naples's destiny.[5] Sabatini is right when he claims that the *Cronica*'s tone flows between invention and reality, fable and history, the serious and the entertaining, especially when it describes the origins of the castle, built from the first egg laid by a chicken:

> *Come consacrò lo ovo al Castello de l'Ovo, dove pigliò il nome (How Virgil consecrated the egg at the Castle of the Egg named after it):*
> Era in del tempo de lo ditto Virgilio un castello edificato dentro mare, sovra uno scoglio, come perfi'mo è, il quale se chiamava lo Castello Marino overo di Mare, in dell'opera del quale castello Virgilio, delettandose con soe arte, consacrò un ovo, il primo che fece una gallina: lo quale ovo puose dentro una caraffa per lo più stritto forame de la detta caraffa, la quale caraffa et ovo fe'ponere dentro una gabia di ferro suttilissimamente lavorata.E la detta gabia, la quale contineva la caraffa e l'ovo, fe'ligare o appendere o chiovare con alcune lamine di ferro sotto uno trave di cerqua che stava appoggiato per traverso a le mura d'una camarella fatta studiosamente per questa occasione con doe fossice, per le quali intrava il lume; e con grande diligenza e solennità la fe'guardare in –de-la detta cammarella in luogo segreto e fatto

---

[3] On those verses see Dattilo and also Comparetti, Virgilio (II 179).

[4] Monti thinks that the Cronica was composed between 1326-1348.

[5] Dattilo 1-16. Cf. also Annecchino; Maiuri; Sabatini, Napoli Angioina 249n133.

siguro da bone porte e chiavature di ferro, imperoché da quell'ovo, da lo quale lo Castello pigliò il nome, pendevano tutti i fatti del Castello. Li antiqui nostri tennero che dall'ovo pendevano tutti li fatti e la fortuna del Castello Marino: zoè lo Castello dovìa durare tanto quanto l'ovo si conservava cossì guardato.("There was in the time of Virgil a castle built in the sea, on a rock, and it was called the sea castle, at which Virgil consecrated an egg, the first egg laid by a chicken. Virgil put the egg through the tight neck of a carafe, which he put into a finely wrought iron cage. Virgil asked that this cage containing the egg and the carafe be tied, hung, or nailed with some strips of iron under an oak girder that was lying across the walls of a little room where, for this occasion, two little holes were made so that the light could pass. With extreme care and solemnity, he kept it in a secret spot in this room that he made sure was well locked with solid doors and big iron locks, since every event related to the castle would depend on that egg, after which the castle was named. Our ancestors maintained that everybody's destiny and that of the Castle of the Sea would depend on that egg; that is, the castle would survive as long as the egg was kept in that way" [Altamura 81]).

Questions arise about the origins of such superstitions surrounding the Latin poet. One answer may be found in Maurilio Adriani's study on the Arabic Virgil.[6] According to Adriani, Virgil was an Arab, and around the thirteenth century, Latin translations of his writings in Toledo became known to the western world thanks to a secret science that he possessed: the Refulgentia. Routeboeuf's Bataille des sept arts also states that, "De Toulete vint et de Naples Qui des batailles sont les chapes/ a une nuit la Nigromance:" Naples, like Toledo, were both famous as seats of necromancy.[7]

The *Cronaca di Partenope* also reports that Virgil's remains are kept in the same place where the egg is ("in parva capsa lignea in quadam capella, ubi in una amphora vitrea est illud ovum" [Dattilo 13]), that is in the Castle of the Egg. In this regard, Petrarch recounts a funny anecdote. He went with Robert of Anjou to pay homage to the poet, whose tomb is at the foot of the Posillipo hill, where Boccaccio also believed the poet was resting. When the coach was passing the Castle of the Egg, Robert reminded Petrarch about the legend related to Virgil and the egg and also asked him about Virgil perforating the hill of Posillipo and other enchantments attributed to the Latin poet. Petrarch, who would not believe the legends produced by the "vulgus insulsum," answered the king jokingly: he knew Virgil was a great poet but not a marble-cutter who could pierce a mountain or a builder of castles in the sea:[8]

---

6 See also Izzo n 6.

7 I owe the reference to Routeboeuf to Izzo's "Virgilio."

8 For Petrarch's visit in Naples, cf. Wilkins and also Annecchino, *Il Petrarca a Pozzuoli*; Sabatini, 82-83 and nn122 and 129.

> Non longe a Puteolis, Falernus collis attollitur, famoso palmite nobilis. Inter Falernum et mare, mons est saxeus, hominum manibus perfossus, quod vulgus insulsum a Virgilio magicis cantaminibus factum putat. Ita clarorum fama hominum, non veris contenta laudibus, saepe etiam fabulis viam facit. De quo cum me olim Robertus regno clarus, sed praeclarus ingenio ac literis, quid sentirem multis astantibus percontatus esset, humanitate fretus regia, qua non reges modo, sed homines vicit, iocans, nusquam me legisse marmorarium fuisse Virgilium respondi, quod ille serenissimae nutu frontis approbans, non illic magiae, sed ferri vestigia esse confessus est ("Not far from Pozzuoli, rises the hill called Falerno, a noble place famous for its wine. Between Falerno and the sea there is a rocky mountain, dug out by man and that the common people foolishly believed was done by Virgil with magic incantations. In this way, the fame of illustrious men, not satisfied with sincere praise, gives way to fanciful tales. Robert, famous for his kingdom but even more so for his talent and culture, once asked me in the presence of many people what I thought about this. Impressed by Robert's regal 'humanitas,' that seduced both kings and simple people, I answered jokingly that I had not read anywhere that Virgil was a marble-cutter. Robert, expressing his approval with a good-natured nod of the head, admitted that in that place there was no trace of magic, but only of iron" [*Itinerarium Syriacum* 36]).[9]

This is not the only time Petrarch reacts to what he believed to be a stupid legend. In a 1352 letter to the Prior Francesco Nelli (Familiares Book 13/6), Petrarch refers to the ridiculous rumour about Virgil being a necromancer:

> Dicam quod magis rideas: ipse ergo, quo nemo usquam divinationi inimicior vivit aut magie, nonnunquam inter hos optimos rerum iudices propter Maronis amicitiam nigromanticus dictus sum. En quo studia nostra dilapsa sunt! O nugas odibiles ridendasque! ("I will tell you something that will amuse you even more: I myself, the greatest living enemy of divination and magic, have often been called a necromancer by those worthy judges because of my affection for Virgil. What hateful and comical absurdity!" [*Letters* 118]).

Clearly, Petrarch is the first to strongly reject any legend related to Virgil the Magician with his answer to King Robert: they are just the foolish beliefs of common people!

Naples remains esoteric and magic to Adenet, the anonymous writer of the *Cronaca di Partenope*, and even to the compiler of the *Statutes of the Order of the Holy Spirit, or of the Knot*. In the prologue to the statutes of the Order founded by Louis of Taranto in 1352, headquartered in the Castle of the Egg, the legend of the egg is mentioned:

---

[9] Cf. also Sabatini, *Napoli Angioina* 248n123.

"Pensiamo d'indire, a Dio piacendo, la prima festa nel Castel dell'Ovo del meraviglioso periglio che Virgilio costruì" ("We are contemplating, God willing, the first celebration of our Order, in the Castle of the Egg that Virgil built").[10]

Boccaccio knew about the *Statutes* as he reveals in Letter XIII to Francesco Nelli. Given the king's lack of culture, a "stultus puer" and, according to Boccaccio's declaration in this letter, the real mentor of the Order would be Niccolò Acciaiuoli, who was also its historiographer. For Boccaccio, Acciaiuoli was the one who drew up the Statutes "scrisse in francesco dei fatti de' cavalieri del Santo Spirito, in quello stile che già per addietro scrissono alcuni della Tavola ritonda: nel quale che cose da ridere ed al tutto false abbia posto, egli sa" ("in the style and in the language in which people wrote in the past about the Round table: in which, if he put ridiculous and false things, he is the only one to know" [Auzzas 811 n358; Lee 145]).[11] This declaration confirms that the legends that were circulating on Virgil and Naples, just as any other fanciful tales that Acciaiuoli included in the *Statutes*, could not have had an impact on the young Boccaccio, who considered them "ridiculous and false."

However, Boccaccio had high respect for Virgil, his poem, and his remains. As the letters show, Boccaccio, like Petrarch, was convinced that Virgil was buried in Naples, based on reliable sources, such as Donato's *Life of Virgil* ("Translata [...] eius ossa [...]neapolim fuere, sepultaque via Puteolana" ("His bones were transported to Naples and buried in Pozzuoli's street"), but he was also convinced by Giovanni Barrili that Virgil's tomb was on the slopes of the "Falerno Collis" (Auzzas 753 n15), as he and Petrarch would call the hill of Saint Elmo in the area of Posillipo. In Letter XXIV, Boccaccio says that the hills of Posillipo have to be venerated, because their roots hide Virgil's remains.[12] In Letter II, he describes himself walking around Virgil's tomb and claims that "virgiliana teneret Neapolis," ("I was staying in the Virgilian Naples" [II 2]). Moreover, in Letter VIII he still refers to "virgilianae Neapoli." Letter I ends with an unmistakable note of tribute to the place where Boccaccio believed Virgil was buried: "Data sub monte Falerno apud busta Maronis Virgilii nonas aprelis III, anno vero Incarnationis Verbi divini MCCCXXXVIIII" ("From the slopes of the hill Falerno at Virgil's tumb, April 3 1339") Boccaccio was a passionate vis-

---

[10] On the Order of the Holy Spirit, or the Order of the Knot, and its Statutes, see Léonard and more recently Morosini's entry on "Niccolò Acciaiuoli" with an updated bibliography in *Dictionary of Literary Biography*.

[11] More on Boccaccio's Letter XIII in Morosini, "'Polyphonic' Parthenope."

[12] In this regard, it is interesting to note that the only mention of the city of Naples in the *Divine Comedy* occurs in *Purgatory*, 3:25-27, when Dante refers to Virgil's tomb.

itor to Naples. Despite his familiarity with the legends, this city remains for him the cradle of "spiriti magni" ("the great spirits"), and the legends he mentions are always related to Virgil, the poet of the *Eneide*, its heroes, and their adventures (McGregor 1991).

In the *Filocolo*, Boccaccio pays homage to Virgil in several instances, referring to Aeneas's vicissitudes and, in a very sophisticated and discreet way, to the legends related to him by making Florio, the young protagonist of the story, stop twice in the city. Florio leaves on a ship to look for his Biancifiore, who has been sold to the Lord of Alexandria. A shipwreck brings him to Naples, where accidentally he meets Fiammetta and other Neapolitan aristocrats, who entertain themselves with the "Questioni d'amore" ("Questions of love"). On his way back to Marmorina, once he has found his beloved Biancifiore, Florio travels again to Naples. This time he means to stop and visit the city and its "antiche meraviglie" ("ancient marvels" [*Filocolo* V 5, 2]).

Naples is the privileged space to assess Florio's upbringing in the middle of the novel.[13] In the first part of the story, Florio's actions are crystallized into immobility due to his fear for Biancifiore, who was sold to merchants by Florio's parents. In Book IV, after having taken part in the "questioning" of a group of young aristocratic Neapolitans, led by the beautiful Fiammetta, Florio goes back to his inn, where he spends a thoughtful night.

> Ma perché il tempo che si perdea, che più che mai gli gravava, passasse con meno malinconia, egli andando per li vicini paesi di Partenope si dilettava di vedere l'antichità di Baia, e il Mirteo mare,e `l monte Mesano, e massimamente quel luogo donde Enea, menato dalla Sibilla, andò a vedere le infernali ombre. Egli cercò Piscina Mirabile, e lo `mperial bagno di Tritoli, e quanti altri le vicine parti ne tengono. Egli volle ancora parte vedere dell'inescrutabile monte Barbaro, e le ripe di Pozzuolo, e il tempio di Apollino, e l'oratorio della Sibilla, cercando intorno intorno il lago d'Averno, e similmente i monti pieni di solfo vicini a questi luoghi: e in questa maniera andando più giorni, con minore malinconia trapassò che fatto avria dimorando ("In order to pass with less melancholy the time he was wasting, and which weighed on him, more and more than ever now, he visited the towns in the vicinity of Parthenope, and took delight in seeing the antiquities of Baiae, and the sea of Mirteo, and Mount Miseno, and especially that place where Aeneas was brought by the Sybil and went to see the infernal shades. He sought out Piscina Mirabile, and the imperial bath of Tritolis, and all the other sights contained in the neighboring areas. He was also eager to see part of the inaccessible Mount Barbaro, and the banks of Pozzuoli, and the temple of Apollino, and the oratory of the Sybil, and searched around the lake of Avernus, and likewise the

[13] More on this particular question in Kirkham 466 n 17.

> sulphurous mountains near those places; and in this way he toured for several days, which he spent with less melancholy than he would have done if had been idle" [*Filocolo* IV 4, 73]).

Once Florio finds Biancifiore, he returns with her to Naples. This time, it is not a shipwreck that brings him to the "ancient Parthenope," since he specifically asks his mariners to chart their route to the city:

> . . . ma però che nelle virtuose menti ozioso perdimento di tempo non può con consolazione d'animo passare, Filocolo con la sua Biancifiore cercarono di vedere i tiepidi bagni di Baia, e il vicino luogo all'antica sepoltura di meseno, donde ad Enea fu largito l'andare a vedere le regioni de'neri spiriti e del suo padre; e cercarono i guasti luoghi di Cummo, e 'l mare, le cui rive, abondevoli di verdi mortelle, Mirteo il fanno chiamare, e l'antico Pozzuolo, con le circustanti anticaglie, e ancora quante cose mirabili in quelle parti le reverende antichità per li loro autori rapresentano: e in quel paese traendo lunga dimoranza, niuno giorno li tiene a quel diletto, che l'altro davanti li avea tenuti. Essi tal volta guardando l'antiche maraviglie vanno e gli animi come gli autori di quelle diventano magni. ("Since in a virtuous mind, the lazy waste of time cannot enter without disturbing the spirit, Filocolo and his Biancifiore sought out the warm baths of Baiae, and the area near the ancient sepulcher of Miseno, where Aeneas was allowed to go and visit the regions of the dark spirits and of his father; and they sought out the ruined places of Cumae, and the sea whose shores were abundant in green myrtles, which caused it to be called Mirteo, and ancient Pozzuoli, with its surrounding antiquities, and all the remarkable things in those areas that are mentioned in revered ancient texts by their authors [...]. Sometimes they went to see the ancient marvels and became as great in their spirits as their creators" *[Filocolo* V 5, 1]).

An entire chapter is devoted to a journey through the cities that have some link to the *Eneide* (III 3). Boccaccio makes the fugitive Fileno visit various meaningful places: Chiusi, Aventine, Rome, the ancient walls of Alba. Then he went southward:

> si lasciò dietro le grandissime Alpi e i monti i quali aspettavano l'oscurissima distruzione del nobile sangue d'Aquilone, e pervenne a Gaieta, etterna memoria della cara balia di Enea. *E di quella pervenne per le salate onde a Pozzuolo, avendo prima vedute l'antiche Baie e le sue tiepide onde, quivi per sovenimento degli umani corpi poste dagl'Iddii* ("He left behind the great Alps and the mountains that were awaiting humiliating destruction from the noble blood of Aquilone, and he arrived at Gaeta, an eternal memorial to the beloved nurse of Aeneas. *And from there he came by the salt waves to Pozzuoli, having first seen ancient Baiae and its warm waters*" *[Filocolo* III 33, 8. My italics]).

Boccaccio does not attribute the baths to Virgil, as the legend wants us to believe, but to the gods who placed them there "for the restoration of human bodies."

Boccaccio shows his concern with the literary Naples more than with the plebeian one that included the repertory of legends and superstitions, as I discussed in a previous work.[14]

These investigations bring me to the manuscript Laurenziano Strozzi 152. At the bottom of the page, which is very difficult to read and packed on the left margin with scrambled notes, I found the verses on the Castle of the Egg. The few verses give a brief account of what is said about Virgil and the egg in a carafe and a signature "Iohannes de Certaldo" which is hardly perceptible. Nevertheless, I still believe that those verses cannot be attributed either to Boccaccio or Pietro.

Pietro (1306/8-1384) was a Neapolitan judge who developed an interest in Latin poetry, strongly influenced by Petrarch's followers; namely Barbato da Sulmona, who praised Pietro highly as a "amplissimus Pyeridum hospes" (Hortis 347-48; Vatasso 1904). Pietro probably came to know Boccaccio during his last visit to Naples in 1370[15] and both shared the defense of poetry against those who tried to condemn it. To be sure Pietro wrote to Boccaccio congratulating him for the treatise on poetry and he also gives an account of an argument with another jurist who dared to attack poetry ((Billanovich I 44-58). Pietro was in fact the first to read the earliest version of the *Genealogia*, although Boccaccio had no intention to send it to him (Auzzas Letter XX 678-81).[16]

Yet, although the two intellectuals developed a mutual respect, especially following Pietro's reading of the *Genealogia*, we cannot assume that they wrote the verses based on such a fabulous and superstitious story and, moreover, in Latin! Why would Boccaccio choose to write about the castle, when he never mentioned the legend related to Virgil anywhere in his texts? Why would he choose to write these verses with Pietro? Pietro had a strong classical background and, like Petrarch eventually, could only mock a legend about Virgil. As far as Boccaccio is concerned, his approach to the "fabuloso," the fanciful — that it is only the product of the ignorant—[17] would not allow him to

---

[14] Cf. Morosini "Polyphonic Parthenope."

[15] It is still arguable when was the last time Boccaccio went to Naples. For more on Boccaccio's visits to Naples and an extensive bibliography on this topic see Morosini, "Polyphonic Parthenope" n13.

[16] In Letter XX Boccaccio gives to Pietro a full account of the vicissitudes of the *Genealogia Deorum* and how the first version of the book ended in Pietro's hands. In fact, Boccaccio had initially given the *Genealogia* to Ugo di Sanseverino in 1370-1371.

[17] In the Filocolo Boccaccio openly attributes the "fabuloso parlare," that is the fanciful chatter, to the ignorant (I 1).

believe in such a story or necromancy. On a more general level, Boccaccio's approach to necromancy and necromancers can be traced back to the question Menedon asks Fiammetta during the "Questioni d'amore", the well-known episode of the *Filocolo* (IV 31-34) and another version in *Decameron* X 5, which present important differences.[18] A study of those differences validates the hypothesis that, if not indifferent to the fabulous and to necromancy, Boccaccio tries to rationalize and minimize them.

The story involves Tarolfo, in love with a lady married to a nobleman. To get rid of her faithful admirer, the lady challenges him with an impossible request: she will be his, if he can offer her in January a big, beautiful garden, flourishing with trees, flowers, and fruits. Tarolfo departs to find someone who can help him to satisfy the lady's request, and after many days, he encounters Tebano, a middle-aged, poorly dressed man, who is picking herbs to make healing potions. Tarolfo tells him of the beloved lady's unusual request, and Tebano promises him he can make it happen, if he is well rewarded. Tebano keeps the promise, and a surprised and disappointed lady is offered a flourishing garden in winter. When her husband learns about his wife's promise to Tarolfo, he insists she keep it, but Tarolfo releases her from her promise. The necromancer Tebano, who seems to be worried only about his gain, finally gives up.

In the *Filocolo*, the "bellissima dimanda" and beautiful story proposed by Menedon, although they involve a necromancer, have one main purpose: to establish, for the benefit of the courtly gathering at Fiammetta's court, who is more liberal, Tarolfo or Tebano. Above all, as I show elsewhere,[19] the tale is extremely functional to the story of Florio and Biancifiore and, in particular, to illuminate Florio's upbringing. From Menedon's question and Fiammetta's answer, Florio learns about liberality as part of his inner growth. Necromancy is not at stake here, but Boccaccio does not miss his chance to make his point about it and the legends about Virgil the Magician. If it is true that Boccaccio draws most of the details of Tebano's episode from Ovid's Metamorphoses, it is also true that he contaminates it with other models; namely, the medieval legends that were circulating Naples about Virgil. It is no coincidence that among the many legends about Virgil the Magician, one, as confirmed by Comparetti (49-54), relates to his power to make gardens flourish in winter.[20] If Boccaccio differs from Ovid, it is not

---

[18] See also Branca's note 3 to Decameron X 9,70.

[19] Morosini,"La morte verbale nel *Filocolo*" and a forthcoming book *Per difetto rintegrare. Una lettura del Filocolo di Giovanni Boccaccio.*

[20] Cf. also Quaglio note 42 to *Filocolo* IV 31. Interestingly enough, another legend recounts that Virgil planted on Monte Vergine (a mountain in the region of Naples that still holds

because he misunderstands him, as Quaglio suggests (*Filocolo* IV 31 n 28), but in reaction to fanciful legends.

In the version of the story given in *Decameron* X, 5, Boccaccio seems to have changed his attitude toward necromancy. During the Neapolitan years, when he was writing the *Filocolo*, the legends on Virgil and necromancy in general seem to have upset him more than later in his life, when he assumes a distant and mocking attitude. In both accounts Boccaccio minimizes the role of necromancy but to a greater degree in the *Decameron* through the use of parody. The reader's first encounter with the necromancer is given simply as "e vennegli uno alle mani il quale, dove ben salariato fosse, per arte nigromantica profereva di farlo" ("he got hold of a man who offered to do it by magic, provided he was well-enough paid"). Necromancy is a gainful profession. Moreover, the Decameron abbreviates the 16 paragraphs describing the arts and rituals used by Tebano to realize a garden flourishing in the middle of winter in the *Filocolo* to one line: "il valente uomo in un bellissimo prato vicino alla città *con sue arti* fece sì che la mattina apparve, [...] uno dei più bbe' giardini" ("*the magician employed his skills* to such good effect that there appeared next morning [...], one of the fairest gardens that anyone had seen" [*Decameron* X 5, 10. My italics]), Boccaccio simply says that the man with *his skills* made the beautiful garden for Messer Ansaldo, the nobleman who requested it. However, the husband, named Gilberto in the Decameron, has an eloquent reaction to what his wife has done. His reaction gives another important insight into Boccaccio's approach to necromancy and people who foolishly believe in it. Gilberto has been introduced at the beginning as a pleasant, good-natured man (he has a "buona aria"), and it seems that Boccaccio is trying to say that only good-natured people can believe or fear necromancers. When Gilberto hears about his wife's promise to Ansaldo, he sends her right away to the man. Apparently, he is being generous to his wife, considering her "good intention," like the husband in the *Filocolo* version, but what really motivates Gilberto is his fear of the necromancer:

> Per ciò che conosco la purità dello animo tuo, per solverti da' legame della promessa, quello ti concederò che alcun altro non farebbe, *inducendomi ancora la paura del nigromante, al qual forse Messer Ansaldo, se tu il beffassi, far ci farebbe dolente* ("But because I know you were acting from the purest of motives, I shall allow you, so as to be quit of your promise, to do something which possibly no other man would

---

still holds that name and hosts the Sanctuary of the Lady of MonteVergine) an entire garden of magic and therapeutic herbs. Izzo maintains that a thirteenth-century manuscript kept at the sanctuary of Monte Vergine (it used to be called "Monte di Virgilio"), still documents the presence of such a diabolic garden. See Izzo 4.

> permit, *being swayed also by my fear of the magician, whom Messer Ansaldo, if you were to play him false, would perhaps encourage to do us a mischief*" [*Decameron* X 5, 15-16]).

