

NATIONALISM AND GENDER IN THE NOVELS OF ALEXANDER PAPADIAMANTIS

ALEKSANDROS PAPADİAMANDİS’İN ROMANLARINDA ULUŞÇULUK VE TOPLUMSAL CİNSİYET

Aslı ÇETE

ÖZ

Yunan ulusçu kimliğinin en önemli bileşenlerinden biri olarak ortaya çıkan Ortodoksluk, Doğu Roma İmparatorluğu’nun bir ara dönem olarak resmî tarih anlatısına katılmasıyla iyice güçlendirilmiştir. Bir din ya da mezhebin ulusçu kimliğin bir parçası haline gelmesiyle birlikte bu kimliği güçlendirecek bir “öteki”ye ihtiyaç duyulur. Her ne kadar Yunan ulusçu anlatısının resmî “öteki”sini Osmanlı/Türk oluştursa da metinlerde farklı “ötekiler”e de rastlanır. Bunlardan biri Batılı/Avrupalı, diğeri ise kadındır. Yerli ve yabancı bu kadınlar, Osmanlı/Türk ya da Batılı/Avrupalı erkek karakterler gibi doğrudan değil, çoğu zaman, gizli bir biçimde ötekileştirilirler. Bu çalışmada Aleksandros Papadiamantis’in 1879-1884 yılları arası yayımlanmış üç romanında beliren karakterlerin, Yunan tarih anlatısına ve egemen cinsiyetçi söyleme uygun olarak nasıl ötekileştirildiği ve ulusçu kimliğin hangi temel üzerine inşa edildiği incelenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Aleksandros Papadiamantis, toplumsal cinsiyet, “öteki” İmajı, 19. yüzyıl Yunan romanı, tarihyazımı.

ABSTRACT

Orthodoxy, which has become one of the most important components of Greek national identity, was further strengthened by the inclusion of the Eastern Roman Empire in the official narrative history as an intermediate period. When religion and/or sect become a part of national identity, an "other" is needed to strengthen that identity. Although the Ottoman/Turkish people represent the official "other" of the Greek national narrative, also different "others" appear in the texts. One of these "others" is Western/European, the other is the women. These native and foreign women are often covertly marginalized, rather than directly marginalized like the Ottomans/Turkish people or Western/European male figures. This study examines how the characters in three novels by Alexander Papadiamantis, published between 1879-1884, are marginalized in line with official Greek narrative history and hegemonic gendered discourse, and on what basis national identity was constructed.

Keywords: Alexander Papadiamantis, gender, the image of the "other", 19th century-Greek novel, historiography.

1. INTRODUCTION

Apart from its self-creative quality, the text also has a society-guiding and society-forming function. In this context, literature is one of the most effective tools for the formation of a national identity. An influential poet and author of the nineteenth century Greek Literature, Alexandros Rizos Rangavis (1809-1892) states the following in his book, *History of Modern Greek Literature* (1877): “When the Greek race fulfils its expectations, its literature will also rise and acquire a new face” (Αποστολίδου, 1994, p. 22). What is meant by the “expectations of the Greek race” is the fulfillment of all the requirements of a nation-state and the completion of national identity. Only after this can there be a state that produces a “higher” literature. In order to create and maintain a national identity, literature is needed to define the nation and draw its boundaries. In this context, the literary canon is defined as a “utopian permanent textual space in which a nation, a class or an individual can find an undifferentiated identity” (Jusdanis, 2015, p. 106). The emphasis on differentiation is important. As is well known, the concepts of “similarity” and “difference” are crucial for the formation of national identity. The “similarity” is based on common values that form a kind of bond between the members of the public, such as language, religion, tradition (Triandafyllidou, 1998, p. 599). “Difference”, on the other hand, is fraught with negativity: “The difference between the foreign and the familiar, between what belongs to us and what does not, and between those who stay away from the group... is essential to the formation of individual or community identity.” (Βεϊκός, 1999, p. 16). So, where does Alexandros Papadiamantis (1851-1911) stand in nationalist literature? In order to find an answer to this question, we should first briefly consider how the Eastern Roman Empireⁱ proceeded as an intermediate period in the Greek official narrative history and what the indirect or direct consequences of this situation were.