In both the *Decameron* and *Filocolo*, even if necromancy is not the protagonist as much as liberality (the theme of the tenth day), Boccaccio opposes Tarolfo's authentic generosity to Gilberto's fears, which are due to his good nature, his "buona aria." He is afraid of the necromancer and what he may do to him and Diadora, and this fear contaminates his apparent act of generosity toward Ansaldo. Finally, the necromancer having witnessed Ansaldo and Gilberto's generosity, he willingly and spontaneously renounces his promised gain.

To fully understand Boccaccio's attitude towards necromancy, I believe one has to look at Decameron X 7: the novella that tells of the widow who is desperately but vainly in love with a man who ignores her.[21] The widow's maid feels compassion for her lady's sorrows, and she conceives a foolish idea ("entrò in uno sciocco pensiero") to use necromancy to help her out. She then calls out to a student who is passing in the street and whom the lady had in the past treated badly (VIII 7,47). In this novella, Boccaccio's emphasis is, on one side and from the very beginning, on the student's knowledge "who studied in Paris with the purpose, not of selling his knowledge for gain as many people do, but of learning the reasons and causes of things," and on the other, on the irrationality if the maid, who believes in necromancy. Moreover, in two instances, he criticizes the lady's poor judgment: she was "più inamorata che savia" (being more a slave to her love than a model of common sense, [VIII 7,55]) to the point of forgetting that she is giving the student the chance to avenge himself for the tortures she had previously imposed to him. If he had any real magic power, he would use it to save himself from her: "la donna poco savia, senza pensare che se lo scolare *saputa avesse nigromantia per sé adoperata l'avrebbe,* pose l'animo alle parole della sua fante" ("the lady was not very intelligent, and it never occurred to her that if the *scholar had known anything about magic he would have used it* in his own behalf [VIII 7, 48]).

Furthermore, I believe that Boccaccio's approach to necromancers is here explicit: if a necromancer knew how to use magic, he would use it for himself. This criticism applies to the so-called necromancer in *Decameron* X 5 but, in particular, to the case of Tebano in the *Filocolo*. Here, the first encounter with Tebano quite eloquently announces Boccaccio's parodic and sceptical attitude towards necromancy:

---

[21] See also Decameron X 9, 70, when the Saladino orders his necromancer "la cui arte già espermentata aveva" to bring Torello during the night in his own bed to Pavia. Other stories in the Decameron involving magic are III 8 and VIII 9.

> . . . un uomo non giovane né di troppa lunga età barbuto, e i suoi vestimenti giudicavano lui dovere essere povero, picciolo di persona e sparuto molto, il quale andava cogliendo erbe e cavando con un picciolo coltello diverse radici, delle quail un limbo della sua gonnella avea pieno. ("A man who was neither young nor very old, bearded –and to judge from his clothing poor-, small of build and much shrunken, going about gathering herbs and digging with a tiny knife various roots with which he had filled a fold of his garment" [*Filocolo* IV 31,11]).

He corresponds so much to the type that Boccaccio is mocking that when "Tarolfo saw him he marveled and much feared he might be other than human." The poor man is there by necessity, not for his own pleasure. In other words, as will be said in the *Decameron*, if he were a magician, he would use magic to help himself. Instead, he is sweating to gather herbs to make healing potions.

> Io sono di Tebe, e Tebano è il mio nome, e per questo piano vo cogliendo queste erbe, acciò che de' liquori d' esse faccendo alcune cose necessarie e utili a diverse infermità, io abbia onde vivere, e a questa ora *necessità e non diletto mi ci costringe di venire* ("I come from Thebes, and Tebano is my name, and I am going over this plain collecting these herbs so that by making things necessary and useful for various infirmities out of their liquors, I may find means to live; and it is *need and not pleasure that constrains me to come here at this hour"* [*Filocolo* IV 31,13] My italics).

Tebano is disheveled , and he is aware of it; in fact, he says to Tarolfo that he, like other people, judges a man by his clothes: "ma molte volte sotto vilissimi drappi grandissimo tesoro di scienza si nasconde" ("but many times great treasures of knowledge are hidden under the vilest of coverings" [*Filocolo* IV 31,18]). Despite the fact that this theme is dear to Boccaccio (see *Decameron* VI,2 and *Comedie delle Ninfe*), in the *Filocolo*, the comment has a parodic connotation.

In the *Filocolo*, the necromancer is a poor old man who is also greedy. The very first question he asks Tarolfo is about what he has to gain by satisfying the request. If he were a real necromancer, he would neither be sweating in the field nor working greedly for Tarolfo to make money. In fact, he adds: "*se questo facessi, a me non bisognerebbe d'andare più cogliendo l'erbe*" ("*if I did this, I would no longer have to go gathering herbs*" [IV 31,19-20. My italics]). Tarolfo confirms this remark, when he says to Tebano: "mai non ti bisognerà più affannare per divenire ricco," ("you will never more have to labor to become rich") if he helps him out.

The description of the making of the magic garden is openly parodic. The night is moonlit, a typical night for witches: "[...] gli uccelli, le fiere e gli uomini riposavano sanza niuno mormorio, e sopra i monti le

non cadute frondi stavano sanza alcuno movimento, e l'umido aere in pace si riposava: solamente le stelle luceano [...]" ("the birds and beasts and men rested without a murmur, and on the mountains the leaves that had not fallen stood still without any movement, and the humid air rested peacefully. Only the stars shone" *[Filocolo* IV 31,24]). Tebano, naked, "barefoot, with his hair loose on his naked shoulders, all alone" starts his mission, but he is definitely not a magician; he is just a professional with herbs and sauces, as he says in his prayer to the goddess Ceres (IV 31,27). Tebano knows from years of experience how to make a garden flourish before the spring. When the cart carried by two dragons takes him from Spain to the Ganges river together with all those ritual altar offerings, Boccaccio is again parodying a repertory that he cleverly uses, referring to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (VII, 215-16; Quaglio IV 31, 28 n34).

When Tarolfo sees the husband's liberality and releases the lady from her promise, the necromancer's first reaction is fear for his reward, but when he knows the husband and Tarolfo's generosity, he renounces his promised treasure. Menedon comments on Tebano, whom he believes to be the most liberal:

> abbandonate le sue contrade, oramai vecchio, e venuto quivi per guadagnare i promessi doni, e *affannatosi* per recare a fine ciò che promesso avea, avendoli guadagnati, ogni cosa rimise, rimanendosi povero come prima ("Tebano, who left his home at an advanced age and came here to earn the promised reward, and *labored* to bring to completion what he had promised, and having earned it remitted everything and remained as poor as he was before" [*Filocolo* IV 31, 55]).

The verb *affannarsi*, to worry, recurrs, proving what I have just said. When the queen answers Menedon's question, she believes the husband to be liberal, but Menedon emphasizes the old man's "worries," painfully trying to satisfy Tarolfo's request: "E chi dubiterà che Tebano fosse poverissimo, se si riguarda ch'egli, abandonati i notturni riposi, per sostentare la sua vita, ne' dubbiosi luoghi andava cogliendo l'erbe e scavando radici?" ("and who will doubt that Tebano was very poor, if one considers that he abandoned his sleep at night and went gathering herbs and digging roots in dangerous places, to sustain his existence?" [IV 33,6]). Boccaccio parodies magic and necromancy; he deflates it by adding magic elements, such as the cart. Magic is impossible; only human efforts can yield results.

Finally, the episode of the flourishing garden in the *Filocolo* also confirms that Boccaccio was familiar with the legends related to Virgil's magic and healing powers, but he, like Dante, simply pays tribute to Virgil as the champion of Reason, the great poet of the *Eneide* and recognizes his presence in the Parthenopeian city. Naples remains the city

of the "great spirits," and the legend of Virgil as a necromancer and magician had little impact on him, as he would generally not take necromancy seriously. Boccaccio would not be tempted to give credence to the tales of magic related to the Castle of the Egg, as Adenet le Roi and the anonymous author of the Cronaca di Partenope would do, to the point of not even mentioning them, as even Petrarch did. Attributing to Boccaccio the verses on the margins of the ms Strozzi 152 only continues to create legends around a mythical Middle Ages. The short passage in Letter XIII to Francesco Nelli best expresses Boccaccio's attitude toward the legend that surrounded Virgil, the Castle of the Egg, and necromancy and superstition in general: they are fanciful legends and like the stories that Acciaiuoli narrates in the French Statutes, a laughing matter: "Cose da ridere e del tutto false!"

Works cited:

Adriani, Maurilio. *Italia Magica, la magia nella tradizione italica* (Roma: Biblioteca di Storia Patria, 1970) and *Storia di Napoli*. Napoli: S. E. Storia di Napoli, 1967.

Annecchino, Raimondo. *La leggenda virgiliana nei campi flegrei*. Napoli: Ricciardi, 1937-1945.

___. *Il Petrarca a Pozzuoli. Nel VI centenario della nascita del poeta*. Napoli: Stab. Tip. di M. Gambella, 1905.

Auzzas, Ginetta. *Epistole, Tutte le opere di Boccaccio,* a cura di Vittore Branca, Vol V. Milano: Mondadori, 1992 .

Billanovich, Giuseppe. "Pietro Piccolo da Monteforte tra il Petrarca e il Boccaccio," *Medioevo e Rinascimento. Studi in onore di Bruno Nardi*. Firenze: 1955.

Boccaccio, Giovanni, *Il Filocolo*, ed. Antonio Enzo Quaglio, *Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*, ed. Vittore Branca, Vol. I. Milano: Mondadori, 1967.

___. *Il Filocolo*, trans. Donald Cheney with Thomas G. Bergin. New York and London: Garland, 1985.

___. *Decameron*, ed. V. Branca. [1987]; Torino: Einaudi, 1992.

___. *The Decameron*, ed. G. H. McWilliam. London: Penguin, 1972.

Comparetti, Domenico. *Virgilio nel Medioevo*, rev. ed. G. Pasquali. 1937; Firenze: La Nuova Italia, 1955.

Virgil in the Middle Ages, trans. E. F. M. Benecke. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1996.

Cronica di Partenope, ed. A. Altamura. Napoli: Società editrice napoletana, 1974.

Kirkham, Victoria. "Iohannes de Certaldo: la firma dell'autore," *Gli Zibaldoni di Boccaccio. Memoria, scrittura, riscrittura. Atti del seminario internazionale di Firenze-Certaldo (26-28 April 1996)*, ed. M. Picone and C. Cazalé Bérard. Firenze: Franco Cesati, 1998. 455-68.

Dattilo, Vincenzo. *Castel dell'ovo. Storie e leggende di Napoli*. Napoli: Casella editore, 1956.

Henry, Albert ed., *Les Œuvres d'Adenet de Roi.* Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1996. Vol. 5.

Hortis, Attilio. *Studi sulle opere latine del Boccaccio con particolare riguardo alla storia della erudizione nel medioevo e alle letterature straniere.* Trieste: J. Dase, 1879.

Izzo, Paolo."Virgiliomago," *Agora* 3 Marzo (2001): 1-12. http//www.napolitheroad.it/virgiliomago.

Lee, Charmaine, "Italy in France-France in Italy" ed. Marianne Pade, Hannemarie Ragn Jensen, Lene Waage Petersen. *Analecta Romana,* Instituti Danici, Supplementum 25, Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1997.

L' image du monde de Maître Gossouin, ed. O. H. Prior. Lausanne: Payot, 1913.

Léonard, Emile G. "L'ideal napolitain: L'Ordre du Saint-Esprit," *Les Angevins de Naples.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1954. 368-70;

___. *Boccacce et Naples.* Paris: Droz, 1944.

___. Niccolò Acciaiuoli. *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani.* Roma: Editoria dell'Istituto dell'enciclopedia italiana, 1960. 87-90.

Letters from Petrarch, ed. M. Bishop. Bloomington & London: Indiana UP, 1996. 118.

Maiuri, Amedeo. *Passeggiate campane.* Milano: Rusconi, 1990. 26-31; 466 ff.

McGregor, James. *The Shades of Aeneas, The Imitation of Vergil and the History of Paganism in Boccaccio's Filostrato, Filocolo, and Teseida.* Athens and London: Georgia UP, 1991.

Monti,Gennaro Maria, "Cronica di Partenope," *Annali del Seminario giuridico economico dell'Università di Bari 5(1931-1932): 72-119.* Reprinted in Dai Normanni agli Aragonesi. Terza serie di studi storico-giuridici, Trani: Vecchi & C., 1936. 29-77.

Morosini, Roberta. "Niccolò Acciaiuoli." *Dictionary of Literary Biography,* ed. Zyg Baransky and Ted Cachey. Layman, SC: Bruccoli Clark, forthcoming.

___. "'Polyphonic' Parthenope. Bocccaccio's Letter XIII and his 'plebeian' Naples according to Domenico Rea," *Quaderni d'Italianistica.* Forthcoming Fall 2003.

___. La morte verbale nel *Filocolo.* Il viaggio di Florio dall'imaginare al vero conoscimento." *Studi sul Boccaccio* 27 (1999): 183-203

___. *Per difetto rintegrare. Una lettura del Filocolo di Giovanni Boccaccio.* Ravenna: Longo, forthcoming Fall 2003.

Periccioli Saggese, Alessandra. *I Romanzi cavallereschi minati a Napoli.* Napoli: Società Editrice Napoletana, 1979.

Petrarca, Francesco. *Itinerarium Syriacum,* ed. Giacomo Lumbroso, *Memorie italiane del buon tempo antico.* Torino: Loescher, 1889.

Sabatini, Francesco. *Napoli angioina. Cultura e società.* Cava de' Tirreni: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane,1975.

Spargo Webster John, "Virgil the necromancer," *Studies in Virgilian Legends.* Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1934.

Tassinari, Umberto. *Castel Dell'Ovo nella storia di Napoli.* Napoli: Arte Tipografica Napoli, 1980.

Vattasso, Marco. *Del Petrarca e di alcuni suoi amici.* Roma: Tipografia Vaticana, 1904.

Vergilii Vita Donatiana, ed. I. Brummer. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912.

Wilkins, Ernest Hatch. *Life of Petrarch.* Chicago: Chicago UP, 1961.

Maria L. Figueredo

DESIRE, DUALITY AND NAMING THE OTHER IN UNAMUNO'S *NIEBLA*: Retrieving the Archetype of the Instinctual Self in the Search for Integrated Consciousness

In Miguel de Unamuno's *Niebla*, the protagonist, Augusto Pérez, confronts various aspects of his consciousness in a Homeric journey that leads him through the mental contradictions and emotional quandries involved in an examination of his life. This journey plays itself out against an awareness of the dualities inherent in the protagonist's understanding of reality. Throughout Augusto's quest for self, a textual canine confidant named Orfeo listens and registers the process. At the end of the novel, Orfeo's eulogy is at once a sentimental testament to the evolution of the protagonist's journey as well as a general critique of ego. The final attack on "man...the most brazen hypocrite of all animals" represents a textual 'howl' in response to spiritual malaise that seeks a unified, realized self.

This analysis of Orfeo in Unamuno's *Niebla* takes into account recent work in archetypal symbology by Jungian analyst Clarissa Pinkola-Estés that has attempted to reconcile contradiction and inner psychic conflict into a healthy perspective of the self. In *Women Who Run With the Wolves* Pinkola-Estés examines the role of myth and story as means of interpreting the archetypal motifs of the psyche and interpreting their role in knowing the self. Several assumptions are addressed including what constitutes 'knowing' and the capacity of archetypal figures in literature to filter that knowing for the reader. As Augusto's 'instinctual self,' Orfeo makes possible the transformative leaps that the protagonist of *Niebla* manifests in his quest for being. Orfeo is the voice of the archetypal symbol that represents a fundamental aspect of the self. In the narrative structure, Orfeo subverts the norms of the text and bridges the inner and outer worlds of the self and the fictional world of the text and the world of the reader.

A fundamental aspect of the work of Unamuno is the incessant need to question the apparent dichotomies of life such as those of thought/emotion, mind/body, and scientific/poetic interpretations of the self. In *Unamuno: An Existential View of Self and Society*, Paul Ilie examines the Spanish author's existential psychology including "the various ego fragments in the structure of the self, showing how they emerge from Unamuno's phenomenology of consciousness" (21).

According to Unamuno, "[e]l hombre que no se entrega al juego de las contradicciones se osifica" ("he who does not submit to the interplay of contradictions becomes ossified" [Valdés, 52]). For him there seemed to be no escape from the sorrows of life, as evidenced in his *Del sentimiento trágico de la vida en los hombres y en los pueblos* (1912) published only two years prior to *Niebla*. Yet coming to uncertain terms with the 'tragic sense of life' was preferable to succumbing to a sense of nothingness or meaninglessness. Anthony Kerrigan expresses in the foreword to his English translation of *Niebla* that "Unamuno had based his entire philosophy on the consciousness of his own being, and had concentrated all his energy on the resistance to death by the person who was himself: and so he could only truly express himself in perpetual soliloquy" (xix). That self "engenders action, moves and creates. In his will to procreation, Unamuno displays, not only his biological nature, but his peculiarly Spanish essence" (xix).

Philosophically and ideologically, Miguel de Unamuno was rooted in his Spanish, Catholic, and modernist views. As Anthony McCann states, Unamuno "was a Christian Existentialist, one of the leading lights of the Catholic Modernist movement, and one of the twentieth century's major original thinkers, greatly influenced by the works of Kierkegaard. Born in Bilbao on September 29th, 1864, Unamuno's political, literary and philosophical life was characterized by a typically modernist struggle against formalism. [H]is basic belief [was] that the will of the individual person and the spiritual conflicts produced by his passions contained the final sense of his and of all existence" (12). Unamuno's ideas on personality and the structure of the self are keenly played out in *Niebla*, the novel widely considered as his *obra maestra*.

Archetypal Perspectives and Unamuno

This paper approaches Orfeo's role in *Niebla* from an archetypal perspective. In particular it seeks to contribute to the dialogue about the process of masculine individuation evidenced in Unamuno's work. For this purpose the key issue is the role of the figure of Orfeo in representing the dual nature in its quest for individuation and integration, and the manner in which Orfeo calls the reader into dialogue with the narrative text. Jungian concepts of archetypes as filtered through the work of Pinkola-Estés, as well as references to cognitive and psychoanalytic theory will serve to complement our interpretation.

Unamuno believed that the purpose of the process of individuation is to know oneself as "the one we want to be, and not the one who we are, in our most intimate self" (Jurkevick, 1). For him, literature was apt as a means of exploring this process because it is "a form of disguise, a mask, a fable, a mystery: and behind the mask is the author" (1).

Gayana Jurkevick points out, "[i]n the context of the novels produced by the Spanish Generation of 1898–to which Unamuno belonged–there is also a marked tendency to create imaginary selves in their fiction" (4). Thus the connection between character/fictional text and author/life is bridged to the point where we, the readers, make our own ontological projections and are drawn into seeing our own existential questions played out in the 'reality' set out by the text. In a Jungian study of Unamuno's novels, *The Elusive Self*, Jurkevich explores the link between archetypal psychology and Unamuno's novels, stating that Unamuno attempted to "create a personal myth through fiction [by examining ...] the recurring networks of archetype and metaphor" (1). Jurkevick establishes the proximity of Unumuno's philosophy and the Jungian archetypes: "All of Unamuno's work shows an extraordinary contact with what C.G. Jung terms the archetype, or primordial image. [... Thus,] the Unamuno novel lends itself especially well to a critical analysis based on Jungian psychology, informed as it is by the symbolic rhetoric of universally familiar mythological motifs" (1-2). Crucial among those motifs is the instinctual self, a term used by Jungian analysts and writer Pinkola-Estés, which is related to Jung's designation of animals as chthonic figures in the psyche that serve to ground individuals in their process toward individuation (Jung, 1970, 146-160)

Pinkola-Estés' latest work on archetypal symbology offers several ways to use literary texts—myths, folk tales, stories—to assist us in resolving, or at least embracing, the multiple contradicting forces within the psyche. In *Women Who Run With the Wolves (WWRWW)*, she deals primarily with what she terms the 'Wild Woman archetype' (8) or the "powerfully psychological nature [or] the instinctive nature...the natural psyche...the 'Other.' [...] In various psychologies and from various perspectives it would be called the id, the Self, the medial nature. In biology it would be called the typical or fundamental nature. But because it is tacit, prescient, and visceral, among *cantadoras* it is called the wise or knowing nature"(8-9). Pinkola-Estés' interpretation of the archetype of the instinctual self is useful as an entry point to analyze the figure of Orfeo in *Niebla*. As Orfeo in *Niebla* Unamuno enters into dialogue with the masculine counterpart of the instinctual nature.

Etymologically, psychology is defined as "*psukh*ℜ/*psych*, soul; *ology or logos*, a knowing of the soul" (Pinkola Estés, 9). The origins of the term reveal an integration of mind and spirit that moves beyond the dualism of mind/body towards a fusion that defies determinism and seeks to integrate all parts of the self into a polyphonic and creative process of a life/death/life cycle that continuously renews the sense of meaning for the autonomous individual. In this movement from the unit of self towards the significance of 'two' in the search for love, no resolution is possible until or unless it subsequently passes into the

realm of the 'three,' representing, as D.W. Winnicott states, "the trinity! Three, the simplest possible family number" (61). This concept borrowed from cognitive psychology also serves this reading of *Niebla* in that it resolves the process in which a splitting-off of the self in relation to the concepts of self provokes a move towards a desire for love and union with the mate, and finally culminates in the quest for the soul which seeks an integrated consciousness.

Orfeo's eulogy in the structure of *Niebla*

To situate Orfeo's "Funeral Oration by Way of Epilogue"[1] (Kerrigan, 3-246) within *Niebla*, it is first essential to understand that it is contained not in a novel, but in a *nívola*. As Anthony Kerrigan explains in his introduction to a translated collection of Unamuno's *nívolas*, "they have no plot; or rather, their plot itself is existential, unknown to the author; plot makes itself up as it goes along, put together by the characters themselves; plot makes itself felt as it plotlessly becomes life-as-it-is-created, in this case by protagonists in a 'fiction'" (vii). Thus, rather than describe the plotless 'plot' direction of *Niebla*, greater insight is to be gained by focusing on the existential themes of the work. Unamuno described his invention of a new genre of fiction in the *nívola* as dramatic tales about intimate realities without the theatrical backdrops or intimations of realism that often lack truth, eternal reality, that of the personality" (my translation; Abellán, 10). Thus, as José Luis Abellán explains, to approach a *nívola by* Unamuno requires an appreciation for the symbolic framework and the ideological structure that form the basis of its conception (10).

The structure of *Niebla* is a metaphor for psychic transformation. According to Valdés, " 'Oración fúnebre por modo de epílogo'–narration of a dog–represents the fifth circle in the narrative structure of *Niebla*" (Valdés, 45).[2] In his analysis of the novel's structure, Valdés points out the interrelationship of five concentric 'circles.' Each level represents a different dimension of reality inherent in the conception of the narrative world, and the corresponding implied relations between author, text, and reader. By extension these allude to questions of a metaphysical nature, in which the text implies a metaphor for author as 'God' and, God as 'author' as well as corresponding relations between

---

[1] All citations of *Mist* are from the English translation of Unamuno's novel by Anthony Kerrigan, "Mist," *Selected Works of Miguel de Unamuno. Novela/Nívola.* Vol. 6. Trans. Kerrigan. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1976; 3-246.)

[2] All citations from the Spanish edition of *Niebla* by Mario J. Valdés are my translation. Unless otherwise noted, all references in text to Valdés' work are from the 1996 edition of *Niebla* listed in the works cited.

life and text, reader and character. In Valdés' explanation of these five concentric circles we see that they include:

> (1) the textual reality of the author ["quien escribe": he who writes] (consisting of the prologue and the post-prologue); (2) the textual reality of the protagonist in the narrative (comprising chapters I to VII); (3) the textual reality of the characters as beings of fiction (encompassing chapters VIII to XXX); (4) the textual reality of the protagonist before the author (including chapters XXXI to XXXIII); (5) the textual reality of the protagonist and the author before the reader (constituted by the epilogue). (22)

Inherent in this construction is the implied movement from author to reader, a shift mediated by the text. If this cycle originates in the author (in the figure of the implied author and the author-as-character or fictional projection as well), it then moves through the interceding text until it is able to reach the final, outer circle of the concentric layout. Orfeo's role as a bridge between the textual world and that of the reader represents the final layer of the structure, in which the reader is expected to interpret the discussion of reality and make sense of what has preceded. Orfeo provides insights for interpreting the psychic significance of *Niebla*'s narrative structure. In doing so, we can relate the deeper metaphysical meanings found in the text to our own awareness. In summary,

> *Niebla* could be described as a somewhat unconventional love story, concerning Augusto's romantic attraction to a young piano teacher, Eugenia Domingo del Arco. Unfortunately for him she is engaged to be married, but he persists, to the point of paying off the mortgage on a house she owns. Following what seems to be a definite rejection he turns his attention to Rosario, the laundry girl in his own house. The romantic intrigues continue, Eugenia finally consents to marry him, telling him that she has broken off the engagement, and asks him to find a job for Mauricio, her ex-financé. This Augusto does, only to find himself jilted three days before the wedding as Mauricio and Eugenia elope.
>
> Augusto decides to commit suicide, but before doing so, he goes to Salamanca to discuss the matter with Miguel de Unamuno, whose essay commenting on suicide he has read. (McCann, 13)

Unamuno tells him that he cannot commit suicide for he is only a product of the author's imagination and not truly alive. The affront on the conventional novel and on the notion of fictional reality and reality itself, permeates the work, and reaches its climax in the final chapter, written in the form of an epilogue.

In the fifth circle, the eulogy for Augusto Pérez is delivered from the point of view of his pet dog Orfeo. It commences in a third-person nar-

rative voice: "When the hero or protagonist dies or gets married, it is customary, at the end of certain novels, to give an account of the fate of the remaining characters. We will not follow that custom, and therefore offer no account of whatever happened to ... [the other characters]. ... We will make only one exception, in favor of the one who felt Augusto's death most deeply and sincerely: his dog Orfeo" (241). This is the preamble to Orfeo's final 'words,' in which the reader witnesses a tragic-comedic shift in textual perspective. The focus on Orfeo essentially unveils the mask of the author behind the text, given that the reader can no longer suspend disbelief to sustain the fictional reality. In experiencing the shift of narrative voice to that of the little dog, the reader must determine the significance of the epilogue, fraught as it is with allusions to the illusory projections of the ego in humans. The narrative voice of the epilogue situates itself outside human form and attacks "man...the most brazen hypocrite of all animals" (Kerrigan, 244).

The little dog first appears in *Niebla* in the fifth chapter, once the fundamental premise of the novel has been established. The fourth chapter brought to a close the first day of the story line, and the reader is familiar by then with the psychological transformation that Augusto will have to face (Valdés, 31). The fifth chapter initiates the second day of the plot, after Augusto has awakened from a dream about his mother, who dominated his life while she was alive. The narrator informs us of the dominating influence Augusto's mother has exercised on the young man's life until that point, and we gain fundamental insights into the patterns of his psyche. Immediately following her death, Augusto finds himself at a threshold of psychic change and Orfeo, the dog, is introduced. Valdés explains that,

> The most important incident of chapter five is Augusto's finding of the dog Orfeo (Orpheus). From that moment onwards the dog will be Augusto's confidant and his monologues will convert into monodialogues with the dog. By exteriorizing the internal monologue, a monodialogue will also take shape and form part of a reasoning process. If chapter V has been one of transition for Augusto, chapters VI and VII represent a new situation in which Augusto can establish a dialogue without obstacles with the other characters, maintain his constant internal monologue as an observer of life and begin to formulate complex ideas in his monodialogues with Orfeo. [my translation] (31)

It is notable that the transformation of internal monologue to external mono-dialogue with Orfeo and increased capacity for dialogue with other characters can only begin because, in dreaming of his mother, Augusto has initiated a rupture from her. In this separation from the mother figure a new independent self begins to emerge, adding a new element to the archetype of the dog named Orpheus. The immediate

connotations brought to the reader's attention relate to the Homeric myth of initiation as well as the dualism of human and divine elements in the self in the Orphic creation story—allusions that will become increasingly resonant as the text progresses towards the epilogue.

When Augusto finds the little animal he notices that it was 'seeking the breast of its mother' (Kerrigan, 55). He feels pity for it and takes it home with him. His next thought is of his love-interest Eugenia, and how Orfeo can help him win her heart. Augusto asks his butler to bring him milk for the dog. After feeding Orfeo, "Augusto christens the dog Orfeo, for some reason which remained obscure even to himself " (55). The mysterious appearance of the dog and its subsequent significance for Augusto signals a secondary level of meaning that will demand a response from the reader. The text offers a clue to the mystery in this initial scene, that Orfeo is to become an assistant to Augusto in his search for meaning, for love and for self-fulfilment. From then on, states the text, Orfeo is entrusted with all the secrets of Augusto's love for Eugenia, as he tells the dog in a low voice: "Listen, Orfeo, we have to fight for love. Now what shall I do? If you know my mother ... But you'll know about that when you get to sleep in Eugenia's lap. But what shall we do now?" (55).

A principal theme in Unamuno's works is maternal love and the relation of a male character to love through elaboration of fantasies in relation to a maternal woman. For Unamuno, as Abellán suggests, "the real love of a woman is always the love of a mother" (25) [my translation]. This aspect of the woman as idealized self and as mother is a search for love of self through the reflection in the Other. The search for the unified self becomes the ultimate quest for spiritual integration. In Jacques Lacan's view of the 'instinctual'–the "I" is constituted by the mirror of the self in the Other. The reconstituted image of self is told through our conscious awareness of the structure which makes up our Self. The mirror stage of Lacan's theory regarding the formation of the Self, is apparent in the mono-dialogues of Augusto with Orfeo. According to Lacan's theory,

> The mirror stage involves two recognitions. First, the subject as child recognizes its own physical unity in the mirror. The subject's first encounter with its idealized self-image in the mirror is fundamentally narcissistic. The mirror encounter serves a catalytic function which initiates the spectral 'Other' in the mirror as the object of desire. This *méconnaisance* or misunderstanding of the mirror image further contributes to the split in the subject's psyche. (Jirgens, 397)

In this *mirror phase,* which is possible after the introduction of Orfeo, Augusto sees his own image with increasing clarity because he is able to objectify his thoughts and rationalize them through this archetype of

the dog, or the masculine instinctual drive of his developing self. In this healthy doubling or *desdoblamiento* (to use the term preferred by Unamuno) of his inner processes, Augusto (re)-cognizes himself more clearly and begins to (re)-present himself in a more coherent form. It is also important to note the insistence in the text, as we have alluded above, to the role of Orfeo as helper in Augusto's quest for love.

Symbols of the instinctual nature, duality and longing for the Other

Archetypes are often encapsulated in myths and stories, as Jung expresses in *Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious:* they "contain a revealed knowledge that was originally hidden, and they set forth the secrets of the soul in glorious images" (7). A comparison of Orfeo in Unamuno's *Niebla* with that of an African-American story, "Manawee," as told by Pinkola-Estés, offers a propitious vantage point from which to view the archetypal symbolism of the dog. Illuminating certain aspects of the archetype leads us towards an interpretation of issues pertaining to the realization of the Self that are present in the narrative world of Unamuno's *nívola*.

As in the tale of "Manawee," Orfeo appears in *Niebla* at a specific narrative juncture once the central problematic of the character has been revealed. Orfeo, like the little dog in "Manawee," enters the story to assist his master through the travails of his journey. According to Pinkola-Estés, the Manawee tale concerns "[t]he Search for Self Through Love and Longing of Mate: Union With the 'Other' " (115). In her version of the tale, we see the following progression of events:

> There once was a man who came to court two sisters who were twins. But their father said, 'You may not have them in marriage until or unless you can guess their names.' Manawee guessed and guessed, but he could not guess the names of the sisters. The young women's father shook his head and sent Manawee away time after time.
>
> One day Manawee took his little dog with him on a guessing visit, and the dog saw that one sister was prettier than the other and the other sister was sweeter than the other. Though neither sister possessed all the virtues, the little dog liked them very much, for they gave him treats and smiled into his eyes.
>
> Manawee failed to guess the names of the young women again that day and trudged home. But the little dog ran back to the hut of the young women. There he poked his ear under one of the sidewalls and heard the women giggling about how handsome and manly Manawee was. The sisters, as they spoke, called each other by name and the little dog heard, and ran as fast as he could back to his master to tell him.
>
> But on the way, a lion had left a big bone with meat on it near the path, and the tiny dog smelled it immediately, and without another thought he veered off into the bush dragging the bone. There, he hap-

> pily licked and snapped at the bone till all the flavour was gone. Oh! the tiny dog suddenly remembered the forgotten task, but unfortunately, he had also forgotten the names of the young women as well. (116-117)

After that, the little dog attempts twice more to retrieve the names, again being lured away from his task by distractions, until he learns to focus on the main objective and brings the names to Manawee[3]. Once he succeeds in his mission on behalf of his master, Manawee is able to win the two "most beautiful maidens of the riverland. And all four, the sisters, Manawee, and the little dog, lived in peace together for a long time to come" (118). Without the dog's help, it seems, this outcome would have been impossible.

By relating the core truths of this archetypal tale to the story of *Niebla*, we gain insight not only to the role of Orfeo (this dog has a name), but also regarding the importance of 'naming' the dual nature of the psyche (in the search for love) and the struggle involved in reaching this objective. A blueprint for achieving full integration of the self emerges from the core aspects of the tale. Having moved first through the *desire for union with the dual nature* of the 'Other,' recognition of one's one duality is possible. Subsequently, there is a desire to *seek to name the Other* as a means of knowing the self, i.e. "amo, ergo, sum" (the "I"-consciousness is mirrored in a love connection). In a third stage, as revealed by the Manawee sequence of events, *the significance of the dog as a guide/helper* becomes a key for bridging the relationship between the two sets of dualities, and for overcoming the obstacles of distractions and superficial temptations. Once the true name of dual nature is discovered, due to the intervention of the dog symbol, the mask of reality is unveiled, revealing the truth we seek, it is possible *to attain integration* with the Other, overcome the fear of death and know what it means to be who we are.

---

[3] In Pinkola-Estés' analysis of the tale, "Manawee," the dog is acting on behalf of his master to retrieve the real names of the dual nature of the feminine (represented by two sisters in the tale). In his various attempts to achieve his task, the dog repeatedly finds and then forgets the names on route back to Manawee, his master, because he is tempted each time by food, sleep, and fear, respectively. Pinkola-Estés writes that the little dog, "travels back and forth, back and forth, in sincere efforts to draw the power of the Two close to him. He is interested in naming them, *not* in order to seize their power but instead to gain self-power equal to theirs. To know the names means to gain and retain consciousness about the dual nature. Wish as one may, and even with the use of one's might, one cannot have a relationship of depth without knowing the names. ... The names of the dualities of course vary from person to person, but they tend to be opposites of some sort. Like much of the natural world, they at first may seem so vast as to be without pattern or repetition. But close observation of the dual nature, asking after it and hearing its answers will soon reveal a pattern to it all, a pattern that is vast, it is true, but has a stability likes waves ebbing and flowing" (122).

The underlying issues of psychological consciousness arising in the character construction of Augusto Pérez appear in connection with the figure of Orfeo as his instinctual self, an inherent archetype of the male psyche. The dog archetype, as studied by Pinkola-Estés in *WWRWW*, reveals the psyche's search for integration of duality, the significance of naming, and the identification that the self experiences through love. In particular, the two perspectives are complementary because they represent masculine and feminine viewpoints, respectively. Although the symbol of Orfeo relates more directly to the male instinctual self, we can also place it in relation to the male-female question of relationship, as treated also in the novel, and by extension to its meaning for women as an *animus* figure. By comparing them we see more clearly what remained unanswered in Unamuno's questions about the existential psychology of the personality. Re-reading *Niebla* in the light of these contemporary facets of the psychology of the self engages the fundamental questions of self in relation to love, truth, and reality. The presence of Orfeo signals a network of references to issues of duality, naming and the desire for integrated consciousness.

Desire, Duality and Naming the Other

The contradictions of the self are key to Unamuno's treatment of character in the search to define truth and the real. By analyzing the figure of Orfeo in *Niebla* in light of the archetypal pattern at the core of the Manawee story, certain dimensions of this essential nature begin to crystallize within the textual metaphors created by Unamuno. At the most superficial level the name chosen for the little dog in *Niebla* becomes increasingly resonant in terms of its associations with the dual nature and with the longing for union with the Other. It recalls the Greek myth in that Orpheus undertakes a quest for the lost soul of his master, implying a *desdoblamiento* or doubling of the self which is reflected in his duality, not necessarily only that of the woman loved (46). Only then is it possible to weave all aspects together into a metaphoric whole that represents a search for an integrated consciousness that transcends beyond the realm of the physical/material world.

The question of duality, so evident in the choice of name for the dog, in fact looms large over the entire novel. Closely connected to this theme is the necessity of naming the Other and entering into relationship with the 'Two' as a means of achieving self-knowledge. According to the Orphic story of creation, every woman and man is possessed of a dual nature: one Titanic (earthly and corrupt) and one Dionysian (Olympian and immortal). Such a complementary dual structure was an advance upon the earlier Greek view that humanity and the gods were forever separate. But it also introduced the concept of original sin, the idea that something inside of us is inherently evil on a cosmic scale.

The fifth century B.C., Pindaric odes (*Nemea* 6, 1-4)[4] reflect first the traditional, then a modified and somewhat Orphic view of human nature: "There is one race of men and gods, and both draw their breath from the same Mother. But there is a difference in power that divides us. We are nothing; they have the realm of the stars as their eternal abode. Yet we and those Immortals may become alike in intelligence and even strength" (Eyer, 4). In view of the inherent duality of the terrestial and divine within humankind, it is the figure of the Mother which unifies. This symbolism thus precedes the appearance of Orfeo in *Niebla* but signals an element that will become more evident to the reader after the fifth chapter.

The scene of encounter between Augusto and the young woman who will win his affections in Chapter I of *Niebla* establishes Augusto's quest. He inquires of the porter, a down-to-earth Spanish woman, about the attractive woman whom he has followed home, after having become smitten with her as they passed each other in the street. In this passage the power of her name holds sway over Augusto's longing for a mate. In his first exchange with the concierge of the lady's residence, he makes his first inquiry about her: "My good woman," he began, his hand still in his pocket, "could you tell me, confidentially and *inter nos*, the name of the young lady who has just gone in?" // "There's no secret to that, and there's no wrong to it, sir" (Kerrigan, 29). Augusto broaches the question of the name with an air of secrecy and intrigue, while the *portera*, or concierge, does not see the mystery at all. His words contain a sense of mystical quest, albeit with more than a touch of comic irony from the reader's perspective, given Augusto's introverted and eccentric nature. Nevertheless, in re-reading this exchange between the concierge and Augusto in the light of the Manawee story keys, the allusion to the secret names signals a deeper pattern of a search for the beloved. The dialogue continues:

> "Well her name is Doña Eugenia Domingo del Arco."
> "Domingo? It must surely be Dominga."
> "No, Domingo. That's her surname, her first surname."[5]
> "In the case of a woman, then, that surname should be changed to the feminine ending. Otherwise, what becomes of concordance in gender?"
> "I don't know anything about that, sir." (Kerrigan, 29-30)

It is Augusto's insistence on 'knowing' and inquiring about the name of the woman that represents the first stage of the ontological process to make sense of his own existence. By rallying between ratio-

[4] Pindar is mentioned in the second chapter of *Niebla* (Valdés, 155; Kerrigan, 34).

[5] In Spanish it is common practice to use both surnames; the father's surname is given first, followed by the maternal surname.

nal process and freer psychological association, he makes his way through his desire to comprehend himself through love. The duality of masculine and feminine perspectives on love becomes an essential element in this quest for knowing, evident for example in Augusto's word play on Eugenia's name: Domingo/a. During this same conversation with the porter, he also inquires whether Eugenia's aunt and uncle, with whom she lives, come from the mother's or the father's side of the family, underscoring his fascination with gender-based societal associations and norms.[6] Whereas the *portera*, Margarita, functions at a purely factual level of communication, thereby completely missing the underlying meanings in his references, Augusto indulges in what Valdés refers to as, "el mundo cerrado del ensimismamiento" and his internal conflict. Valdés also underscores the fact that, "Augusto is an exceptional character; in effect he is a perfect example of the introverted type described by Carl Jung. Suffice it to note that the need to enter into dialogue puts him in a situation that is a struggle to externalize himself. In this first meeting with another character the conflict consists of a contrast between the common, daily discourse of Margarita and Augusto's aestheticist ideas" (Valdés, 29). Pinkola-Estés also emphasizes a duality of the self as civilized *versus* its 'wildish' manifestation on the one hand, and that of the more controlled and filtered mundane consciousness on the other; both are key tensions in the novel. In an earlier passage, for example, we see a reference to two Eugenias—one of flesh and blood, and another a product of Augusto's imagination. In a letter he writes to her, Augusto addresses both sides of her nature:

> Yes, my Eugenia, mine, the Eugenia I'm making up all by myself. Not the other one, the one of flesh and blood, the chance apparition, not the concierge's Eugenia. Chance apparition, I said. But what apparition is not a chance apparition? What logic lies behind apparitions anyway? Perhaps the same logic that lies behind the chain of figures in the smoke from my cigar. Chance! Chance is the inner rhythm of the world. Chance is the soul of poetry. (Kerrigan, 34)

Augusto continues his soliloquy with escalating euphoric and fantastical intensity, posting his Eugenia, ideal Other, as the antidote to his dull existence:

---

[6] There is another duality at play, and this is the register of the conversation that Augusto uses, in contrast with that of the *portera*. From the beginning of the novel we see that Augusto does not filter between his pure consciousness and that which he expresses through language. Random thoughts continuously appear in his strange turns in conversation, at times hindering communication, and in turn affecting his relationships with other characters. There are many examples of moments at which the dialogue functions at mismatched levels of register, such as that cited in the text.

> Ah, my chanceful Eugenia! My own humble, humdrum, routine life constitutes a Pindaric ode made up of the day's endless detail. Daily detail! Give us today our daily bread! Give me, Lord, the endless detail of every day! The only reason we don't go under in the face of devastating sorrow or annihilating joy is because our sorrow and our joy are smothered in the thick fog of endless daily detail. **All life is that: fog, mist. Life is a nebula.** And now suddenly Eugenia emerges from the mist. And who is she? Ah! Now I see it all: I have been looking for her a long time. And while I was gazing about, she appeared just in front of me. Isn't that what is meant by 'finding' something? When anyone finds an apparition, discovers the apparition one wanted, is it not because the apparition, responding to one's own desire, comes to meet me? Did not America emerge for the meeting with Columbus? Didn't Eugenia emerge to meet me? Oh, Eugenia! (34)

Augusto sees Eugenia as a light out of the confusion, out of the fog or mist, an allusion to the title of the *nívola*. We note as well the repetition of her name and his insistence on searching for his female counterpart. Augusto prefers the idealized half of Eugenia's dual nature. The emphasis upon his need for union with the feminine finds resonance in his fascination with her surname "Domingo," which he wishes to modify into "Dominga" as a testament to her femininity.[7] Indeed this word play manifests the duality inherent in every identity: -o (social civilized self, useful for naming boys/sons) and -a (instinctual female).

The onomastic focus offers the first clue to unraveling the mystery of fulfillment that Augusto seeks. It is also at this point in the narrative that the quest for the 'Other' is revealed as a circular movement; insofar as Augusto seeks Eugenia, or the 'Other,' he is in effect also in a search for meaning in his life and for his realized Self. We see an illustration of this aspect in the ensuing conversation between Augusto and

---

[7] Augusto analyses her name in the spirit of its relation to his growing need to find meaning in his existence. After his initial encounter with the *portera*, Augusto muses on the issue of her name: "I can't get used to her surname being Domingo. No, I'll have to get her to change it to Dominga. But then our children...Will the males have to use the female Dominga as a second surname? And then, since they'll want to get rid of my own absurd surname, the innocuous Pérez, reducing it to the initial P., what will our first-born and heir be called? Augusto P. Dominga? Oh, this won't do. ... Where is all this leading me? What a fantasy!" (Kerrigan, 31-32; Valdés, 112-13). The interplay of the masculine and feminine versions of Eugenia's surname reflects Augusto's existential questions and reveals the emptiness of his own identity. Proceeding from an increasingly apparent disassociation with the factual Eugenia, there is a movement towards an idealized, invented one, also evident in the final image of the union of the two as a new entity: Augusto P. Dominga; in this way, Augusto reveals a need to integrate his duality into a unified self. He recognizes that by loving another and knowing the 'Other,' he will in turn learn to love and know himself. This integration also implies a reversal of the normal social order, in that he emphasizes the erasure of his surname in favour of hers, giving as justification the innocuousness of his own paternal surname.

his butler whose name happens to be "Domingo:"

> Augusto heard himself repeating her name aloud. Hearing a call, his manservant appeared at the door:
>
> "Did you call, Señorito?"
>
> "No, not you! ... But: wait a minute. Isn't your name Domingo?"
>
> "Yes, sir," replied Domingo, without showing any surprise that such a question should be put to him.
>
> "And what's the reason for the name Domingo?"
>
> "Because I am called Domingo."
>
> Augusto addressed himself: *Very well:* ***we call ourselves whatever we are called.*** [my emphasis] *In Homeric times people and things had two names: the name given them by man and the one given them by the gods. I wonder what God calls me?* [my note: recall the Orphic myth] *And why shouldn't I call myself differently than I am called by other men? Why shouldn't I give Eugenia a different name from the one given her by others, from the name used by the concierge, for example? But what should I call her?* (Kerrigan, 34-35)

Augusto's search for her twin name begins. He sits down to write her a letter in which he declares his attraction for her. In this letter he states his hope that they "may see each other and talk. That we may write one another, and learn to know each other. And then...The, God and our heart will tell us what to do!" (Kerrigan, 35-36). Thus the search for the 'true,' secret name of his love-interest begins, in which we see the archetype of the search for union with the mate. The call to duality reflects a call to the initiation of the one who seeks to know the names of the mate. To achieve this Augusto must rely on a mysterious path towards truth, in an attempt to win the prize of union in love (as we see in Pinkola-Estés' analysis of the tale of "Manawee"). The name that Augusto yearns to find for his newfound love is her mythical one, the name given her by the 'gods' ['dioses']. In turn, when Augusto also seeks the true name of God, the search for the naming of the 'Other' reveals a deeper search for meaning of the 'self' in relation to God or to a higher metaphysical truth.

Duality, then, is intricately linked with the challenge of naming. The search for self requires that the dualities be named and taken hold of, before any deeper knowing of the nature of love, life and death, can be grasped. The next question is, what then is contained in Augusto's preoccupation with finely dissecting the meaning of names, particularly that of his love-object, Eugenia? In "The Power of Name" Pinkola-Estés discusses the significance of naming. She posits,

> Naming a force, creature, person, or thing has several connotations. In cultures where names are chosen carefully for their magical or auspicious meanings, to know a person's true name means to know the life path and the soul attributes of that person.