The Greek official narrative history initially attempted to fill the gap between Ancient and Modern Greek with Macedonia and the Hellenistic period, but this was not to be taken literally. The inclusion of Byzantium in the historiography as an intermediate period happened over time and systematically. However, the Crimean War (1853-1856) is credited with a crucial function in the inclusion of Byzantium in the Greek official narrative history as an intermediate period (Σταματόπουλος, 2009, p. 68). The fact that Britain,

France, and Germany supported the modernization efforts of the Ottoman Empire, France’s distrust of Greece’s mediating position between East and West, and its ever-increasing influence on the Ottoman Empire worried Greece. According to Skopetea, this support from Europe for Ottoman modernization shook Greece’s aspired mediator position in the East and challenged its sense of superiority, which it believed it had as a legacy of the Ancient Greek (Σκοπετέα, 1988, p. 224).

The establishment of an organic link with Byzantium through religion required the Orthodox Christian identity of the nation and consequently the national identity of the Church.ⁱⁱ Considering that religious identity has existed since the time of the Ottoman Empire, it is clear that the new event is the nationalization of the Church. After the establishment of Greece as a nation-state, the ice between the Church and Patriarchate was broken when the Church of Greece declared its autocephaly in 1833 and was subsequently recognized by the Patriarchate on June 29, 1850. It is a well-known fact that when religion and/or sect becomes part of the national identity, it needs the “other” to strengthen that identity – perhaps to bring it into being. Although the nationalist narrative history presents the Ottoman as the official other, different others are also mentioned in the texts. Despite the fact that the nationalist narrative history presents the Ottomans/Turkish people as the official “other”, different “others” are also included in the texts. One of these “others” is Western/European, and the other is native or foreign womenⁱⁱⁱ.

The relationship between the West and Greece is still marked by paradoxes today. The “Hellenic pride” (ελληνική υπερηφάνεια), which appears as the inheritor of a glorious past (Ancient Greece), is invalidated by Europe, which is more “advanced” in every respect. This wounded “pride” manifests itself in a constant effort to prove itself to Europe (Çete, 2020, p. 288). Mike points out that Europeans were perceived very intensely in the 19th century in Greek literature and argues that this is related to Papanigopoulos’ and Zampelios’ interpretation of history (Μυκέ, 2009, p. 20). According to this interpretation, the European identity of modern Greeks was also being “proven” by their love affair with European men and women.^{iv} On the other hand, these two historians did not show the same attitude towards the West. Zambelios argued that the Greek narrative should adopt a position opposed to that of the West: “Past? Oh! We leave it to the foreigners to make us believe, writing it with their prejudices, their

own systems and interests.” (Λιάκος, 1994, p. 181). Paparrigopoulos, on the other hand, sought to position the Greek narrative within the European narrative (Σταματόπουλος, 2009, p. 83). In this context, it was important for Paparrigopoulos to have a European/Western identity, because only in this way could the Byzantine Medievalism be accepted by Europe.

One of the “others” in 19th-century Greek literature is the woman, but she is not directly marginalized like the Ottomans/Turkish people or Western/European male characters, but often hiddenly marginalized. Accordingly, the introduction of women and/or all people who exhibit feminine behaviors as “inherently weak characters” and the fact that those who are accepted as “strong” or “ideal” women exhibit male characteristics are among the most common situations. The hegemonic European gender discourse of the 19th century manifests itself in Greek prose as well as in many aspects of social life. This research examines how characters in the three novels discussed in this study are marginalized in accordance with the dominant discourse and on what basis national identity was constructed.