> In fairy tales and folktales there are several other additional aspects to the name, and these are at work in the tale of Manawee. Although there are some tales where the protagonist searches for the name of a malevolent force in order to have power over it, more so the questing after the name is in order to be able to summon that force or person, to call that person close to oneself, and to have relationship with that person.
>
> The latter is the case in the Manawee story. He travels back and forth, back and forth, back and forth, in sincere efforts to draw the power of the Two close to him. He is interested in naming them, *not* in order to seize their power but instead to gain self-power *equal* to theirs. To know the names means to gain and retain consciousness about the dual nature. (122)

In naming someone or something we come closer to the object of our desire, in so far as we align ourselves with our desire. As Kramarae states "those who have the power to name the world are in a position to influence reality" (4). As a result, through his *mono-dialogues* with Orfeo, Augusto grows in his awareness of the women in his life, thereby constructing the Other for his own image.

The Archetype of the Dog

According to Pinkola-Estés in her essay "The Mate: Union With the Other" (115-129), the dog is an archetype of what she calls "psychic tenacity" (123-24). In "Manawee," as told by Pinkola-Estés, the little dog is tested and re-tested several times but never gives up his task in the name of his master. Moreover this same dog saves the day and wins the names of the two sisters for Manawee, effecting a "happily-ever-after" ending.

In "Achieving Fierceness" (127) Pinkola-Estés discusses how Manawee's little dog manages in the end to gain control over his fears and appetites/distractions, and is then able to bring the names of the two sisters back to his master so that the story can resolve itself positively. Pinkola-Estés posits that the Manawee tale manifests, in archetypal symbology, how the consciousness of the psyche is rising so that it can achieve union with the desired objective.[8] There is an *arch* construction (note the apparent association with Eugenia's second name "del Arco"). Augusto is constructing his feminine self/side or rather he

---

[8] The narrative in many aspects runs parallel to the Gilgamesh epic, i.e. the quest for immortality and the companionship of a loved one. Pinkola-Estés contends that, as in this ancient Babylonian epic, "wherein Inkadu, the hairy animal/man, counter-balances Gilgamesh, the too-rational king, the dog is one entire side of man's dualistic nature. He is the wood's nature, the one who can track, who knows by sensing what is what" (123).

is differentiating his masculine side in response to his desire for union with the feminine, after the separation from his mother is complete. In his quest for love Augusto senses that he can achieve his goal by entering into relationship with Eugenia Domingo del Arco, and thus fend off his fear of a mundane, meaningless life (Kerrigan, 34). In this way he will be saved from a senseless (soul-less or God-less?) existence.

As Augusto's consciousness of himself comes to ever increasing fruition in his pursuit of the self through love —"Amo, ergo sum" (Kerrigan, 141)— "the fight to be serious about what we are about" (Pinkola-Estés, 127) is also reflected in Augusto's fight with Unamuno (as the fictionalized author of the *nívola/novela*) for what is real for each psyche. In Chapter VII, Augusto reaches an intense moment of insight when he senses redemption from the world and the possibilities for self-creation through love:

> And now the twin stars of Eugenia's eyes shine in the sky of my solitude. They shine with the sheen of my dead mother's tears. They make me think that I exist. Dulcet illusion! Amo, ergo sum! And this love, Orfeo, is like the blessed rain which dissipates and condenses the mist of daily existence. Thanks to love I can feel my own soul take on shape, respond to my touch. My soul is sentient, feels pain, at its center. What is 'soul' in any case but love, sorrow made flesh?
>
> 'The days come and the days go and love remains. At the very heart of all things, the current of this world sweeps against the current of the other, and out of this sweeping contact arises the saddest and sweetest of sorrows, the sorrow of living.
>
> 'Look, Orfeo, consider the warp and woof, how the shuttle throws the thread back and forth, how the treadle goes up and down! And yet–where is the warp rod which rolls up the texture of our existence, where?'
>
> Inasmuch as the dog–Orfeo!–had never seen a loom, it is not likely that he understood his master, though, gazing into his master's eyes, it may be that he intuited his meaning. (Kerrigan, 65)

Here is the difference between the dog in the tale of "Manawee" as told by Pinkola-Estés (123-127) and Orfeo in *Niebla.* Orfeo, as Augusto's instinctual nature, only listens; he does not become fierce. He does not progress from the I AM to the I DO stage. Orfeo merely understands, at times only 'intuiting' the meaning of what he hears in Augusto's *monodialogues,* such as in the above passage from Chapter VIII.

Orfeo appears to represent the core of Augusto's psyche. Throughout *Niebla,* Orfeo maintains his loyalty to Augusto and is always there to accompany him in his travails. It is through the monodialogues with Orfeo that Augusto evolves his understanding of his relationships with the other characters, as well as in relation to the text as a whole. A dog is meant to represent a specific psychological func-

tion or structure. It is the medium-like presence of an animal that is efficacious. As Pinkola-Estés explains, "[d]ogs are the magicians of the universe. By their presence alone, they transform grumpy people into grinning people, sad people into less sad people; they engender relationship" (123). The mediumistic aspect of the dog reflects the inner work of psychological transformation, for "[t]he world of the dog is filled with constant cataclysmic sound ... sound that we, as humans, do not register at all. But the little dog does. / So the canid hears outside the range of human hearing" (124).

A highlighted characteristic of the dog in the "Manawee" tale is weakness to temptation and distraction due to his appetites (124-26). This aspect is evident in *Niebla*, insofar as Augusto is tempted by the abstractions of Paparrigópulos and science, as well as by the lust he feels for Rosario, the cleaning girl, and his ambition to win Eugenia's hand in marriage. Throughout all of these events, the dog patiently waits and listens. At the end of the narrative, when Augusto confronts his *reality(-ies)*, it is Orfeo who appears more real to us than the other characters, and it is through his narrative 'voice' that Unamuno chooses to present the eulogy for Augusto and have it serve as the final chapter of the novel bringing the dog into the same narrative scope as Unamuno's narration. The archetypal symbolism of Orfeo is heightened in the eulogy / epilogue through references made to other mythical dogs:

> *Perhaps up there in the pure air, the high plateau of the good earth, the pure world of pure color, Plato's world, which men call divine; on that superior terrestial plane from which precious stones fall, where the pure and purified dwell, quaffing air and breathing the aether. There, too, dwell the pure dogs, the one that accompanies Saint Humbert the Hunter, Saint Dominic's dog with the torch in its mouth, and Saint Roch's. Saint Roch is the one the preacher pointed out in a painting and said:* 'There you have him, Saint Roch, dog and all!' (Kerrigan, 245)

The main point of convergence among the three saints mentioned by Orfeo, other than their religious connotations, seems to be their association to the figure of the dog. Saint Humbert, the Benedictine monk of the 7th or 8th century (b. 655; died 772), is the patron saint of hunters that lived in what is now Belgium; according to Valdés, this saint and the other two mentioned are always represented in the company of a dog. Saint Dominic (Santo Domingo de Guzmán; Valdés, 300) of Silos was an abbot born in Cañas, Navarre (now Rioja), Spain, (c. 1000; died 1073) is venerated in Spain and is the famous founder of the Order of Preachers, also known as the Dominicans. He is the patron of shepherds and captives and is invoked against insects and mad dogs. Saint Roch, a French medieval priest believed to have belonged to the Third

Order of St. Francis of the Catholic Church, died in prison due to being mistakenly identified as a spy. Perhaps this sense of tragic finality and cruel injustice to a man who had dedicated his life to curing others of the plague, resonates with the search for a true sense of self and Augusto's tragic loss at the end of *Niebla*. Augusto had been betrayed by Eugenia, who ran away with another man, after having pretended to be planning a wedding with Augusto. It was that betrayal that led to Augusto's insistence on suicide, which brought him face to face with Unamuno, the "Author" of his life, and finally to confront the author and displace his reality beyond the fictional world of the *nívola*.

In the end, Orfeo mourns his master's passing more passionately than the others, and finally, dies of grief after his master:

> Orfeo, a dog, scents the dark mist descending. His tail signals furiously, and he leaps toward the master. *Master! Man, poor man!* Shortly thereafter, Domingo and Liduvina picked up the poor dog, dead at its master's feet, purified at last like him and like him shrouded in the black cloud of death. Domingo was deeply moved and he wept. It would be hard to say whether he wept for the death of Augusto only or for the death of the little dog, too. Most likely he wept, in his simple way, to see that stunning manifestation of faithfulness and loyalty. And he murmured, once again: 'And there are people who say that no one dies of grief!' (Kerrigan, 246)

In effect, he has only lived for a little while longer to serve so as to witness the unfolding of Augusto's journey towards a full awareness of selfhood. The emphasis of Orfeo's last words on "Man, poor man!" implies a more general appellation, serving metaphorically to represent the life of any person. It also recalls the protagonist of the "Manawee" tale from which I would also infer a play on the word 'little man' or 'wee-man.' In the last paragraphs of *Niebla* the use of "no **one** dies of grief," brings to the forefront again the concept of 'one,' and I AM, attributed to this little dog. The dichotomy of self/other that reflects a desire for union through love is a reflection of the deeper yearning for a resolution of the tensions between rational thought and feeling. The connection between love and self-recognition saves the self from tragedy.

Cogito, ergo sum versus *Amo, ergo sum:* the sum of integrated consciousness

In *Being in Love*, David Goicochea deals with the question of love in philosophy, and about the wisdom that is revealed in contemplating reality with "loving thinking":

> But what is loving thinking? If one thinks of this question in the light of Descartes's mode of thinking one can see that it is not to be exclud-

> ed from the thinking of demons, dreamers and madmen. How would Socrates have thought without his demon? What would Aristotle's Eudaimonia have been without the demons? What would ancient wisdom have been without the thinking of dreaming? What would the thinking of Plato's *Phaedrus* be without madness, albeit divine? Plato claimed that our greatest blessings: the political institutions of Athens, tragic healing, poetry and philosophy are gifts of madness. Lovers are mad! Lovers are demonic! Lovers dream! In all of that they are thinking. Should this thinking be excluded from philosophical thinking? If it is then the being of demons, dreamers and madmen will be excluded from philosophers. They will be left with things as calculable numbers or at best with thinking and its work of art. Being will be forgotten. (xxii)

The dichotomy between thinking and loving is bridged by allowing them to coexist as two parts of a whole, mind and body producing the whole of being, or soul, which is greater than the *sum* of its parts.

In *Niebla*, Augusto cannot be considered a hero until his evolution from unconsciousness (from the 'niebla' or fog of the meaningless details of the mundane) has penetrated through to a consciousness of his true nature that cannot be destroyed. This true nature is even stronger than Unamuno's, his literary creator. Orfeo, therefore, speaks beyond the death of Augusto's novelistic circumstance to his true enduring nature, that which is by the same token connected to the reader(s). At the end of the novel the reader witnesses the upper-most, metaphysical reality of Augusto's self, a self that exists beyond the confines of the text. It is precisely through the medium of the novel that the fictional Augusto argues with 'Unamuno' and concludes that as a character he will become more "august" or renowned than his creator/author and become equal in the reality of the reader(s). D.W. Winnicott addresses this shift of being in "Sum, I am" and captures the full extent of the movement from Descartes axiom to the one proposed by Unamuno in *Niebla*. According to Winnicott:

> The struggle to reach to this concept [of integration] is reflected, perhaps, in the early Hebrew name for God. Monotheism seems to be closely linked to the name I AM. I am that I am. (*Cogito, ergo sum* is different: *sum* here means I have a *sense* of existing as a person, that in my mind I feel my existence has been proved. But we are concerned here with an unselfconscious state of being, apart from intellectual exercises in self-awareness.) Does not this name (I AM) given to God reflect the danger that the individual feels he or she is in on reaching the state of individual being? If I am, then I have gathered together this and that and have claimed it as me, and I have repudiated everything else; in repudiating the not-me I have, so to speak, insulted the world, and I must expect to be attacked. So when people first came to

> the concept of individuality, they quickly put it up in the sky and gave it a voice that only Moses could hear. (57)

In *Niebla* the author alludes to such a movement towards integration, one that for the tragedic Unamuno can only be realized for his protagonist in death. What we see in Manawee's tale is that integration in life at the same level may only be achieved through union in love. Though such primacy of love is posited by Unamuno in his *nívola* through the repeated references to the twist on Descartes into "Amo, ergo sum" it is not fully experienced by Augusto.

What we gain from re-reading *Niebla* and the questions inherent in Orfeo's message for us in the light of the recent archetypal work by Pinkola-Estés is an appreciation of a new concept of reality that manages to surpass the limitations of dual thinking. As Winnicott explains,

> [i]n the old days–a hundred years ago–people talked of mind and body. To get away from the dominance of the split-off intellect, they had to postulate a soul. Now it is possible to start with the psyche of the psyche-soma and from this basis for personality structure to proceed to the concept of the split-off intellect, which at its extreme, and in a person with rich intellectual endowment in terms of grey matter, can function brilliantly without much reference to the human being. But it is the human being who, by an accumulation of experiences duly assimilated, may achieve wisdom. The intellect only knows how to talk about wisdom. ... In the split-off intellect, division presents no difficulties. [...] On the basis of unit status, the achievement which is basic to health in the emotional development of every human being, the unit personality can afford to identify with wider units –say, the family or the home or the house. Now the unit personality is part of a wider concept of wholeness. And soon will be part of a social life of an ever-widening kind; and of political matters. (60)

By reaching into the archetype of the dual nature, and harmonizing it with the full allusions brought to bear by the figure of Orfeo in the novel, Unamuno's text mitigates for us an ontological process that continues to challenge us to respond.

Integration and Death

Winnicott also puts forth the link between integration and death, stating that "[t]here is no death except of a totality. Put the other way [a]round, the wholeness of personal integration brings with it the *possibility* and indeed the *certainty of death*; and with the acceptance of death there can come a great relief, relief from fear of the alternatives, such as disintegration, or ghosts–that is the lingering on of spirit phenomena after the death of the somatic half of the psychosomatic partnership" (61-62). This phenomenon plays out in the story of Augusto. When he

is finally revealed to himself in the fullness of himself, he is also ready to accept his death. Before then, he had seen death merely as an escape from sorrow. This later turns into a fear of death, or murder (perhaps of the attack as discussed by Winnicott), and he travels to Salamanca to plead with 'Unamuno' for his life in Chapter XXXI (Kerrigan, 352-357). It is only when Augusto has accepted death that he is able to see beyond his textual reality and assume the greater implications of the integration of his true self, as we read in chapter XXXII:

> *Could it be true that I do not really exist? he wondered. Is he [Unamuno] right when he says that I'm no more than a figment of his imagination, a purely fictional creature?*
>
> *Lately his life had been overwhelmingly sad, painful beyond belief, but it was even sadder and more painful to think that all of it had been no more than a dream, and not even his dream, but my dream. Nothingness was more horrific than all of his suffering, his pain. To dream that one exists...well and good! That might be endured. But to be dreamt by someone else...!*
>
> *And why must it be that I do no exist? Why? he wondered. Let's assume it's true that this man has invented me, dreamt me, fashioned me out of his imagination–but still, don't I live in the imagination of other people, for instance, those people who read this story of my life? And if I live that way, in the [f]antasy-life of some people, isn't that reality, that which is common to several minds and not just to one? And if I come to life out of the written pages in which the tale of my fictitious life is contained, or rather from the minds of those who read them, of you who are reading them at this moment, why should I not exist, then, as an eternal soul, eternally painful and sad? Why?* (Kerrigan, 228)

Inherent in this life/death dichotomy are issues of contradiction and truth. As Pinkola-Estés points out, "[o]nce we've found out what our lives are really about, we bump up against the force called Death [that] is one of the two magnetic forks of the wild. If one learns to name the dualities, one will eventually bump right up against the bald skull of the Death nature. They say only heroes can stand it" (129). Augusto does not own his sense of self until he is able to accept his death. After death he believes he has become more real than the author of *Niebla* because he will live on forever in the minds of readers and in the text. Thus, by surrendering to the truth he can become who he is, that is, by becoming someone for the Other. The doctor that examines Augusto's body after his death states, "Each one of us knows less about our own existence. ... We only exist for others. [...] The heart, head and stomach are all one and the same thing" (Kerrigan, 236). Spirit, body and mind are alive in the presence of Augusto Pérez, the character while he remains in that life until chapter XXXII. Afterwards, in Chapter XXXIII and the chapter prior to Orfeo's eulogy, Unamuno as fictional author, suffers regret over the death of Augusto. This feeling dissipates, how-

ever, after the protagonist appears to Unamuno, the fictionalized author, in a dream where August states that he will outlive his creator. The spirit of the fictional main character then surpasses the former existence. Orfeo carries out the task of awakening the dialogue with the reader's position before these realities. In the final words, the dog expresses his grief over his master's death and admits its purifying effect on his own spirit: "I feel my soul becoming purified from contact with death, with this purification of my master. My own soul seems to rise toward the mist into which he was at last dissolved, the mist out of which he emerged and into which he disappeared. I can feel the dark mist descending" (Kerrigan, 246). Orfeo follows Augusto into the same mist and dies soon after him. Referring back to Jung's notion of the collective unconscious, "[t]his primordial awareness is an awareness of the split that has taken place in man himself and in his world. This is the substance of all myth [... which] is the built-in nostalgia in man for a lost paradise that he has never seen but feels as a unity of oppositions. Religion has usually called this nostalgia the need for God. Unamuno had called it *hambre de Dios*" (Valdés, 1982, 74-75). The conclusion of *Niebla* and the double death of August and Orfeo brings union and ultimate truth, symbolizing the release of life into a level of being beyond duality.

Wilfrid Laurier University

Works cited:

Abellán, José Luis, ed. "Introducción." *Abel Sánchez*. By Miguel de Unamuno. Madrid: Editorial Castalia, 1985. 9-41.

Eyer, Shawn. "Orpheus in Orbit: Reframing Hellenistic Dualism of the Body and Earth." *Green Egg*. Vol. 109. Summer 1995. 4-6.

Goicoechea, David. *Being in Love*. St. Catharines: Brock University, 1984.

Ilie, Paul. *Unamuno: An Existential View of Self and Society*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.

Jirgens, Karl E. "Lacan, Jacques-Marie Emile." *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory*. Ed. Irena R. Makaryk. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

Jurkevick, Gayana. *The Elusive Self: Archetypal Approaches to the Novels of Miguel de Unamuno*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1984.

Jung, Carl. "The Personification of Opposites." *Mysterium Conjunctionis: An Inquiry into the Separation and Synthesis of Psychic Opposites in Alchemy. Collected Works*. Vol 14. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970. 146-160.

—. *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. 2nd ed. Trans. By R.F.C. Hull. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1980.

Kerrigan, Anthony, trans. "*Mist.*" (Selected Works Vol. 6) By Miguel de Unamuno. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976. 3-246.

Kramarae, Cheris. *Women and Men Speaking. Frameworks for Analysis.* Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House, 1981.

Martínez, Alejandro. "La necesidad del diálogo." *Lenguaje y dialogía en la obra de Unamuno.* Madrid: Editorial Pliegos, 1998.

McCann, Anthony. *'Ar Long na Gaoithe': Death, the Quest for Immortality, and the Pursuit of the Unjustified Self in Séamas Mac Annaidh's Cuaifeach Mo Londubb Buí.* Masters thesis. University College, Galway, Ireland. 1997.

Pinkola-Estés, Clarissa. "The Mate: Union With the Other." *Women Who Run With the Wolves: Myths and Stories of the Wild Woman Archetype.* New York: Ballantine Books, 1992. 115-129.

Valdés, Mario J., ed. *Niebla.* By Miguel de Unamuno. 1935. Madrid: Cátedra, 1996.

—. *Shadows in the Cave: A Phenomenological Approach to Literary Criticism Based on Hispanic Texts.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.

Winnicott, D.W. *Home Is Where We Start From: Essays by a Psychoanalyst.* Eds. Clare Winnicott, Ray Shepherd and Madeleine Davis. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1984.

Ian Begg

GREECE 1921-1924 IN THE BAGNANI ARCHIVES

Gilbert Bagnani was born in Rome in 1900, the only child of Gen. Ugo Bagnani, a military attaché, and Florence Dewar Bagnani, an heiress from Port Hope, Ontario. His father died at the British front in France in 1917. He attended private schools in London and Rome and graduated from the University of Rome in 1921. He studied archaeology in Greece and travelled extensively in Europe, becoming proficient in at least six languages. In 1929, he married Mary Augusta Stewart Houston, the great granddaughter of Sir John Beverly Robinson, Chief Justice of Ontario, and granddaughter of John Beverly Robinson, Lieutenant Governor of Ontario. He was invited to join the Italian excavations at the Graeco-Roman sanctuary town of Tebtunis in Egypt in 1931, and acted as Field Director there until 1936. He then immigrated to Port Hope, Ontario, where they bought and enlarged a country house he called Vogrie. He taught in the Classics Department at the University of Toronto from 1945 to 1965, and both Gilbert and Stewart taught part-time until 1975 at Trent University in Peterborough, Ontario, not far from Vogrie. After their deaths in 1985 and 1996 respectively, their property and papers were left to Trent University. A few years earlier, however, Stewart had donated several cartons of letters and photographs to the Art Gallery of Ontario (AGO), where she had run the extension department many years earlier. As a result, their papers are divided between the two institutions in Peterborough and Toronto.[1]

Gilbert wrote letters almost every week to his mother in Rome from 1918 until her death in 1935, as well as letters to Stewart in the years before their marriage. There are hundreds of names, many well known or identifiable, scattered through thousands of pages, and it will require much time to finish the identifications. Most of the hundreds of photos are not labeled, but are primarily of Egypt, Italy and Greece, and are being closely examined. As a student, Gilbert made use of small pages of notes (now at Trent), some made by quartering full pages. On the

[1] It is pleasant to have this opportunity to acknowledge publicly the unfailing support of the archivists at Trent University, Dr. Bernadine Dodge and her Assistant Jodi Aoki, and at the Art Gallery of Ontario, Larry Pfaff and his assistant Amy Marshall; without their help, this project would not have proceeded as expeditiously as it has. I am also deeply grateful to Prof. Thomas Symons and his follow Trustees of the Bagnani Endowment for their continued support and encouragement.

backs of some of these, after being re-pieced together, can be seen itemized lists of his travel expenses. By studying all of this scattered material, it has been possible to reconstruct his life as a student in Greece from 1921 to 1924.

The letters surprisingly reveal that he acted as the anonymous foreign correspondent for the London *Morning Post*; an album in the AGO of pasted newspaper cuttings of anonymous articles corresponds exactly to his references. The letters further reveal that his sources were the elite political families of Athenian society, although many names remain to be identified. He had the habit of referring to individuals by nicknames or abbreviations, which he explains only when his mother did not know the intended references. For example, the W refers to Alessandro della Seta because Seta means silk Worm, the beautiful apothecary is evidently Kalopothakis, and the Incest is Philadelpheus, because the name means brother-lover. Many names, however, evidently known to his mother, remain to be identified. How he arrived in Greece so well prepared is still unclear. In Rome he was well acquainted with William Miller, an historian writing books on modern Greece, to whom he wrote letters updating him on the Greek political scene. He also brought with him several letters of introduction to specific members of Greek society. Indeed, several of the elite individuals seem to reside in Italy as well as Greece.

At the same time, he was studying archaeology at the Italian School in Athens, giving public lectures in the winter, and travelling extensively throughout the countryside in the spring. He participated in excavations and explorations especially in the Dodecanese islands, then under Italian control. This article is a first attempt to reconstruct his life in Greece in chronological order within the context of the political events in Athens.

It may be helpful to the reader to have a brief survey of Greek politics in the period leading up to Bagnani's arrival in Greece.[2] During the First World War, Britain wanted Greece to join her side against Germany, Austria and Turkey. In January 1915, when Prime Minister Venizelos hinted that he needed the prospect of significant gains in order to overcome the opposition of King Constantine to entering the war, the Liberal Foreign Secretary, Sir Edward Grey,[3] offered Venizelos undefined "important territorial concessions on the coast of Asia Minor." His Acting Chief of the General Staff Ioannis Metaxas opposed the offer: not only did the Turks outnumber the scattered Greeks every-

---

[2] The main secondary sources employed in this historical reconstruction are: Housepian 1972, Macmillan 2002, Mavrogordato 1931, Miller 1928, Pallis 1937, Smith 1973, Sturdza 1983, and the *Annual Register of World Events* for the appropriate years and countries.

[3] It was Grey who observed: "The lamps are going out all over Europe; we shall not see them lit again in our lifetime."

where in Anatolia, even in Smyrna, with no natural geographical limit there was no military way that Greek forces could occupy and hold such an extensive territory against the will of the Turkish inhabitants; they would be as overstretched as Napoleon in Russia. Only with guaranteed Allied support and the partitioning of Anatolia could Greece safely accept the proposed territory. Nonetheless, the Great Idea of the political union of lands inhabited by Greeks was very appealing for both Venizelos and the Greek people. At this period, irredentism was much discussed; originating in recently unified Italy, this was a nationalist movement agitating for the inclusion of "unredeemed" adjacent lands inhabited by ethnically related peoples under a foreign government, like the Italians in Trieste, or the Greeks in Anatolia; in Greece this was called the Great Idea.

King Constantine, however, was adamantly opposed to entering the war, possibly anticipating a stalemate and refusing the appeals of both sides. Whether or not Constantine was reflecting the popular will of the Greek people, by not accepting the advice of his Prime Minister to enter the war Constantine contributed to the political polarization of his country. Venizelos was dismissed by Constantine after allowing French and British troops into Salonika to defend Serbia and check Bulgaria, a foreign occupation bitterly resented by many Greeks. The Allies then bombarded Athens and blockaded Greece until Constantine appointed his second son Alexander in his place, since Crown Prince George was also unacceptable to the Allies. Constantine left for exile and Venizelos was finally able to lead Greece in the war against Germany and Turkey in June 1917. The blatant foreign interference supporting his coup left him much less popular at home than abroad.

Throughout the spring of 1919 Britain and France were rapidly demobilizing the millions of men still in service and had no stomach or means for more fighting. Despite the grandiose reordering of the world at the Versailles Peace Conference after the war, in reality no one was prepared to implement any of their political decisions. Turkey, however, was being reenergized by its rebel leader Kemal, who had successively defended the Dardanelles from repeated Allied attacks. Several hundred thousand troops deserted the last Sultan. Italy, while pressing for its territorial claims in Anatolia offered to it too by Britain and France during the war, was also offering support to Kemal in the East through its Ambassador in Constantinople, Count Carlo Sforza. Alarmed by the warm reception to Venizelos in Paris, in March 1919 Italy landed marines from Rhodes at Adalya on the south coast of Anatolia and began advancing northward toward Smyrna. Since neither Lloyd George, Clemenceau, nor Wilson was willing to occupy Smyrna with any of their own forces, Lloyd George suggested sending in the Greeks, who were eager. The leaders made this decision without

consulting their advisers in order to keep the Italians from learning of it, and while the ostensible pretext was to protect Greek nationals from the Turks, in reality it was to prevent their Ally Italy from unilaterally occupying unassigned territory. So in May 1919 Greek troops disembarked from destroyers and transports at the harbour of Smyrna to find a warm welcome from the Greeks and open hostility from the Turks. It was a gift to Kemal.

From the Turkish point of view, the Greeks, as opposed to the English, were precisely the wrong nationality to police Smyrna. In the violence immediately following the landing, scores were killed on both sides. In the Turkish press, this became a massacre of thousands, and Kemal's rebel Nationalist supporters grew rapidly. The new High Commissioner, Aristeides Sterghiades, did not endear himself to his fellow Greeks by his severely even-handed treatment of the situation: he had Greek culprits caught and executed. By the time that the Supreme Council in Paris subsequently determined that the Greek-occupied territory should consist only of Smyrna and the surrounding area within three kilometers, the Greek forces had already spread out in all directions to protect their own nationals in outlying towns and villages. The Greek and Italian governments agreed between themselves on their respective territories in Anatolia, while the Greeks alleged that Turkish guerillas were launching their attacks from Italian-held territory with Italian support and encouragement. This is the geo-political context of the Nationalist Turks later granting permission for Italian excavations around Bodrum, ancient Halikarnassos.

What the Greek people failed to realize was just how militarily isolated they were in Anatolia. The very reason that they were there was because no other Ally was willing to send any troops to the region. Nor did the Greek populace appreciate the strategic impossibility of their situation, as foreseen and articulated by Metaxas in 1915.

By the Treaty the Allies and the Sultan's representative signed at Sevres in August 1920, all of Turkey was partitioned into zones of influence: Constantinople and the Dardanelles were to be demilitarized, there would be an independent Armenia and Kurdistan, and Greece was to obtain both Thrace and Smyrna. By 1920, since the Powers were all dealing unofficially with Kemal and all unwilling to get involved militarily, the degree of unreality of the Sevres Treaty is astonishing. The publication of its terms gave encouragement to both sides for opposing reasons. In its immediate aftermath, the Greek forces achieved some military successes, which further extended their lines and manpower, but the Sultan's willingness to accept the dismemberment of Turkey inspired the Nationalists to revolt.

In October, during the Greek election, Alexander died from blood poisoning from a monkey bite; when Venizelos offered the throne to his

younger brother Paul, who refused it, the succession became an election issue. In the first election since Constantine's forced surrender to the Allies in 1917, the Royalist party won, Demetrios Rallis became the transitional Prime Minister, and Venizelos retired into exile in France, a "broken man" according to William Miller who saw him in Rome shortly afterwards. In December 1920 after obtaining a landslide majority in a plebiscite, Constantine returned as king. The Allies, who had not appreciated the depth of nationalist feelings aroused by their treatment of Greece during the war, were now free to withdraw even nominal support of Greece in Anatolia, and refused to pay any further reimbursements to Greece for expenditures incurred by her for their armies in Greece. The country was seriously split between the Royalists and the Venizelists, and political purges began to reverse the purges previously undertaken by the Venizelists, both among civilians and, more forebodingly, the military. Gounaris, the leader of the Constantinists, deferred to foreign opinion and stepped aside for Kalogeropoulos to become Prime Minister in February.

Despite election promises by the Royalists to cease hostilities and the mobilizations and to reduce taxes, in early January 1921 Constantine announced the continuation of the military campaign in Anatolia. The reasons for his fatal decision are still debated. It was the Greeks living abroad who actively supported the Great Idea and Venizelos. To abandon the Greeks in Asia Minor and sacrifice territory held by the army that was winning battles seemed "monstrous" (Polyzoides 1923, 544). In any case, with so much national pride and dreams placed in the Anatolian enterprise after its initial apparent successes, to persuade the Greek populace to accept a return of the army now and abandon the Great Idea was more than Constantine was prepared to do. An invitation in February 1921 by the Allied Supreme Council to attend a peace conference in London with Turkish representatives split the cabinet. The new Premier Kalogeropoulos told the Council that Greece was ready to clear Kemal's Nationalists out of Anatolia. The Council, however, responded with a proposal to modify the unratified Sevres Treaty, much more favourable to the Turks and leaving only the city of Smyrna occupied with Greek troops under the sovereignty of the Turks. Kemal rejected it and Gounaris immediately called up reserves and launched a new offensive which again achieved initial successes.

Constantine and his brothers led the Greek army toward Ankara. Despite the fact that Greece had been the Ally and Turkey the enemy, the Council declared it was a private war between Greece and Turkey and that the Great Powers would be strictly neutral, although that did not prevent France and Italy from sending aid to Kemal. In August the Greek army was defeated by Kemal, helped in part by bombs dropped

from French planes, beyond the Sakarius River in central Anatolia and withdrew. In October Stratos, the leader of the National Reformist Party, one of the opposition parties, demanded and was granted by Constantine a convocation of the National Assembly, which endorsed a visit to Paris and London by Prime Minister Gounaris and Foreign Minister Baltazzis to find a face-saving way out of the untenable situation, but the mission failed to bring about any immediate results. Lloyd George told them that, with the restoration of Constantine as King, it was absolutely impossible for the Greeks to remain in Asia Minor (Smith 1973, 248). Greece was in a state of war with the Turks, a war they did not have the military or financial resources to win, but which no one dared politically to resolve. The lives of two hundred thousand Greek soldiers plus many more undefended Greek inhabitants in Anatolia were at risk.

It was at this point in December 1921, as the Royalists were celebrating the first anniversary of Constantine's return from exile, that the twenty-one year old Gilbert Bagnani arrived in Athens. Kalopothakis, who had been the correspondent for the *Morning Post* during the war, invited him to tea where everyone seemed considerably surprised at finding that he was familiar with Greek politics (5 December 1921). At the same time, it was somehow determined that he was going to study the Roman Agora and the Tower of the Winds.

Within a week of arriving, after leaving letters of introduction, he was invited to tea with the Princess de Vicovaro, a sister of Mme Bouboulis, and there he met their family, the Skouzes, whom he calls the Skews. Alexander Skouzes (1853-1937) had been a lawyer, Deputy, and Minister of Foreign Affairs, and his family were all Royalists. In a few more days his invitations began to conflict between the Royalists and Venizelists like Alexander Carapanos, the Deputy for Arta and former Foreign Minister. By this time, he was already carrying on conversations in Greek, and reading the *Hestia* newspaper.

His first article from Greece for the *Morning Post* concerned a religious purge: the Venizelist Archbishop of Athens, Meletios Metaxakis, had been deposed by the Royalist government in December 1920 and, after travelling through America to rouse support for Venizelos, was now elected by the Holy Synod to be the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople. The government and Royalist bishops refused to recognize him and intended to convoke their own synod and elect their own Patriarch. Bagnani's viewpoint is that of the dispassionate though bemused observer.

At a dinner party at the Skouzes', he met the Italian Ambassador, Giulio Cesare Montagna, and members of the Serpieri family. Ferdinando Serpieri and his father were Italian engineers who had reopened the ancient mines at Laurion and reestablished the Greek

mining industry; their house in Athens later became the headquarters of the Agrarian Bank. "The dinner was excellent but never ending. We first had soup, then a large fish, looked like a sturgeon (by the way, the fish here is wonderful) with mayonnaise, olives, etc. Then came three courses of entrées of various sorts including a kind of Russian salad and small pieces of liver on toast, then turkey, and finally ground chestnuts and whipped cream, cheese, fruit and chocolates and sweets. Too much." The Princess de Vicovaro "took me aside a moment and told me where to leave cards. She said she wanted me to get to know the right people (i.e. read royalist circles)" (Friday 16 December 1921).

Gilbert left this party after Ambassador Montagna did about 11:00 p.m., and walked down the street to the Carapanos house. As it was still lit up, he went in to make the acquaintance of Carapanos. He met a woman named Peroglou who introduced him to Venizelos' secretary Politis, and they discussed Greek and Italian politics. Count de Rilly, the French Ambassador was there too, but Bagnani did not know him yet.

On Monday 19 December the Royalists were celebrating the first anniversary of Constantine's return from exile. There were crowds of people in town, many in national dress. The Royalists displayed banners as large as the houses. The entire city was illuminated, with festoons of bulbs being hung across Stadiou Avenue resembling a kind of gallery of light. The Serpieris had sent a car around to the Italian School, causing a stir there, with an invitation for Bagnani to go to their house after dinner. Assuming this would be similar to the previous dinner, he wore his dinner jacket and went around at 10:00 p.m. After passing the Evzone guards posted outside and seeing everyone else inside in tails, he was preparing an excuse for his hostess on his way up the stairs when "the footman flung open the doors and the first person I saw, standing in the center of the room, was Tino!!!!" [King Constantine] A beautiful blond woman wearing an electric blue dress embroidered in gold was the Romanian Princess Elizabeth, who was married to Crown Prince George. "The King was continually talking to a very striking woman. Old but very straight, with a wonderful mop of white curly hair (I thought it a wig but am assured it isn't) with what in other days must have been a wonderful face. Very suitably dressed too in black and silver with a long train. To cut it short, she seemed to me a grande dame of the 17th century & most decorative where she stood with the King (she is quite as tall as I am). Later on she came into the ballroom where I was talking to the lovely Skew, everyone paying her almost as much deference as to royalty. She came up and spoke to the Skew & so I dropped discreetly into the background till she beckoned to me with her finger and introduced me to —- Lady Law!!![4] I have come to the

[4] Catherine, the Greek widow of Sir Edward Fitzgerald Law, an expert in state finance.

conclusion that the two most imposing ruins of Athens are the Acropolis and Lady Law" (20 December 1921).

The next morning Bagnani had to go to the Athenian port of Piraeus to meet Doro Levi, his fellow student, who would eventually become the most eminent Italian archaeologist in Greece. After showing Levi the sites of Athens, he went to the Peroglou's house "The young Perogle was very much amused when I told her of my social life; she said though that I will have to be very careful if I want to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. Certainly of the two, the royalists have the chic and the Venizelists the brains... The Perogle told me that there is every probability that I will find the King when I call on the Ruin, so will have to put on my best clothes. This explains why at the Carapanos Friday none are in smoking [jacket] even; no danger of royalty calling there!" Mme Carapanos invited him to go to Aigina on her yacht and he met Col. Ghika, a Romanian military attaché, who was violently Venizelist (Tuesday 20 December 1921).

While he was visiting the Gripari family on 21 December, a paper was brought in with the news of an attempt to assassinate Admiral Paul Condouriotis, former Regent and prominent Venizelist. He did not think the government could be behind it since Condouriotis was very popular with everyone and all the government people he had spoken with considered the matter very serious politically (23 December 1921). He called on the Carapanos to hear the Venizelist version, but there too no one thought that the government was behind the attempt. The Griparis told him that the French Ambassador supported the Venizelists since he had been in Salonika with them, and recently had been provocative (30 December 1921). Members of the French Legation frequently turned up at the Carapanos (3 February 1922). When his friends the Courvoisiers planned to arrive in Athens Bagnani believed that, since they were related to de Rilly, who was known for his Venizelist sympathies, they could not expect to be greeted by any Royalist (4 March 1922). At Lady Law's, he met Mme Chariclée Baltazzi, the wife of Foreign Minister Georges Baltazzi, and Nikolaos Stratos, the opposition leader of the small National Conservative Party, as well as the man in charge of antiquities in Attica, Philadelpheus, the Incest (Friday 23 December 1921). A lot of [Venizelist] generals were being dismissed (25 December 1921) while others [Royalists] like Hadjianestis were awaiting new appointments (Hibben 1923, 545).

On Wednesday 28, the Director of the Italian School, Alessandro della Seta, finally arrived at the Piraeus. Bagnani, Levi and the third student Cattaneo, went down to greet him. Della Seta told him that he had heard much about him from Mrs Strong, the eminent Roman art historian and Assistant Director of British School at Rome. Bagnani told him that he had met the Italian Ambassador through the Princess de

Vicovaro, but della Seta told his students, looking hard at Bagnani, not to waste time in society, and gave him to study, in addition to the Roman Agora, the statue basis of Nemesis at Rhamnous with its reliefs (30 December 1921).

Bagnani met the Italian military attaché, Col. Ferdinando Perrone di S. Martino, who had known his father in London, and enquired from his friends at the Foreign Office about the political status of Mt. Athos for Miller in Rome: Greece had confirmed all its privileges by the Treaty of Berlin, which most people he had consulted regarded as a regular treaty and not just a protocol. Also, the frontier between Albania and Northern Epirus had been closed, and not even Carapanos, the Deputy from that district, had any influence on it (30 December 1921).

Ambassador Montagna gave a New Year's reception at which Bagnani met the members of the Italian Legation (3 January 1922). At the Carapanos, he met Prof. Soteriades of the University of Athens. As a Venizelist, Soteriades was expecting to be purged at any moment, and the Royalist and Venizelist students had come to blows over the purges. At one point students rushed into his classroom and stopped his lesson (3 January 1922). Soteriades had to lecture in the puristic Katharevousa language preferred by the Royalists while the Venizelists favoured the vulgar Demotic speech of the people (18 February 1922). On a climb up Mt Hymettos just east of Athens, Carapanos gave Bagnani his opinion of Stratos as a politician: a good administrator, debater and Parliamentarian, but not a leader. Bagnani spent Orthodox Christmas with Col. Hoare Nairne and his wife; his comment that Hoare Nairne spoke not a word of Greek[5] (9 January 1922) is interesting in light of his task, as the British military attaché in Greece, to visit and assess the Greek forces in Anatolia to report back to London (Smith 1973: 221-222, 273-275).

On 7 February Gilbert saw a wonderful sculptural relief that had just been discovered, and sent an article about it for the *Morning Post*, to be followed by articles about the Parthenon and the Patriarchal dispute. He hoped to see Sir Arthur Evans, who had come to Greece to visit Mycenae, Tiryns and Thebes again, and was in Athens discussing the transfer of his property at Knossos, Crete, with Wace, the Director to the British School (Evans 1943, 376). Another base with a relief carving resembling a hockey game was found in the Wall of Themistokles, less fine than the first one (4 March 1922), and Bagnani sent a brief notice to the *Morning Post* (9 March 1922).

On Tuesday 21 February Bagnani gave his talk about the Roman Agora at the Open Meeting of the Italian School, making use of slides that he photographed and developed himself. Many distinguished guests attended, mostly Royalists like Lady Law and the Skouzes, and

---

[5] "They made me milit. attaché without any qualifications for the job."

Bagnani had a challenge simultaneously looking after them as well as the Venizelists like Peroglou (22 February 1922).

In February, Greece seized an Italian ship carrying airplanes and a French freighter, the 'Espoir,' carrying coal to Kemal. Bagnani spoke with a naval officer in the Greek air force flying one of the seized planes who told him that the Turkish officers on board the ship had passports supplied by the Italian High Commissioner in Constantinople, Count Carlo Sforza (25 February 1922). Since Lloyd George refused to see him Gounaris appealed again to Lord Curzon, indicating that, since France, Italy and Russia were sending supplies to Kemal, if Britain could not support Greece, then the Greek army would have to withdraw while they still could. Curzon offered no military or financial aid, but suggested that the Greeks expedite a diplomatic solution for an orderly evacuation, while telling the Turks that he was trying to persuade Greece to withdraw from Anatolia (Nicolson 1934: 256-258).

In early March, Andreas Kavaphakes, the Director of one of the Venizelist newspapers, *Eleutheros Typos*, was murdered. Bagnani attended his funeral and the subsequent session of the Senate with the Italian legation (9 March 1922). Carapanos told him that the Venizelist party could support Stratos as premier under certain conditions, and Bagnani wondered whether Miller wanted him to conduct an interview with Stratos for the *Morning Post*, which he could arrange easily through Lady Law (13 March 1922). Another article on March 13 noted that the publication of a new newspaper, the *Eleutheron Bema*, indicated a revival of the Venizelist party.

On a brief trip to Delphi with the Murray Youngs of New York, he had their driver bring him a telegram with the names of the latest members of the cabinet. All the Deputies around Delphi supported Gounaris and the people in that region believed that Gounaris had not been successful because the Allies stood in his way. The local head of antiquities, however, was a Venizelist who had nearly lost his position after the elections and whispered to him that Venizelos was a great man (19 March 1922). Also at Mycenae, the custodian was an ardent Venizelist while most of the local people were supporters of Gounaris (26 March 1922).

On Saturday 25 March, Bagnani attended the Open Meeting of the British School, where a solicitor named Freshfield spoke about Byzantine Constantinople, and Stanley Casson the Assistant Director about his excavations in Macedonia. Bagnani's article on "Plea for Excavation in Constantinople" was dated 26 March but it did not appear in the *Morning Post* until 4 April. Grant, an editor at the *Morning Post*, made an offer to Bagnani, which he declined because, being away from Athens all spring and summer, he would not be able to keep in touch with the situation but he was willing to send him information from Asia Minor and for Smyrna in particular. Bagnani hinted that he

might reconsider the offer at the end of his term as a student in Greece as he found it an amusing experience (26 March 1922).

In Paris, a conference of the Allied Foreign Ministers in March proposed still more favourable terms for Turkey: a three months armistice, both Smyrna and its hinterland would be under Turkish rule, racial minorities would be under the League of Nations, the Greek army should evacuate Turkey, the Straits were to be demilitarized, and Greece would retain Adrianople in Thrace. Turkey was ready to accept provided that the Greek army evacuate Smyrna immediately and Asia Minor within four months. Greece announced her acceptance too, but simultaneously prepared for a Government of Ionia in Asia Minor. The Greeks abroad, mostly supporters of Venizelos, opposed the Greek army evacuating Asia Minor.

In a *Morning Post* article dated March 26 and entitled "M. Gounaris —Peace at any Price— Struggle to Continue in Office," Bagnani wrote "That the country is heartily sick of the war is absolutely unquestionable." Gounaris was prepared to evacuate Asia Minor, either because Kemal would never accept peace terms as some said, or because Gounaris wanted peace at any price, as Bagnani maintained. Gounaris had the confidence of the Parliament, but not of the Greek people.

On March 30 in an article entitled "Greece Relieved—Satisfaction Over Adrianople," Bagnani wrote that Greece was relieved that it would not be asked to surrender Adrianople and Gounaris would accept the peace terms as proposed in the Note by the Allies provided that they recognize the King. The Greek press pretended that his acceptance was only a basis for negotiations, but the Venizelist and Independent opposition politicians were screaming betrayal of Greece's interests. Bagnani wrote home that some of the Venizelists were even hoping that Kemal would reject the proposed peace terms. He himself felt that the Greeks had been badly treated and lamented the original British offer of territory around Smyrna. Parliament gave Gounaris a narrow vote of confidence, as Bagnani had predicted, and the Venizelists withdrew (2 April 1922).

Everyone was quite depressed about the peace terms, and Greece's inability to raise any funds abroad necessitated a "forced loan" to help pay the military expenses which barely passed in Parliament (6 April 1922). Formerly a Professor of Engineering, Petros Protopapadakis as Finance Minister had the currency cut in half into "crosses" (money which remained in circulation) and "crowns"(bonds to be redeemed by the state), with the result that the drachma fell to half its value. The drachma, which had been worth 24 to the British pound in 1919, sank to 70 in 1921, and 165 in 1922 (Miller 1928, 66). All Athens was illuminated for the Greek national holiday but the more ardent Venizelists did not support the flag (9 April 1922).

After giving a lecture on Cyrene in a school for the local Dante Alighieri Society on April 9, Bagnani joined the other students as they began their journey around the Peloponnese and western Greece. When he arrived at Olympia, he ran into Mme Courvoisier who told him that Lord Apsley, the son of Lady Bathurst, the owner of the *Morning Post*, was in Athens looking for him to ask him to become a permanent correspondent. Bagnani was annoyed to learn that Wace now knew that he had been writing for the newspaper (21 April 1922). Della Seta told Apsley that as Director of the Italian School he had to ignore such "outbreaks" among his students.[6] Another correspondent, still not identified, began contributing articles of a different political persuasion from Bagnani's (13 May 1922). Only in northwestern Greece, the region represented by Carapanos, did Bagnani find support for Venizelos (2 May 1922). The Italian consul at Ioannina told him that Sterghiades had been Governor there and had earned a reputation for being able but very violent (13 May 1922).