2. THE EMIGRANT (Η ΜΕΤΑΝΑΣΤΙΣ, 1879-1880)

The Emigrant was serialized between 1879 and 1880 in the newspaper *Neologos*, published in Istanbul. The novel begins with the Great Plague of Marseille in 1720, which killed nearly thirty to forty thousand people. Marina loses her mother and father during the plague and then embarks on a journey to Izmir on the ship *Sotiria*, together with Captain Villios, a family friend, and his son, Zennos. The Rizos family, with whom Marina’s family did not maintain good relations during her lifetime, also travels on the same ship. Mrs. Rizu^v, the wife of Mr. Rizos, and her daughter Kakia show pseudo-concern for Marina and try to bind her to them. When Kakia notices Zennos’ interest in Marina, she becomes jealous and tries to draw attention with all kinds of gestures. When Mrs. Rizu realizes the situation, she promises her daughter that she will make Zennos her son-in-law. Upon her arrival in İzmir, Marina goes with Anthusa, her nanny (also a housemaid), to her aunt, Mrs. Valsami, and becomes engaged to Zennos. Mrs. Rizu then loses her temper and together with her close friend of Italian origin Marconi, manages to alienate Zennos from Marina and make Zennos fall in love with Kakia by putting a curse on him.

R.W. Connell, an Australian sociologist known for her studies of masculinity, argues that “gender is a social practice that constantly refers to bodies and bodily reflexive practices” (2019, p. 142). Hegemonic masculinity, which is one of the many models of masculinity in this social practice, “legitimizes men’s dominant position in society and justifies women’s subordination” (Connell, 2019, p. 150-151). As we will mention in the novel *Gypsy Girl*, subordination includes not only women but also homosexual men and other gender identities perceived as feminine in a given society. The main image created by hegemonic masculinity is the dichotomy of “strong” man - “weak” woman. This dichotomy is also emphasized in the novel. When Zennos hints at how devastating the outbreak of the plague in Marseilles was, Villios becomes enraged and begins to tell him of many terrible pandemics he has experienced in his life. Turning to his son, Villios says, “You will suffer too, but you should not cry like a woman!” (p. 24). Crying, which is perceived as weakness, is equated with the female gender, which is considered “weak”. A direct connexion is made between seasickness and sensitivity. During the voyage, Kakia feels unwell. In the following pages, we read that Maria, who has been portrayed as relatively “stronger” than Kakia, catches an obscure illness and cannot get out of bed for days, and wastes away. The following dialogue between sailors is also noteworthy:

- Excuse me, Uncle Verettas, I forgot the tiger of the seas was here, said Mitros.
- What were you thinking? Is it mermaids that rule the storms, asked Kotsos... (p. 72)

So, while Verettas is identified with a strong animal like a tiger, he was also stylized with the ability to rule. The act of ruling, fictionalized by the mastery of a powerful natural phenomenon such as a storm, is not seen as something a woman (mermaid) can do. When one considers that the nation-state, the supreme structure in which this act took place, is also a male institution, the extent to which a fixed relationship between strength/power, domination, and masculinity has been established becomes understandable: “The top echelons of business, the military, and the state exhibit a fairly convincing corporate masculinity that even today has not been shaken by feminist women or dissident men.” (Connell, 2019, p. 151).

Mrs. Marconi, a close friend of Mrs. Rizu, is of Italian origin and an “adventress” who is in her fifties and has been married and divorced four or five

times. In order to separate Zennos and Marina, Mrs. Rizu concocts a diabolical plan with this woman. Marconi invents a lie about Marina's past. She tells that Marina was in love with a handsome French boy and that she escaped with this young man and returned home (p. 168-169). It is noteworthy here that only the woman's past is questioned, not this slander of Marina: "Well, it's really a heartbreaking state of affairs, on the one hand, and I'm the one who regrets it the most. But is it not better for you to know your fiancée's past in advance?" (p. 169). But Marina is not planned to break off the engagement, by uttering a similar slander against Zennos.