Gounaris resigned a second time, followed again by Stratos who resigned 22 May to make way for a Coalition Cabinet which included Stratos and Gounaris, led by Protopapadakis. Gen. Hadjianesti was appointed as Commander in Chief of the military. Despite the ideals implied by a "coalition," this was the cabinet that was doomed to pay the price for being in power at the wrong time. Many Royalists were ignoring the situation, discussing the illness of Princess Elizabeth, the wife of Crown Prince George (25 May 1922).

Public awareness in Athens of Bagnani's role as a foreign correspondent caused him difficulties as articles about King Constantine recently written by his successor were attributed to him. His own stance had been politically neutral, and he would henceforth refrain from contributing political articles to the *Morning Post*, since its political viewpoint no longer corresponded with his own (25 May 1922).

The Italians' hopes of excavating in Caria in southern Turkey were dashed by the evacuation of the Meander Valley leading to Ephesus some distance south of Smyrna (16 May 1922). As Bagnani was setting out for Rhodes, he was planning to write an article on the fourth centenary of the Turkish siege of the Knights Hospitalers of St. John and hoped to be able to go to England in the fall to lecture to the English Knights about it (30 May 1922). The Dodecanese islands had been seized by the Italians during their dispute with Turkey over Libya in 1912 and remained under Italian control until the Second War. The students stayed with the family of Amedeo Maiuri, the Director of the Italian Mission in Rhodes, in the Inn of the Auvergne in the medieval

---

[6] Soon Apsley would be flying to Iraq to negotiate with the Arab leaders there with the assistance of Gertrude Bell.

town and he became reacquainted with Count Alessandro de Bosdari, the Governor, who knew the Bagnanis in London. Bagnani loved medieval Rhodes, which he observed had more Turks and Jews than Greeks. On a brief visit to Bodrum in Turkey, he noted that the village was almost deserted of its Greek inhabitants, perhaps massacred he thought, all the shops were closed, and only Turks were in evidence. The Tower of England at the Crusader castle had been badly damaged by English bombardment during the war. The governor at Bodrum received orders from Kemal to facilitate the Italians excavating some tombs at a site north of town (31 May 1922).

On June 1 they arrived on Kos at Kephala, a small village near its west end. From here Bagnani excavated a little around earlier German excavations at Astypalaia while Levi discovered and excavated a Neolithic settlement in a cave at Aspri Petra. After a few days however, Maiuri wanted to go elsewhere looking for inscriptions and so they sailed to Kardamina about midway along the south coast. As the others rode their mules up to the village of Pili, Bagnani took a detour to see the Crusader castle near Antimachia. Setting out for the town of Kos, they passed the Byzantine castle at the deserted village of Palaio Pili. Based at Kos, Bagnani proceeded to excavate the Roman theatre south of town for the next three weeks (25 June 1922).

Briefly leaving Cattaneo to oversee this dig, Bagnani returned to Bodrum on June 19 where he heard that the Greeks had bombarded Samsun, a Turkish port on the Black Sea. After studying the Crusader castle, he sailed away the next day on the torpedo boat of Governor de Bosdari for Samos and Kos. Later in Rhodes he met the Russian Ambassador, Prince Demidoff and his wife. He took a postal ship to Smyrna on July 12 to visit the brother of their Italian maid who appeared very comfortably established. Smyrna had a population approaching 500,000, according to the American consul George Horton, who had resided there for a decade (Housepian 1972, 265). A very cosmopolitan port, it was the largest exporting city in Turkey, dealing especially in tobacco and carpets. There is no mention in Bagnani's letter of any concern about the future of Smyrna at this time (11 July 1922).

Both Bagnani and Levi were invited to return to the Italian School for the following year. The week of July 17 to 22 was spent in the disappointing excavation of a cave at Pharsalos in Thessaly, and Bagnani acted as the photographer/developer (25 July 1922).

In an effort to obtain a better bargaining position, on July 29 the Greek Government sent a note to the Allies declaring its intention of occupying Constantinople with Greek troops, and General Hadjianesti, the Greek Commander in Chief, transferred 25,000 troops from Anatolia to Rodosto, a port on the north shore of the Sea of Marmara. In response to a British warning against this action, Foreign Minister Baltazzi gave

assurances that Greece would not occupy Constantinople without Allied approval, which was refused. The following day the Greek Government proclaimed a protectorate over Smyrna.

Back in Athens in early August, Bagnani lunched with the Demidoffs where he met Col. A. C. Corfe from New Zealand. He was Chairman of a League of Nations Mixed Commission on Graeco-Bulgarian Emigration established to arrange the transfer of peoples in Macedonia. Corfe later introduced Bagnani to Drummond Wolf, who turned out to be the new correspondent for the *Morning Post*, although just when he began this position is not yet clear. He was also a representative of Armstrongs, the British aircraft and munitions manufacturer, which had just signed a large contract with the Greek Government (12 August 1922).

On Friday 4 August, British Prime Minster Lloyd George made an historically important and controversial speech in which he strongly supported the Greek claims to Asia Minor and Thrace. As a result, the Greeks believed they had British support to maintain their claims and occupation of Turkish territories, and wanted to proclaim an independent Ionia in Asia Minor; the Turks on the other hand may have felt they had to hurry before Britain sent support to the Greeks. What neither side knew was that Lloyd George had no support in cabinet for this policy and was speaking only for himself.[7] The Allies announced a peace conference to be held in September. While Athenians felt very supported by Lloyd George's speech, Bagnani said he was afraid that Lloyd George was a jinx because all his favoured nations seemed to end badly (12 August 1922). Bagnani was away visiting sites and museums in Crete from August 8 until 31, when he returned to Athens for a week before leaving for Rome and England.

Whether Lloyd George's speech may have set in motion the final calamity has been debated. On August 26 the Turks caught the Greek armies by surprise at Afyon Karahisar, and captured 50,000. The Greeks forces were scattered and increasingly separated, having lost their communications. Greeks fleeing toward the Sea of Marmara surrendered to the French who turned them over to the Turks. As their soldiers fled, Greek residents panicked and joined them, allegedly torching their own villages behind them. Greece appealed to the Allies to intervene but it was too late. The Turks, having the upper hand, refused an armistice. In his article dated September 9 and entitled "Greece's Disaster – Misled by Mr. Lloyd George," Bagnani wrote that Kemal had captured the railway lines between Afion and Eskishehr allowing him to concentrate his troops at any point along the front with great rapidity, and a general

[7] Lloyd George's political position is outlined in Churchill 1929, 414-417.

panic among the foreign colonies in Smyrna ensued. The Greek press blamed Stratos for having taken 50,000 Greek troops from the Turkish front to Thrace to support the Greek bluff against Constantinople. The Greek people still hoped that the Greek army in Thrace would attempt to occupy Constantinople by force if the situation in Smyrna became too desperate (but Constantinople was already occupied by British and French forces). The Greeks could hardly expect the French troops there to hold their fire as the Greek press was already printing names of French aviators allegedly supporting Kemal. Foreign Minister Baltazzi was powerless to muzzle the most violent articles in the press. As the Greek populace belatedly realized they would have to abandon Asia Minor, no one had had the courage to give the order in time and face the returning army. Stating that Lloyd George's policy of dilatoriness and rhetoric might have caused the ruin of European enterprise and influence in the region, Bagnani believed that Britain and France should finally agree and force Greece to leave Asia Minor to induce Kemal to an armistice. But events were moving too quickly.

At first defeated soldiers and then thousands of panicking residents from the interior began streaming into Smyrna and the port of Cheshme to the southwest. Major Davis of the American Red Cross estimated that about 150,000 Christians poured into Smyrna in early September (Housepian 1972, 265). Sterghiades and other Greek officials departed on Friday,[8] and on Saturday September 9 Turkish troops entered an undefended Smyrna. As order gradually broke down, looting, raping, and killing were seen, especially in the Armenian section of town.[9] The Greek Archbishop was hacked to pieces. Early on Wednesday fires deliberately set by the Turkish troops using cans of oil began to spread forcing anyone in hiding to try to escape to the harbour, where they were penned in by more troops. Ships of the British, French and Italian fleets lay at a distance in the harbour, at first refusing to take any but their own nationals to safety. Finally, despite orders to the contrary, they rescued perhaps 30,000 who were taken to Salonika and Piraeus.

Kemal declared that all Greek and Armenian males between eighteen and forty-five (including civilians) were prisoners of war and that the rest had only until October 1 to leave the area. After considerable international deliberation and heroic individual efforts, 180,000 refugees were taken to nearby islands, according to Commander Powell of the American ship Edsall. It is alleged that out of perhaps 400,000 Christian occupants of Smyrna at the time of the fire, since 210,000 were

---

[8] Sterghiades sailed to Romania and lived in exile in France, never to return to Greece. Smith 1973, 304-305.

[9] For a map of Smyrna, see the sketch facing p. 36 in Bierstadt1924.

transported to safety on nearby Greek islands, 190,000 were never seen again, although the figures of the dead and missing have been controversial.[10]

Faced with this catastrophe, the Greek coalition cabinet was powerless and resigned, replaced by a temporary government led by Triantaphyllakos, a former High Commissioner to Constantinople. Nonetheless, as the islands began to fill up with refugees with no food nor money, mutiny spread among the remaining Greek forces. With the remnants of their armies on the islands of Chios and Mitylene, Colonels Gonatas and Plastiras conspired to overthrow the Government, demanding the abdication of King Constantine and the imprisonment of the politicians. Martial law failed to quell the spreading revolt, and the King abdicated September 27, succeeded by his eldest son George II, and the cabinet resigned. As Greek troops entered Athens the next day, the Colonels ordered the arrest of the leading politicians and the expulsion of the royal family.

Able to communicate once again with the *Post*, Bagnani resumed submitting articles. In "The Bulgar Slayer," he concluded that, while court circles had been aware of the militarily impossible situation, no one had had the courage to admit it and order the evacuation of the troops, even after it had become a certainty as a result of the Allied note in March. Constantine was alleged to have positioned his political enemies at the front and Royalist shirkers near the back of the fighting, and hence the revolution broke out among the front line troops. In his next article on "The New King of the Hellenes," George and his uncle and mentor, Prince Nicholas, were believed to have been the actual leaders of the opposition to Venizelos in 1917, although Venizelos believed that George was dominated by his uncle. George was booed by his own troops at a review in December 1921.

As Kemal's troops disregarded the Allied neutral zone along the Straits and began to surround the British at Chanak on the Dardanelles, Lloyd George finally decided to hold firm and insist on a Turkish withdrawal. The Greeks were regrouping in Thrace but they were not even invited to participate in the negotiations at the harbour town of Mudania on the south shore of the Sea of Marmora. The British had little choice but to offer to hand over Constantinople as well as Eastern Thrace including Adrianople to the Turks to keep them from fighting the British through the neutral zone and attacking Constantinople. All the Christian inhabitants of Thrace, perhaps 250,000, began to leave immediately for Greek territory west of the Maritza River as the Greek

---

[10] Housepian 1972: 265; Clogg 1992: 97, says that 30,000 Greeks and Armenians were massacred in Smyrna. For a detailed account of the escape by the most famous refugee, Aristotle Onassis, see Fraser et al. 1977, 15-23.

troops protecting them there were soon replaced with Turks. There were no roads and the rail line was barely adequate to move the remaining troops. The silent procession of the refugees walking in mud for days in the pouring rain was observed and vividly described by a young Ernest Hemingway when he was a reporter for the *Toronto Star* (White 1985, 232).

In Athens more politicians and generals were arrested and charged with treason. Despite the plight of the swelling numbers of refugees, politics prevented government action. It was decided that "only through an independent, non-political organization could something be done," and the Refugee Treasury Find directed by Epaminondas Charilaos was established by the Greeks themselves to begin the Herculean task of sheltering and resettling the refugees (Morgenthau 1929, 71-78). Though less dramatic than the Smyrna disaster, and much less written about, the successful assimilation of over a million refugees within a few years by a country of only five million is no less worthy of commemoration as an illustration of Greek resilience.

Of significance for future relations with Greece, after months of turmoil in Italy Mussolini staged a peaceful coup in Rome. In England, for his near war with the Nationalist Turks at Chanak the Liberal Prime Minister Lloyd George lost the support of the Conservative Leader Bonar Law and resigned. On October 31 Bagnani was in London to address the Central Asian Society on "The Knights of St. John in Rhodes and Asia Minor;" this was subsequently privately printed, and a copy survives in the Trent Archives. With Kemal recognized as the effective leader in Turkey, he had the National Assembly abolish the Sultanate and declared Turkey a republic. Four governments (Greece, Britain, Italy and Turkey) had changed hands within a matter of weeks.[11]

In Greece, however, Prime Minister Gounaris, War Minister Theotokis, Foreign Minister Baltadjis, Interior Minister Stratos, Finance Minister and Prime Minister Protopapadakis, and Gen. Hadjianestis were charged with treason for having allowed the Turks to occupy Greek territory (which legally it had never been). Col. Plastiras, the leader of the revolution, demanded punishment as a purification (catharsis) because as Royalist politicians who had allowed King Constantine back, thereby alienating Greece's European supporters, they had not provided adequate financial aid to the armies (Papadakis 1923, 673). Despite British pressure, the politicians were executed hastily on November 28, while Admiral Michael Goudas and Gen Xenophon Stratigos were imprisoned for life. As a prisoner on trial, Prince Andrew (the father of Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh) was fortunate to be

[11] It is little wonder that the discovery and ongoing revelations from the tomb of Tutankhamen in Egypt from November onward came as a welcome journalistic relief.

allowed to go into exile. In protest against the executions, Britain recalled Ambassador Lindley. Venizelos, very much in touch with European governments, had to restrain the colonels, who still believed that they could militarily force the Turks out of Eastern Thrace.

The timing too of the executions was unfortunate because they interfered with Curzon's arrangement of the negotiations at Lausanne for Greece's benefit, and so he then invited Fridtjof Nansen, the Norwegian explorer acting as the High Commissioner for Refugees for the League of Nations to report on the refugees. As a permanent solution for irredentism, Nansen proposed a compulsory exchange of the remaining half million or so Christians and Moslems, along the same lines as the previous voluntary exchange of Greeks and Bulgarians in 1919. While it seemed inhuman to Curzon, it passed easily enough by the end of January so that the conferees could get on with negotiating more difficult boundary concerns along the Straits (Nicolson 1934, 300-302).

When Bagnani returned to Athens for a second year of study at the beginning of January 1923, his first problem was to find accommodations in a city filling up with refugees, although most were in the islands (19 January 1923). Both the Italian and British Schools were fully occupied with students. He asked both the Skouzes and Condouriotis families to look out for a room for him (3 January 1923). He then had to rush off to the Cycladic islands to join the other students there for a week on Santorini. The boat and the islands it stopped at were full of refugees (19 January 1923). When he returned Condouriotis helped him find a room in a pension at almost twice his housing allowance (20 January 1923). Levi had returned as well, and this year the new student was Giulio Jacopich; Bagnani felt that he was inclined to take things too seriously, although he got along well enough with the students and the Director (19 January 1923).[12]

Ex-King Constantine died in exile in Palermo, Sicily, on January 11, barely two years after his rapturous return to Athens. His health had never been very robust after he had had pneumonia, pleurisy and two ribs removed in 1915 (Michael, 1990, 53). As his burial in Athens was refused by the government to avoid public disturbance, his temporary resting place was at Naples: the Liberals, military and 125,000 refugees from Anatolia and Thrace now crowded into Athens would intensely resent any public honours for the man who caused all their disasters

[12] Both of the latter were Jewish, and years later, after the promulgation of the racial laws against Jews in Italy in 1938, Jacopich would be responsible for forcing Mario Segre, a Jewish epigrapher who worked for years on the inscriptions of Kos, out of the German library in Rome and the possibility of a job in America but into a jeopardy that would end with his death at Auschwitz (Barbanera 1998, 150-151). Jacopich worked for several years as the head of antiquities in the Dodecanese, and no other explicit evidence on the nature of his working relations with Della Seta or Levi is yet apparent.

and undo the reconciliation underway. John Metaxas and his wife were at the Serpieris with Bagnani but they had no news of the King's funeral. The *Daily Express* correspondent told Bagnani that to avoid censorship he sent his messages out of Greece by wireless from the boats (20 January 1923); nevertheless, Bagnani wrote that he did not try to contribute anything about the King's death because no one in Greece was allowed to comment on it. He was told by Kalopothakis that the government was tapping the wireless transmissions and would know all about them (9 February 1923).

After Ambassador Lindley's recall to London, the senior British diplomat in charge was Sir Charles Bentinck, a chargé d'affaires. According to him, the Greeks must have known that Lindley was not bluffing because Lord Curzon had informed the Greek Ambassador in London that if the men were executed Lindley would be withdrawn. Bentinck and Bagnani suspected that Kalopothakis had written the *Morning Post* article on the murders (20 January 1923). Until he actually saw each article, he was not sure which ones published by Grant in the *Post* he himself had written (9 February 1923).

In more *Post* articles, written on January 21 1923, Bagnani wrote that prices had soared but the streets were no longer crowded with refugees, who were all violent partisans of the present revolutionary Government, and many wanted to emigrate. A massive military build-up in Thrace by Gen Pangalos at great expense to a bankrupt country was not justified by the peaceful attitude of the Turks and was causing great consternation in Athens. Although the Venizelist press was claiming that the Greeks could easily defeat the Turks, the suspicion was rather that Pangalos intended to use the military to proclaim a republic, now favoured openly by many Venizelists. The execution of the five ministers would perpetuate the poisonous political life of the country. In an unpublished article about the recent declaration of an amnesty, he wrote that the Revolutionary Committee, away from the influence of Pangalos, was trying to conciliate its opponents but the ultra-Venizelists were not pleased with it (25 January 1923).

At the end of January Greece and Turkey signed conventions agreeing on an obligatory exchange of populations based on religion from May 1, 1923, with Moslems (some speaking Greek) having to leave Greece except Western Thrace, and orthodox Christians (some speaking Turkish) having to abandon Turkey except Istanbul. Perhaps a million people were to be forcibly exchanged by the end of the year, although the main movement did not begin until May 1, 1924 (Huntford 1998, 15).

In a published article dated February 4 and entitled "Bellicose Athenian Press," the press of all parties felt aggrieved at the Allied warning to the Greeks to respect the armistice zone. Some, however,

blamed the disaster on the Gounaris government and not the army and called for the use of force against Turkey. Some extremists even argued that the government had provoked the catastrophe just to abandon Smyrna (28 January 1923). In "Greeks & Serbs at Salonika - Expected Ending of Old Balkan Trouble," written February 4, Greece and the Kingdom of Serbia agreed to keep Salonika as an open port to provide an outlet to the sea for Serbia.

Bagnani sent off a brief note to the *Post* entitled "Gregorian Calendar in Greece – Church's Conservatism," explaining that Greece was converting from the old Julian calendar to the Gregorian by adding the missing thirteen days so that they would jump from Old Style February 15 to New Style March 1, 1923. The article was dated February 1 but not published until February 14.

Bagnani's mother was in Greece from the end of February until May. During that period, there is only a travel and expense diary to account for his moves, and the dates of the articles in the *Post* to illuminate the politics in Athens. Because of continued deportations of Greeks from the Pontus, Greece was postponing the exchange of civil prisoners, but eventually started the process by deporting 25,000 Moslems to provide houses for homeless Greek refugees. The Greek Government began to seize gold deposits and impose a retroactive capital tax. Foreign military missions were being dismissed for economic reasons.

At an Open Meeting of the Italian School, 15 March 1923 Levi spoke on excavations of the previous year at Kos, particularly in Aspri Petra and in the nymphaeion cave at Pharsalus; Bagnani illustrated a statue of Artemis from the Museum at Canea in Crete whose type was connected to that of the Artemis at Ostia, now in the Museo Nazionale delle Terme in Rome.

In a still enigmatic reference, Anna Cosadino was suspected of something, according to Mme Boubouli, and warned Bagnani, who destroyed her letters. Mme Pyrrhos Carapanos now claimed to have been a fool to be Royalist and blamed everything on Gounaris (diary entries for 1 April 1923).

On April 2 Bagnani and Levi set out for the Peloponnese. In Arcadia he was told that the people there were against Venizelos as they had suffered too much under him. Although the top local officials had been replaced during the Revolution, most of the people remained royalist. King George was not as popular as his father since people felt he should have abdicated because of the executions. The wife of a Venizelist prefect was collecting for the refugees (6 April 1923). The museum guard at Sparta was reluctant to reveal that he was opposed to Venizelos (8 April 1923). At Levitsova a monument to Constantine had been defaced, and there were more Venizelists in Lakonia. Some adult male refugees had been sent to Tripolis for propaganda purposes (9 April 1923).

Sailing to Gytheion, he met a thin young man in uniform who told him that he had worked in Smyrna and had been captured. While he had little to eat and thrashings were frequent, the same was true for the Turkish soldiers (12 April 1923). He then met a wounded captain returning home who was still Royalist like many others in the Mani (13 April 1923). For the first half of May, the students excavated at Poliochni on Lemnos. Stopping at Chios and Lesbos, he saw that these islands also were full of refugees. The large bay at Mudros had been occupied by the Allies during the war and dumps of empty tins and petrol cans were still visible. The churches at Salonika were interesting but full of refugees. The value of the Greek drachma was plunging on the currency exchanges (18 May 1923).

He met a colonel at Mme Bouboulis' who told him that he had accompanied the King and Queen around the Peloponnese where they had been enthusiastically received. On Monday 21 with Cosadino he visited Admiral Goudas in prison, where he was writing a history of the trial. Cosadino told Bagnani that Mme Baltazzi had grown very thin. Bagnani also visited General Stratigos who had been condemned but allowed to live at home because he was crippled with arthritis. Bagnani found him intelligent and less violent than some other Royalists. Bagnani believed that the peace agreement would not be signed before the end of June, and that the government would have to demobilize the troops and settle the refugees before they could hold elections. He asked his mother to convey to Miller a brief article that would not pass the censor: everyone was anticipating war as the only way out of Greece's dilemma, but hoping that England would force Greece to yield (24 May 1923). On Sunday morning 27 May, everyone was relieved to hear that Turkey had accepted the peace agreement, and that war had been avoided, as he had been predicting against the pessimists like Cosadino (27 May 1923).

Out in the Dodecanese again, the politics had not changed from the previous year, in that the Greeks were still awaiting annexation to Greece, which was not going to happen. The falling exchange rate had made Athens much more expensive than the Italian islands (6 June 1923). For a variety of reasons they were not able to work in Turkey, and therefore explored around the island of Karpathos. He returned to Smyrna to visit Ernesto again, and found him doing a good business helping to rebuild the city, as were his in-laws (20 July 1923), but his article for the *Post* on "Smyrna Today — Life Amid the Ruins" reveals details and the extent of the devastation. On July 24 the peace treaty of Lausanne was signed.

The Greeks refused to allow the Italians to dig on Lemnos on the ground that Greek archaeologists had not explored there yet, but they had allowed the French to dig on the newly acquired territories of

Thasos and Samothrace and so the Italians did not believe their reasons. Bagnani was also upset because he had been telegraphing a lot lately and the Greeks had intercepted one of his telegrams quoting a Venizelist newspaper. Coming to the end of his term as a student in Athens, he was willing to stay on as a paid correspondent to cover the upcoming elections, if they asked him (28 July 1923).

Bagnani toured the Averoff, one of the warships in the Greek navy. He was expecting Goudas and Stratigos to be released under the terms of the peace treaty (9 August 1923). He spent a fortnight on Mykonos staying with the Grippari family, who were all more or less violently Venizelist. After sailing twice to the nearby island of Delos, he submitted an article about it, "A Visit to Delos — Ancient Mart and Sanctuary." Despite a general strike, Greece ratified the Lausanne Treaty on August 26. The letters reveal that Stratigos was the "distinguished general" whose thoughts published by Bagnani August 21 in "Greek General on Policy of M. Venizelos" set off a debate in the *Post* between C. S. Hourmouzios of the Foreign Press in London and M.G. Grusuchi formerly of Smyrna. The last articles for 1923 concern attempts to arrange the Greek general election, but then they cease abruptly and intentionally.

On August 27 near Iannina in western Greece, unknown assailants attacked and murdered Italian General Tellini, the president of the commission for the delimitation of the Gréco-Albanian frontier and four members of his suite. Mussolini demanded an immediate apology, an inquiry, and 50,000,000 lire. Greece refused and on August 31 Italian troops occupied Corfu after a lethal bombardment. Greece appealed to the League of Nations over the incident.[13] Bagnani wrote to his mother that Italy was completely in the wrong and the Greeks had behaved very well about it. He postponed a planned trip with Mme Bouboulis through Arcadia. The Legation and Italian schools but not the School of Archaeology were being guarded by troops. At the Serpieris, Bagnani heard the Italian consul give the Legation's version of events. When Grant did ask Bagnani to cover the news for the *Post*, however, Bagnani refused, saying that as a member of the Italian School he could not compromise the School or the Legation (7 September 1923). Bagnani printed over one hundred photos of the crime for the Legation. Ambassador Montagna wanted a report on the political feeling in the area and Perrone, the Italian military attaché, a report on the military possibilities of the railway in the Peloponnese and where it might be vulnerable from the sea.

So, with Mmes Boubouli and Edoux (not yet identified) as traveling companions, he set out by train for the Peloponnese, possibly on Sunday morning the 16th. Decades earlier the Italians had built a trac-

[13] For a detailed account of the events, see Barros 1965.

tion rail line to bring ore down from Kalovryta through a gorge to the Corinthian Gulf at Diakopto. The travelers went up to the monastery at Megaspeleion and the village of Kalovryta before passing on to the waterfalls on Mt Chelmos where the River Styx supposedly originated. They were back in Athens by Wednesday 19 (24 September 1923). No trace of any report has yet been located.

Upon their return from Crete on Wednesday 5, Levi, Jacopich, Reggiani, and Cosadino were involved in a minor car accident in Athens. Anna Cosadino nursed Levi back to health and within two weeks Bagnani suspected that she was in love with him (24 September 1923). In 1928 they would marry in Florence (Gerlini 1995,170).

On September 19, the Greeks held a public funeral for the slain Italians, as part of their agreement. They paid the 50,000,000 lire on September 27, and the League pressured Italy to withdraw her troops from Corfu.

After being released from prison, Admiral Goudas invited Bagnani to join him on the island of Poros together with the Baltazzi family, and he stayed with them from Monday 1 until Thursday 4 October, before returning to Athens to sail for home. In November Henry Morgenthau, formerly American Ambassador to Constantinople, arrived in Greece as the head of the Greek Refugee Settlement Commission for the League of Nations. With loans from abroad, he was able to follow Charilaos' lead in providing for the permanent resettling of the refugees still sheltered in schools, churches, warehouses, etc. (Morgenthau 1929; see also Howland 1926 and Ladas 1932).

Censorship was increased, prohibiting any reference to the executed ministers, King Constantine or the individual Revolutionary leaders. In late October a military counter revolt of Royalists under Metaxas around the Peloponnese was suppressed. Military Republicans like Pangalos demanded a plebiscite on the monarchy. The frequently postponed Greek elections were finally held in December and the Venizelists and Republicans won in a landslide. At the request of Prime Minister Gonatas, on December 18, just three years after Constantine's triumphant return, King George and Queen Elizabeth left Greece for Romania, pending a plebiscite, with Condouriotis acting as regent again. On December 30, finally yielding to universal demand, Venizelos left Marseilles for Athens.

Over the course of the winter the widow of the executed Foreign Minister Baltazzi wrote several letters to Bagnani in Rome, at least four in French to him and one in English to his mother (these are in the Trent Archives). In the reprisals and purgings that followed the failed counter coup, Admiral Goudas had been arrested again and condemned to exile and his property seized even though it was proven that he had no knowledge of the attempted counter coup. Mme Baltazzi reported that

on the Sunday before the election, a peaceful demonstration of a quarter million royalists ended in a riot with several dead and many wounded when they were charged by machine guns and rifles. The opposition royalist parties therefore abstained from the election (27 December 1923).

In March Bagnani offered to translate Baltazzi's legal defense into French and English. For this and any other support, his aggrieved widow was very grateful. She blamed Venizelos for the assassination of her husband, who had the misfortune to be in the cabinet at the time of the catastrophe engineered by Venizelos (13 March 1924). She expressed her husband's opinions from his correspondence about some of the English individuals in London with whom he dealt as a Foreign Minister (28 March 1924). She wanted to send copies of the translation to anyone in Rome who had worked with her husband or Prime Minister Gounaris, and asked for help in getting their names, some of which she already had. She was deeply grateful for Bagnani's efforts to rehabilitate her husband's name abroad (3 April 1924).

On March 25 the Greek Assembly declared Greece a Republic pending the upcoming referendum, and on April 13 the referendum supported a republic.

Bagnani returned to Athens on Tuesday May 13, 1924, to find it packed with people and prices much higher than in Rome. Della Seta had married a violently jealous woman, and the Demidoffs had been ejected from the Russian Embassy by the Bolshevik minister. The American diplomat Henry Morgenthau had arrived, and William Miller the historian had moved to Athens in November 1923 (15 May 1924), but there had been a 'raffroidissement' between Bagnani and the Millers over Greek politics.[14] Being Venizelist, the Millers were considered rude by Lady Law. Perrone introduced Bagnani to the new Italian Ambassador Brambilla (26 May 1924)

Jacopich had been offered and accepted a position as inspector at Rhodes for two years. Despite not having a job, Bagnani believed that he would have been wrong to accept the position. Perhaps not completely serious, he admitted to becoming Royalist only after their fall from power, and did not see many during his short stay in Athens. He left Greece on Sunday May 25 for Istanbul and Trabzon[15] in Turkey (26 May 1924), and did not return again, despite repeated intentions to do so, until 1936.

In conclusion, the Greeks did not create the international situation that led to their being offered such a temptation as the part of a dis-

---

[14] By a coincidence, Bagnani mentions in a letter that Miller's dog was a nuisance, and Miller had a dog buried on the property of the British School at Athens, where he spent a lot of time in the library (Waterhouse 1986, 69, 78).

[15] It may be significant that Miller wrote a book on *Trebizond, the Last Greek Empire* in 1926.

membered Turkey inhabited by Greeks for three thousand years, but once offered it was hard for any Greek to resist it. At several stages the Allies could have intervened to prevent a militarily impossible situation from growing worse, but they did not. What is striking in Greece, however, is the bitter division between the political factions vividly and repeatedly exemplified in the Bagnani papers. Indeed politics seem to have been of greater concern to Athenians than the increasingly perilous situation in Turkey. Bagnani's letters highlight the social schism between the warring political factions, while his moderate stance and his family's background in diplomatic circles enabled him to remain in friendly contact with both sides. His position as a disinterested outsider with access to elite sources allowed him to articulate his unique viewpoint and astute insights to English readers. As such his articles provide us with a balanced yet vivid account of the lifestyles and thoughts among elite Athenians at a very tragic time for Greece.

The foregoing is a first preliminary attempt to present the sociopolitical aspects of the new material and, as such, may be emended in future. It is far too soon for an evaluation of Bagnani's value as an historical resource or as an historical analyst: much remains to be done. There are many names remaining to be identified, partly through genealogies, and their Italian connections need to be researched. References to contemporary events need to be investigated to understand the context and significance of conversations; copies of old Greek newspapers are being examined to bring into focus the historical events on a daily basis. As part of the larger Bagnani Project, records of the *Morning Post* from 1921 to 1924 need to be examined in England for any surviving correspondence with Bagnani.

It is due to the intelligence, foresight and generosity of Gilbert and Stewart Bagnani that so much was written, preserved, and donated to Canada for publication. As a result, the tumultuous events of an unhappy period in Greece's modern history may be seen in a new or clearer light.

Trent University

Works cited:

Bagnani, Dr. Gilbert. *The Knights of St. John in Rhodes and Asia Minor*. 1922.

Barbanera, Marcello. *L'Archeologia degli Italiani*. Rome: Editori Riuniti, 1998.

Barros, James. *The Corfu incident of 1923: Mussolini and the League of Nations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Bierstadt, Edward Hale. *The Great Betrayal*. New York: Robert M. McBride & Company, 1924.

Churchill, Winston. *The World Crisis. The Aftermath*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929.

Clogg, Richard. 2002. *A Concise History of Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Evans, Joan. *Time and Chance. The Story of Arthur Evans and His Forebears*. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1943.

Fraser, Nicholas, Philip Jacobson, Mark Ottaway, and Lewis Chester. *Aristotle Onassis*. Philadelphia and New York: Lippincott, 1977.

Gerlini, Elsa. "Doro Levi. Nota Biografica," in Guida and Floreano 1995, 169-178.

Guida, Paola Cassola and Elisabetta Floreano. *Mnemeion: ricordo triestino di Doro Levi : atti della giornata di studio (Trieste, 16 maggio 1992)* Rome: Quasar, 1995.

Glasgow, George. "The Greeks in Smyrna," *The New Europe* 25 March 1920, 253-256.

Hamdi, Abdullah. "The Burning of Smyrna," *Current History* November XVII 1922, 317.

Hibben, Paxton. "Betrayal of Greece by Lloyd George," *Current History* XVII January 1923, 545-551

Housepian,, Marjorie. 1972. *Smyrna 1922. The Destruction of a City*. London: Faber and Faber.

Howland, Charles P. *L'Établissement des Réfugiés en Grèce*. Geneva: Société des Nations, 1926.

Huntford, Roland. *Fridtjof Nansen and the Unmixing of Greeks and Turks in 1924*. Oslo, 1999.

Ladas, Stephen P. *The Exchange of Minorities, Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932.

Mackenzie, Compton. *Greek Memories*. London: Cassell and Company Ltd., 1939.

Macmillan, Margaret Olwen. *Paris 1919: six months that changed the world*. New York: Random House, 2002.

Mavrogordato, John. *Modern Greece: a chronicle and a survey 1800-1931*. London: Macmillan, 1931.

Michael, Prince of Greece, and Alan Palmer. *The Royal House of Greece*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1990.

Miller, William. *Trebizond, The Last Greek Empire*. London: S.P.C.K., 1926

_____. *Greece*. London: Ernest Benn Limited, 1928.

Morgenthau, Henry. *I Was Sent to Athens*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Doran, 1929.

Nicolson, Harold. *Curzon, The Last Phase, 1919-1925*. London: Constable & Co Ltd.,1934.

Pallis, Alexander Anastasios. *Greece's Anatolian venture—and after; a survey of the diplomatic and political aspects of the Greek expedition to Asia Minor (1915-1922)*. London: Methuen, 1937.

Papadakis, S. S. "The Greek Treason Trials," *Current History* XVII January 1923, 672-673.

Polyzoides, Adamantios Th. "The Greek Political Executions," *Current History* XVII January 1923, 539-544.

Smith, Michael Llewellyn. *Ionian Vision, Greece and Asia Minor 1919-22*. London: Allen Lane, 1973.

Sturdza, Mihail-Dimitri. *Dictionnaire historique et généalogique des grandes familles de Grèce, d'Albanie et de Constantinople*. Paris: M. Sturdza, 1983.

White, William (ed.) *Ernest Hemingway. Dateline: Toronto. The Complete Toronto Star Dispatches, 1920-1924*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1985.

Pedro Guerrero Ruiz & Tina Pereda Barona

THE DRUMS OF CALANDA OR LUIS BUÑUEL'S SPAIN

They asked him:
—Don Luis, where are you from?
Buñuel replied:
—I am Aragonese, (like Beethoven).

Luis Buñuel

The search for information about the past in the work of an intellectual reveals traces of his personality, his cultural character. We are, in part, our past, our childhood, our adolescence, and not just for psychological reasons but because experience begins to form during these first years of our lives. The case of Luis Buñuel cannot be explained in any other way. Luis Buñuel was clearly influenced by his hometown, his family, and his religious education among the Jesuits and at the Residencia de Estudiantes. In great part, his intellectual formation and personality evolved from life in his hometown (Calanda, February 22, 1902). Although his family moved to Zaragoza when he was just four months old, Buñuel's presence in Calanda was almost constant. He spent his summers there with his parents in villa Mariana, a house with a painted roof, green blinds and various corners with signs of aging. Whenever possible, Buñuel would return to Calanda to remember his childhood and listen to the beating of the Holy Week drums. His first interests, the years in Zaragoza and especially, his stay at the Residencia de Estudiantes in Madrid (which he entered on October 6, 1917), shaped a great part of his life's passion, his cinematographic work: "My memories of that period are so rich and so vivid that I am absolutely certain that if I had not lived in the Residencia my life would have been very different" (Buñuel, 59). The bleak lands of Teruel, located, as Buñuel said, in a state of temporal standstill, as if the Middle Ages had not ended, his childhood games, his sometimes primitive pastimes, the very harshness of the landscape, all these elements contributed to Buñuel's way of portraying the crude reality of *Tierra sin pan*, that "land without bread" which is Las Hurdes. The same dry realism produced those marauding bands of street children, children of the streets of Mexico City, in one of the most intriguing movies of his Mexican period, *Los olvidados*.

It is clear that, if Buñuel had not stayed at the Residencia de Estudiantes, the extravagant and surrealist fiction of the Aragonese director would not have been possible in *Un perro andaluz* and *La edad de oro*. Nor would he have been in contact with the intellectuals, artists, writers whom he met in Madrid: Federico García Lorca ("talkative, charming, inclined to elegance, his glance dark and brilliant, he had a magnetism which no one could resist... He wasn't the least bit effeminate nor was there the slightest affectation in him... while he did not believe in God, he conserved and cultivated a great artistic sense of religion..."), Rafael Alberti ("...one of the greatest figures of our group. At first we thought he went in for painting..."), Pedro Garfias ("a man who could spend two weeks searching for an adjective..."), José Moreno Villa ("talented painter and writer"), José Bergamín ("skinny, sharp, from Málaga. Along with a fondness for 'preciosismo' he cultivated word games and paradoxes, as well as some old Spanish myths such as the Don Juan or bullfighting ones"), José María Hinojosa ('as modern and daring in his poetry as he was conservative in his ideas and political behaviour"), Salvador Dalí ("in spite of the admiration that a great part of his work still inspires in me, it is impossible for me to forgive him his fiercely egocentric exhibitionism, his cynical adherence to Francoism and most of all, his declared hatred of friendship"), Manuel de Falla ('rather like a sacristan, but a good person"), Valle-Inclán ("what is admirable in him is the language: archaisms, neologisms, Mexicanisms, Valleinclan-isms..."), Gómez de la Serna ("perhaps the most famous figure in Spanish letters"), Gutiérrez Solana ("crude, very interesting. He had a great booming voice"), Unamuno ("he was a famous person, very serious, rather pedantic, and without the least bit of humour") (García Buñuel, 61-62). If Buñuel had not known all these individuals or the other classmates and people who passed through the Residencia or whom he met during his stay in Madrid, surely his life would have followed another quite different creative path.

During this period, Buñuel enjoyed himself with his fellow residents. Together they invented "los putrefactos" (a mocking name for anything bourgeois and conventional), surrealist poetic games such as anaglyphs, as well as the fartometer. Rafael Alberti described this last invention as a square wooden box with a candle inside. A string was hung inside the box at a certain distance from the flame but at the same height. The merit consisted in the intensity of the air that each contestant was able to expel into the orifice. A powerful fart was needed in order to make the flame bend and light the string. They also created the Order of Toledo. Buñuel declared himself "Condestable" on the day it was founded, March 19, 1923. Pepín Bello was Secretary and founding members were García Lorca and his brother Francisco, Garfias, Centeno, Uzelay, Sánchez Ventura and one woman, Ernestina González.

Some of the members were named Knight of the Order, among these were Alberti and María Teresa León, Jeanne Rucar, Dalí (later "demoted"), Hinojosa, Ugarte, Lulú Viñes, and then there were squires. To be a knight one had to love Toledo without reserve, get drunk for at least one night and wander along her streets; those who went to bed early remained squires. On the way back from that fervent drinking expedition through the taverns of Toledo (preferably in the Venta de Aires) with Yepes wine, they would stop at the tomb of Cardinal Tavera, sculpted in alabaster by Berruguete. The face of this sculpture appears in the movie *Tristana,* when Catherine Denueve leans on it. One of Buñuel's inventions was to throw water from the balconies of the Residencia and douse the people passing by, "spring showers" they called it. Buñuel recreated this habit in a scene in *Ese oscuro objeto del deseo,* when Fernando Rey throws a bucket of water on Carole Bouquet.

As we can see, Buñuel's childhood and youthful adventures are repeated as "winks" in his movies. They form an anthology of oddities and magical realities that have nothing to do with symbols but rather with actual occurrences or ones dreamed up by an overwhelming, ironic, and whimsically transgressive intelligence concordant with Buñuel's cultural personality.

Most of the Spaniards who gave the country prestige in this century spent time at the Residencia. The entire Generation of '27 (Bergamín called it the "Generation of the Republic") passed through there. Buñuel's relationship with members of the Spanish *avant-garde* was more important than all the readings of Surrealist manifestos or his fervent friendship with André Bretón, the champion of Surrealism. In this sense we can affirm that Buñuel was already a Surrealist before the defining characteristics of this movement were established in films.

The same thing happened with a great deal of his later films, based on experiences or readings on internal conflict and are an indication of a fanatical reality which originated in his childhood and adolescence in Spain. The adventures of Father Nazario in Mexico (adapted from Galdós's *Nazarín*), have a feeling of methodology of doubt, which in Buñuel always functioned as a phenomenal device not for rhetorical discussion, but rather digression and unease. In other words, what was *Viridiana* if not an innocent albeit powerful blasphemy, capable of rocking the foundations of the most obsolete Vatican theology, a sort of disbelief in his religious education? What about the Parisian bourgeoisie that Buñuel knew so well and depicted in his magistral *Discreto encanto de la burguesía*? What was it but the denouncement of the absurdity of an endogamous and drowsy microsociety lacking stimulus or response?

Where do most of his films' "winks" come from, the rebellious Buñuelesque itinerary, the coarseness, if not from his childhood adven-

tures? Blind men in *Los olvidados* and *Viridiana*; there was also a blind man in Calanda whom the children used to insult and throw cow patties at. He responded by wildly brandishing his cane and hitting anyone he caught unawares. The family kitchen in *Diario de una camarera.* The dead donkeys, rotting, like that dead donkey in Calanda that Luis Buñuel had seen lose an eye to the birds feeding on the carrion. This scene made a deep impresssion on Buñuel but he was unable to repeat it in *Abismos de pasión* because, according to Pedro Christian García Buñuel, the Mexican vultures failed him. Donkeys in *Un perro andaluz* and in *Las Hurdes.* Shouts, boys, and girls jumping rope, the miracle of Calanda. Or is Buñuel different from Goya or Gutiérrez Solana, in a black Spain that survived, coexisting with the intellectual *avant-garde*?

No one can free himself from his childhood, from that childish culture painted in black, developed in black and white, between life and death. Buñuel said: "The thought of death has been familiar to me for a long time. From the skeletons paraded through the streets of Calanda in the Holy Week processions, death forms a part of my life" (Buñuel 17). That is the way he talked of death, with a true critical naturalness, almost always free from symbolism, as different pseudo-scholars of film criticism and psychoanalysis have thought: the mutilations of eyes, Viridiana's leg, the insects, the snails, the cows... and the drums of Calanda in *La edad de oro, Nazarín* or *Simón del desierto.* The emotion of hundreds of *calandeses* playing the drums between noon on Good Friday and two o'clock of the following afternoon, the time that elapsed between the death and the resurrection of Christ, produced a profane emotion in Buñuel, an echo of his infancy. According to someone who knew him well, when he was away from Spain he always played the drums at the same time as the *calandeses*, surprising his neighbors, because of the time difference, in whatever country he was living.

From where did he get the education, the attempt at a Jesuit education, of which there are complex traces in his cinematographic "scandals"? It is thus that the literary Buñuel, in his writings, screenplays, and films, harmonized his own national episodes, what he saw, enlarging a world which seemed small and unknown until a totally free eye made him see it and he proceeded to show it to us in all its realism.

Buñuel's life, the source of his cultural life, is to be found in his childhood and youth. Nevertheless, today we might say that because of his intellectual daring, his transgressive personality, his uncontrollable and unsubmissive conscience set in permanent rebellion, Buñuel's genius went further than the road he traveled (even though it was the land and peoples of Spain, their culture and the countryside, which gave the first glint of brilliance, the first drum rolls, to the encounter that would last his whole life). He is currently considered a true revolutionary of cinematographic ideas, a filmmaker between Classicism

and the *avant-garde*. In this sense, we could affirm that any movie of Buñuel's, could be considered today, a masterpiece in harmony both with the present time and the future of filmmaking. This is the modernity of the ideas and of the works sprinkled with the genius of the artist who on his first trips to Paris already knew what perspective his future work would take.

Even though it is unthinkable to study Buñuel without knowing his concept of Spain, which clings to the soles of his shoes in his explainable wanderings, it is not simply the past of a creator that shapes him. The keenness of his intellectual vitality, of his own efforts, also plays an important part. As pointed out in Luis Buñuel's letters to Francisco Rabal (Guerrero Ruiz, *Querido sobrino*). Buñuel had Spain at his heels. But we also see in him the fusion of his life in Paris, the knowledge of the artistic and social avantgarde movements (that is, the Surrealist movement, to which Buñuel belonged, and the Communist movement), in a Europe in crisis and a Spain in lethargy starting in the 40s, after the Fascist victory in the Spanish "Uncivil" War.

Buñuel was always involved in the *avant-garde*, withdraws when that vanguard forgot Man as a free individual, becoming unsubmissive, carrying in his ideological baggage a special form of Iberian anarchism, a detachment from dogmas, a rejection of the position of the masses led by saviours of ideas or of countries. "Against Franco we were better off" (Guerrero Ruiz, *Querido sobrino 83*), he had read on a wall in Madrid, and thus he ended his days, mistrusting the disideologized movements of transition, between the vanguard of his own ideas, his own religion and the vitality of a critical, alert, avantgarde and sceptical spirit.

Spain is always in Buñuel and in his cultural personality, so is the Spanish Civil War, his exile and return to Spain to see his ill mother. Thanks to the good offices of Paco Rabal he was able to obtain a visa. Also present in Buñuel are the memories from Mexico, of time spent with Garfias, Rejano or León Felipe, and his stays in Madrid, at the Torre, and the Viana café, with Barros, Bergamín, Saura, Rabal or Justo Alonso.

Spain at his heels, as Julio Alejandro Buñuel's scriptwriter who died forgotten by, with the Mediterranean at Jávea,would say in his "Testamento oral", a cassette conserved by Francisco Rabal in which Alejandro informs Rabal about aspects of the life and thoughts of Buñuel and his relationship with the actor from Aguilas, Spain in the shaping of his personality, in his dreams, in the dispersed and different gags, in the intimacy of his inhabited celluloid geography, in a new film, in a poetic film, in the new poetry, in the fight for a new form of expression within a complex industry. Admired by Man Ray, Aragón, Bretón, Giacometti, Huston, Hitchcock, Billy Wilder, John Ford; rewarded in Cannes, in Hollywood, in Berlin, a victim of a deafness caused by pis-

tol shots (one of Buñuel's inexplicable hobbies, as was boxing), genius of ellipsis, of documentary films, of transgression, of denouncement; recognized internationally as the best director of Spanish filmmaking-only Spanish? He was not a good patriot because he was not a flag-waving patriot; prodigal son of the Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church, expelled from the United States because he was a Communist and an atheist, according to Dalí. And *Tristana*, his last Spanish movie, which he was able to make because of an old Republican from Lorca, Rafael Méndez, who spoke with Fraga Iribarne so that Buñuel could film in Spain after *Viridiana* was denounced by the Vatican as heresy, a blasphemy against the Catholic Church.

Buñuel's Spain is also the place of his dreams, his experiences and his wild imagination. In his dreams he spoke with his deceased mother and he saw her lost among the shadows, as he would later show in a sequence in *El discreto encanto de la burguesía*. He also had dreams of animals and insects. And Buñuel following the old custom of Spanish children, dressed-up in disguises of monks and nuns, bandits and waiters, priests or Franciscans. The amusing and surprising Buñuel.

Between April and May of 1932 Buñuel filmed *Las Hurdes*, which, given sound in Paris in 1937, was first mutilated and then forbidden by the censors at the height of the Republican period. This tremendously crude movie, considered one of the most important documents of realist film, reveals an isolated region, where its incredibly underdeveloped inhabitants suffer illnesses, the consequences of cretinism, congenital problems and live barefooted in squalid houses. Poverty, hunger, misery... Buñuel was able to film all this thanks to his friend Ramón Acín, who won the lottery and gave him the money, as did some other friends, to make the film. The Spain that Buñuel presents is the real one, the human geography of a truly harsh documentary, the final product as harsh as the two months during which he was filming and living among the people of Las Hurdes. His return to Spain after a long exile in Paris, the United States and Mexico is due to Francisco Rabal, whom he met in 1958 and with whom he had filmed *Nazarín*. Knowing that Buñuel liked Spanish wine and that he collected antique pistols, Rabal took him a bottle of wine and a seventeenth Century pistol. At their first meeting they decided to call each other uncle and nephew. Rabal tells it thus:

"On my fourth day in Mexico, Barbachano takes me to Buñuel's house, a small villa at number 27 on Cerrada de Félix Cuevas Street. There lived the director, who was 58 years old at the time:

How are you, don Luis?

Fine, and you? But don't call me don Luis.

It's just that I respect you a lot...

— Good, good, Paco — Buñuel then laughed. Very Spanish, I like

that respect thing. Look, from now on you will call me uncle (and use usted) and I will call you nephew (and use tú). So, from now on, uncle and nephew."(Rabal 198-90).

By then Buñuel was already going deaf. Paco Rabal would listen to Buñuel talk to himself each morning in order to see if he could hear himself and thus know how his deafness was progressing. Buñuel was an extraordinarily interesting person. He was contagious and would let you act and improvise; very sharp, affectionate and always joking around, according to Rabal. Later, in 1959, when Rabal was making *Sonatas* with Bardem in Mexico, he often visited Buñuel. There he met Juan Rejano, Pedro Garfias and León Felipe, among other Spanish exiles that were friends of the director. The encounters with the Murcian actor were to talk about Spain.

From 1960 to 1982 Buñuel wrote some 30 letters to Rabal, as well as two telegrams and several notes. They indicate the profound and intimate memory that Buñuel had of Spain, as well as the contempt he felt towards certain Hispanic attitudes and the cultural situation that was nothing else but an extension of the political situation. Here is a transcription of two letters and a note from Buñuel to Rabal in which we can see the steps taken by the actor so that Buñuel could return to Spain.

The first letter reads:

Mont Fleury Hotel

(handwritten on the right hand side of the letter)

I can see my hopes of sitting down to a card game at Doña Salvadora's house drifting away again.[1]

Cannes, May 8, 1960

Dear nephew,

Thank you so much for you very effective intervention. The consulate in Paris did in fact notify me that the visa was ready. But the next day I received another telegram saying exactly the opposite because apparently certain "formalities" hadn't been taken care of. They say that they will let me know when everything is in order. I don't know if it will take them a day or a month. What I do know though is that if my visa isn't ready by the 15th then I'm going back to Mexico. At any rate, your activity, interest, seriousness, and INFLUENCE[2] *have sped up the process in*

---

[1] According to Rabal, Buñuel means to say "Doña Julia", in Madrid.

[2] Ever since the filming of *Nazarín*, Buñuel had told Rabal about his desire to return to Spain. He felt very close to Spain, both physically and culturally. In Cannes he told his actor friend: "If I could enter Spain, it's so close.... I'd go to Zaragoza, to see my mother who is very sick. See if you can arrange." The actor, with the help of his brother Damián and Justo Alonso, spoke with Enrique Llovet, a diplomat with a friend who worked in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and dealt with the exiles who wanted to return to Spain and were required to present an enormous amount of paperwork.

this matter which not even Rodrigáñez,[3] *Pepín,*[4] *Dominguines*[5] *nor anyone else could move along even a centimeter before your help.*

I received Ricardo's[6] *telegram, give him a big hug. I hope I will be able to do so myself soon.*

Lots of kisses for my niece and my little grandchildren[7] *and the same for you. Your Uncle Luis.*

(handwritten addition)

My film[8] *was shown in a gala session yesterday. A great success.* (Guerrero Ruiz, *Querido sobrino 17*)

In the second letter Buñuel says:

Mont Fleury Hotel
Cannes, May 10, 1960

Dear Paco,

Most active nephew, helpful and influential,[9] *I can't believe that you exist. Three days ago the Consulate notified me that this time it was serious and I have the visa that will save me from being jailed in Spain. All this thanks to you.*

Cesareo,[10] *whom I did not know personally, gave me your card yesterday after the showing of "Los golfos" when I went to give those two wonderful boys, Portabella and Saura*[11] *a hug.*

Juan Luis[12] *talked to you on the telephone today because I cannot hear anything.*

Along these lines Rabal comments: "Thanks to Llovet's friend, who turned out to be a great admirer of his [Buñuel], and the Spanish Consul in Paris, who was a friend of his, Buñuel did not have to wait for months and months as I was afraid he would." (Rabal, 197). So, the process for Buñuel's return to Spain was expedited. He heard the news while in Cannes presenting *La joven* (a story about racism and eroticism). In Cannes, Buñuel met Carlos Saura who was showing *Los golfos*, a film Buñuel liked.

3 Eduardo Rodrigáñez. According to Rabal, he was a friend of Buñuel's and tried to help him return to Spain.

4 Pepín Bello.

5 The Dominguín brothers: Domingo, Pepe and Luis Miguel.

6 Ricardo Muñoz Suay. He had invited Buñuel, as a member of Uninci, to film in Spain. The director refused the offer, on that occasion, for political reasons.

7 Here he refers to Paco's wife, María Asunción Balaguer, and their children, Teresa and Benito.

8 Buñuel refers to *La joven*, which was shown at the Cannes Film Festival.

9 The underlining here is copied from the original.

10 Cesareo González, the producer.

11 Buñuel met Pere Portabella and Carlos Saura at the Cannes Film Festival.

12 His son, Juan Luis Buñuel (1934). He worked as assistant director in *Diario de una camarera, Ese obscuro objeto del deseo, La joven*, and *Viridiana*.

I leave on the 15th for Paris.[13] *I'll pick up my visa on the 16th and leave on the 17th for that unknown land, —sadly, it is not the land I knew— called Spain.*[14] *I'll go to Barcelona to see my sister, then I will spend seven or eight days in Zaragoza*[15] *and then you will see me in Madrid around the 1st of June.*[16] *I will let you know the exact details of my arrival.*

I would like to see the great sentimental-cynic Ricardo[17]*in Paris, I will be in that city on Monday the 16th. Send me a telegraph to CIMURA*[18] *letting me know where he is staying so that they can give me the address.*

Many, many hugs from Luis B.) (Guerrero Ruiz, *Querido sobrino* 29).

Once in Spain, Buñuel comments the following in a note to Rabal:

---

[13] According to Rabal, Buñuel journeyed to Spain directly from Cannes (Rabal, 198).

[14] It was not the Spain that he had known. Luis Buñuel served the Republic in the Civil War. According to his friend, José Luis Barros, Buñuel's great adoration for Spain sometimes caused him to lose objectivity when he talked about some of the unforgettable things of this country, such as the people. However, Buñuel did not feel Spain in a patriotic sense, which is also the case with Rabal. For Buñuel, love of God and country brought repression and blood. According to Carlos Fuentes (*ABC.es*, "Centenario de Buñuel", Carlos Fuentes, March 5, 2000) "patriotism, chauvinism, political ideologies are counted among the things which Buñuel did not tolerate. On the other hand, he used to clarify his anarchist imperatives. For Buñuel, anarchism was a wonderful but unworkable idea. Its only throne was thought. As an idea, blowing up the Louvre Museum was a splendid one. As a practice, it was atrocious. The wise Buñuel distinguished the freedom of the imagination from the restrictions of reality" (2).

[15] His mother (María Portolés), two brothers and three sisters lived in Zaragoza.

[16] About his return to Spain, Carlos Saura says: The country had been profoundly modified after a terrible civil war and a no less terrible post-war period. I lived through his persistent search for his past through the streets of Madrid and Toledo, and saw how reminiscence appeared constantly. At the same time I was a witness to his sadness upon seeing how so many things had disappeared or had changed. In the sixties we still suffered the severity of Francoism, sometimes with extreme virulence. Returning to Spain was an act of bravery and a challenge. From Mexico the criticism intensified: he was called a traitor, he was harshly attacked in Republican circles. Those of us who knew him here know about his doubts and hesitations, his deafness and his emphysema, which worried him so much. On more than one occasion he was about to catch a plane and return to Mexico (...) But soon he would brighten up, especially when he could hear better, because his deafness was temperamental. He liked to eat and drink with his friends and his conversation was pleasant and entertaining. He was an old-fashioned conversationalist, a "tertulian". He commented on the divine and the human, always with his Aragonese slyness and that surrealism that has been mentioned so often, but which, in my opinion, was nothing else than a constant of his personality with anarchist outbreaks and a youthful and provocative aggressiveness that was present in his films and in his daily life as well, a resource inseparable from his personality. His quick remarks had a special wit. He enjoyed breaking the established order, the accepted norms, the commitment acquired by the contrivance of laws, but at the same time he adopted an ethical posture against hypocrisy and conformity" ("Surrealismo ibérico y mordaz", in "El Espectador", February 20, 2000, supplement of *El País*)(11).

[17] Ricardo Muñoz Suay.

[18] According to Rabal this was the agency that represented Buñuel in Paris.

Zaragoza, May 24, 1960[19]

Dear nephew Paco,

I will call you at your house next Sunday, the 29th, at 11 am and if you are up we'll get something to eat together.[20]

Big hugs. Buñuel.) (Guerrero Ruiz, *Querido sobrino 31*)

Later on, the relationship between Buñuel and Spain, whether in letters or in visits he made, would always be filtered through his adopted nephew, the actor Paco Rabal. Rabal, along with his family and some friends, including José Luis Barros, Carlos Saura, José Bergamín, Pittaluga, Luis Miguel Dominguín, Fernando Rey and Damián Rabal (the actor's brother), knew everything that was going on. Francisco Rabal kept him informed about all the important events.

---

19 Handwritten note. Buñuel arrived in Port-Bou on the 17th. His sister Conchita was waiting for him there "in order to warn him of any incident or possible arrest. But nothing happened." (Buñuel, 273). Buñuel spent eight days in Barcelona with his sisters Conchita and Margarita. Then he wrote to Paco Rabal on the 24th from Zaragoza where he was with his mother. He indicated that he would arrive in Madrid on the 29th. Buñuel´s mother trusted her son greatly and had assisted him economically during 1947 and 1948 when he was without work in Mexico. She also loaned him money to make his first movie, *Un perro andaluz.* She now had Alzheimer's disease and Buñuel told Paco that she had not recognized him but instead had said very politely:
" -Please come in sir and have a seat. Oh good, well, anyway, here we are. How are you?
Every now and then he would say:
-Mother!
And then she would look at him with tenderness in her eyes, take his hand and say:
-My son...
But then she would change the topic and would forget again..." (198). At the beginning of *Mi último suspiro* Buñuel discusses the importance of memory loss, its different levels and the situation it produces. Buñuel's biography *Memoria* commences with these words: "During the last ten years of her life my mother lost her memory little by little. Sometimes when I would go to see her in Zaragoza, where she lived with my siblings, we would give her a magazine which she would look at carefully from cover to cover. Then we would take it away from her and give her another one that was actually the same one. She would look at it with as much interest as the first. She reached a point where she did not even recognize her children. She did not know who we were or who she was. I would go in, give her a kiss and sit with her for a bit. Physically my mother was very fit, quite agile for her age. Then I would leave the room and come in again. She welcomed me with the same smile and invited me to sit down as if she were meeting me for the first time and did not even know what my name was." (9)

20 Even though Buñuel was staying at the Torre de Madrid, he went to Paco Rabal´s for lunch. "He came in teary eyed, full of emotion. According to Rabal, Buñuel said:
-What good people there are in Spain, Paco. You can't imagine how good the taxi driver who brought me here is, how honourable... The only thing I don't understand are the horrible Spanish colds: *uff, uff, jum, jum,* they cough like this and spit in the streets. I don't like that at all. But for everything else, they are very good people." (Rabal, 198).

After his movie *Viridiana,* which Bollero called "that necessary and inflammatory blasphemy" (Guerrero Ruiz, *Francisco Rabal,* 74); Buñuel had problems filming *Tristana,* problems that were later resolved. *Viridiana* had created a tremendous stir in the Franco era. Produced by UNINCI and UNIESPAÑA, it made it past the first censors, only to have the Franco regime repudiate it as a Spanish film and fire the General Director of Cinematography, José María Muñoz Fontán, after he received the Cannes Palme d'Or in 1961 for this film. This happened because the voice of the Catholic Church, *L'Observatore Romano,* had, the day after the projection of the film and its receipt of the prize, published an editorial in which it called the movie "blasphemous" and said that it was inconceivable that Spain had participated in its presentation.

On March 18, 1963 Buñuel wrote to Paco Rabal from Mexico: "Indeed, I am going to make TRISTANA. It is quite an adventure. I have spent months selecting this subject (...) In this case my objective has been to make a movie that is perfectly reactionary in its form. My intention is to make it so that even a court of bishops will find nothing to cut. What's more, I would like one of the prelates to say: 'stop the projection, we're reactionary enough for everyone'" (Guerrero Ruiz, *Querido sobrino,* 47). In this ironic fashion Buñuel tried, once more, to outwit the Franco censors, but the prohibition against filming *Tristana* was not lifted until 1969.

To explain the life and works of Buñuel, in relation to Spain and during the 60s until the death of the director from Teruel, we need to turn to his correspondence with Rabal. This correspondence is important to understand his cultural interest in Spain and its myths. In a letter that he wrote to Rabal from Mexico on July 29, 1967, Buñuel expresses his opinion about the different versions of *Don Juan*:

> I have been rereading all the theatrical Don Juans that have been written, starting with the first one: Tirso (horrible), Moliere (some lines are acceptable), Goldoni (mediocre), Dumas (well, that version's the father of Zorrilla's, it premiered six years before Don José's), Rostand (foul), Pushkin (inoffensive). Don't you think that from a cultural perspective it would be good for the T.N.P. to put on Dumas's Tenorio before Zorilla's, to show how one author is inspired by another and manages to surpass him, as is the case of Zorilla's Don Juan and Dumas's? (Guerrero Ruiz, *Querido sobrino,* 66).

In his letters to Rabal Buñuel goes on to tell him what his projects are and asks that Rabal inform him about happenings in Spain. He wants to make a movie with him in France, asks if they cut out the laughing Christ in the premiere of *Nazarín* and wants to know what Rabal thinks of the situation in Spain.

On October 23, 1979, he writes from Mexico and asks Rabal: "When will we see each other? For the first time in many years I am not going

to Europe this fall and winter, much less to Spain. The political situation disgusts me. Right now my only political party is the one whose slogan is: 'Against Franco we were better off'" (Guerrero Ruiz, *Querido sobrino,* 83). Many years have passed and Buñuel, not only in these moments in which he writes but also until the end of his days, is very far from all understanding of partisan wishful thinking. He repeats these ideas in 1982, in *Mi último suspiro*: "I don't like politics. In that aspect I have been free of any false hopes for the past forty years. I no longer believe in politics. Two or three years ago I noticed this slogan carried by Leftist demonstrators through the streets of Madrid: 'Against Franco we were better off'" (Buñuel, 271).

Luis Buñuel returned to Calanda on Holy Thursday of 1980. He went to the town square, looked for his friend Tomás Gascón and said to him: "Tomás, I am pretty much finished ... I'm worn out. This will most likely be the last year I come to Calanda, I don't think I'll last much longer." Luis Buñuel picked up his drum and played with the drummers of his land. He would never again return to Spain. Buñuel's Spain was like the landscape of his personal geography, like the harsh obstinacy of the drums of Calanda, which one day, on the 29th of July, would be silenced in Mexico.

Works Cited:

Buñuel Luis, *Mi último suspiro,* Barcelona: Plaza & Janés, 1958.

Fuentes Carlos, "Centenario de Buñuel" ABC es. March 5, 2000.

García Buñuel Pedro Christian, *Recordando a Luis Buñuel, Zaragoza:* Ayuntamiento de Zaragoza, 1985.

Guerrero Ruiz Pedro, *Francisco Rabal,* Murcia: Editora Regional de Murcia, 1992.

——. (ed.), *Querido sobrino,* Valencia, Pre-textos, 2001.

Rabal Francisco, *Si yo te contara. (Memorias recogidas y ordenadas por Agustín Cerezales),* Madrid: El País-Aguilar, 1994.

Saura Carlos, "Surrealismo ibérico y mordaz" in "El Espectador" (Supplement of *El País*) February 20, 2000.

Universidad de Murcia
Nazareth College of Rochester

Review

José Belmonte Serrano. *Arturo Pérez-Reverte: la sonrisa del cazador*. Murcia: Nausica Edición Electróncia S.L., 2002.

Belmonte Serrano's critical book on Pérez-Reverte provides an excellent groundwork for what will become, given the author's extensive readership, an important area study in itself. In line with critical studies opening areas of inquiry, the critic is careful to place Pérez-Reverte's work in the context of Spanish and European literature while addressing major aspects of the Spanish author's oeuvre. Also of interest is Belmonte Serrano's relationship to the author's work. He has been both a critic and a chronicler of the author's literary career from the outset; in fact, not surprisingly, this shared trajectory has led to a friendship. Thus, owing to the critic's intimate knowledge of the author's work, this collection of essays can be read as a genealogy of his discursive evolution as a Pérez-Reverte critical reader as well as part of the founding process of a discursive field.

The book is made up of twelve essays and an interview, all arranged chronologically. The critical purview encompasses all of Pérez-Reverte's works, from his first fiction –*El húsar*— to the last one –*La reina del Sur*—as well as his newspaper articles in *El semanal*, a weekly magazine. Despite the chronological arrangement a number of recurring themes allow the reader to cluster the articles thematically. Leaving aside the interview, centred on one of Pérez-Reverte's most celebrated characters, Alatriste, Belmonte Serrano deals with the author's place in contemporary fiction, his literary technique, the study of his literary characters, the historical novel, the serialized novel, the pedagogic vein, and the use of cinematic technique. Additionally there is an essay on Pérez-Reverte's cultural articles, where the critic places the author in a long-standing tradition of cultural criticism, which he traces back to the romantic Larra.

In contextualizing the author's work, Belmonte Serrano studies the literary tradition behind the oeuvre. He carefully elucidates the nineteenth-century models –such as Dumas, Dickens, Melville, Clarín and Galdós, among others— and how the author's seductive literary technique reworks the successful serialized novels. Regarding Galdós, Belmonte Serrano argues for example that the Madrid of *El maestro de esgrima* is encoded by the literary representation of this Spanish writer. As for the author's literary technique, the critic details all the reworked aspects of the nineteenth-century models (style, action, suspense) while properly locating Pérez-Reverte in post-modern writing. In this context, he studies the interactive, the intertextual and metafictional elements and corresponding calculated demands made on the reader. Literary theory and the author's literary practice are carefully studied in relation to *El Club Dumas*, the author's most auto-reflective novel. In the essay entitled "La teoría literaria y su didáctica: Arturo Pérez Reverte y la novela española actual," the critic elucidates the role of the reader in the author's fiction. In the tradition of Cervantes and Unamuno's *Niebla*, the reader is made to reflect on the writing process and

its relation to literature in general. According to Belmonte Serrano, this aspect of the author's writing coupled with his popularity make him an ideal candidate for the Spanish academic curriculum. Belmonte Serrano is in fact very concerned with pedagogy and the future of the humanities, and particularly literature, in the Spanish education system. Consequently, Belmonte Serrano, the critical reader, who explores, among many other facets, the metafictional and interactive quality of Reverte's works, sees in turn, from a pedagogical standpoint, these texts as excellent didactic tools to apprehend the creative process.

Belmonte Serrano studies as well the didactic vein in Pérez-Reverte in relation to the historical novel. The author is placed in the historical novel's boom of the eighties in Europe and Spain, the beginning of which the critic sees in Eco's *The Name of the Rose* (1980), coincidently a text that thwarted the writing of Pérez-Reverte own historical novel on the knights templar. The author's first published work was a historical novel —*El húsar* (1986)— set in the context of the Napoleonic Wars. Belmonte Serrano approaches the text in many of the essays analysing generic questions, treatment of characters, intertextual elements such as the *ekphrastic* encoding of *Los horrores de la guerra* in textual descriptions. The critic also studies the series of novels set in the Golden Age period, starting with *El capitán Alatriste* (1996). Belmonte Serrano shows, tracing the literary reworkings of the intertextual and historical, how these texts are an attempt to didactically and critically revisit the history and literature of a period often seen only for its literary splendour.

The author's work in relation to cinematography is recurrently studied. Belmonte Serrano identifies Spanish authors and generations characterized by this cinematic tendency, analyses the role of cinema in the author's fictions and reflects on the several film adaptations made of his works.

Belmonte Serrano's book is an excellent introduction to Pérez-Reverte. For those interested in exploring critically the Spanish author, the book offers countless avenues of inquiry.

Jorge Carlos Guerrero
University of Toronto

INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

Scripta Mediterranea is the journal of the Canadian Institute for Mediterranean Studies, an international learned society based in Canada and devoted to the study of all aspects of Mediterranean culture and civilization, past and present, with a special interest in interdisciplinary and cross-cultural inves-tigation. Manuscripts may be submitted in English or French, and two copies must reach the editorial office by September 15th. Articles and brief communications should follow the guidelines set out in the MLA Handbook. Articles should normally not exceed thirty pages and brief communications five pages, double spaced. Each full-length article should be accompanied by two abstracts of about one hundred words, one in English and one in French. Manuscripts and editorial correspondence should be sent to:

The Editors
Scripta Mediterranea,
Canadian Institute for Mediterranean Studies,
c/o Department of Spanish and Portuguese
University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5S 1A1.

Subscription to SM is included in the annual membership fee:

Student:	$ 15	Senior: $ 25	Regular/Institution: $ 35
Couple:	$ 60	Donor: $ 50-199	Benefactor: 200-499
Patron:	$500 or more.		

Outside Canada the above amounts should be paid in U.S. funds or the equivalent. Subscriptions and all other inquiries concerning *SM* or the Institute should be addressed to the Canadian Institute for Mediterranean Studies, Depertment of Italian Studies, 100 St. Joseph Street, Carr hall F-2, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5S 1J4.