Zennos becomes so angry with Marina that he wishes her dead. A young man visiting a cemetery comes across the grave of a young girl with the same name as Marina as he walks around the graves. On the tombstone is written: "Here lies Marina Romali, a young girl who died a virgin at the age of 18." (p. 174). Zennos is secretly pleased to see this. Although there is a concrete situation to which Marina has been subjected (she has been dumped without giving a reason), it is Zennos who feels "grief". Moreover, this "grief" is due to an alleged situation that Marina experienced when she did not know him or have a romantic relationship with him. The remarkable point is not to find Marina/woman "guilty" based on a lie, but to condemn her based on that lie or her actual past. But, it is also noteworthy what Zennos thinks of Marina's invented past: "In the castle built on a high mountain, where the sea rages, where the wind throbs all night on the railings and doors, and where the voice of a griffon is heard, she sleeps all night in the arms of another. Oh, Lord! My Lord! I shall lose my mind!" (p. 197-198). The extreme humanistic reactions, sadness and ambivalence of Marina, who has locked herself in her room for days because she has been jilted by her fiancé for no reason, are not approved of by the old Valsami, who is introduced as a "righteous" woman:

"[Marina] showed the women the door, called her dead mother as if she were still alive, said again and again that no one loved her, that she was all alone in this life. Mrs. Valsami pulled at her grey hair and scratched her wrinkled cheeks. She said her nephew had gone crazy for love. She could not remember if she had experienced such a thing in her own youth.

— Oh, Lord! My Lord! Have mercy on this sinner! I want

to hear her say such things!
And the daughter of a holy
woman, just like her mother!"
(p. 230-231)

The positivity of Marina, who has been described with characterizations such as "angel of compassion and patience", "saint of the first centuries of Christianity", "model of love and humility", stems from the fact that she preserves tradition, dresses canonically when necessary, and knows how to hide her pain. Kakia, on the other hand, a vivacious, pretty young woman, is perceived negatively because of these qualities (p. 53, 104). Although the narrator/author emphasizes Marina's goodness, he says that she acts out at times and is extremely annoying to those who do not like her. The narrator suggests that these two different situations arise from contradictions in her structure and in her nature (p. 105). The light and dark sides of man, described as contradictions, are identified only with woman.

Marina becomes ill because of the situation she had with Zennos, and after some time loses her life. Passion, which is considered the root of all evil, could be the reason for Marina's unclear illness. Her passionate love for Zennos even prevents Marina from dying easily: "But in this body there was still a mortal thought, a passion, a feeling that prevents the soul from disembodiment itself. The name of this feeling was Zennos" (p. 121).

Because of this passion, Marina is one step away from being the "ideal" woman. The young woman, whose soul is refined only purified by hallucinations on her deathbed, is completely emancipated by death:

"Like a shapeless caterpillar that transforms into a beautiful butterfly, so too the soul detaches itself from a mortal body. From a provisional and mortal love springs a divine and heavenly love. [Marina] hovered between life and death, enjoying the dawn of eternity. She waved mysteriously to the past and lovingly embraced the future." (p. 232-233)

Ratio (reason), to which great respect has been paid since the Enlightenment, is a masculine ratio. Philosophers such as Rousseau, Kant, and Schopenhauer believe that women are not really capable of reasoning (Llyod, 2015, p. 109-110). Also in the text, men are portrayed as someone who does not and should not believe in irrational words. The fact that women easily believe in such things, on the

other hand, is described as “natural”. In order to increase the plausibility of his lie and thoroughly stir up suspicion and curiosity in Zennos, Marconi does not hesitate to use a masculine phrase: “Words of people! Rumors from women! You, my friend, Mr. Zennos, will you resist them? Will you, as a man, believe them?” (p. 167). Ignoring her maid Anthusa, Valsami says Captain Villios: “Will you listen to the words of these foolish ones? Even I, as a woman, ignore him” (p. 184). Captain Villios’ will to listen to Anthusa, who has ignored Valsami, is important: “Often you hear the truth even from foolish people. Who knows?” (p. 184). The behaviors of Anthusa, who is portrayed as extremely feisty, are often disapproved of, but what she feels is always right. Anthusa can see the whole truth. She knows how bad Mrs. Rizu and Mrs. Marconi are, and constantly warns those around her. To understand this nonsensical attitude of Zennos, Anthusa goes to the ship and finds him and says:

“Don't blame her, Zennos! If you only knew how much she loves you! She's not left her room for two days. No one sees her but God. Have a little pity on her, she is so unhappy! She cries without ceasing. I haven't seen her tears; but I know she's crying. She doesn't want to show her pain to anyone. This behavior of yours has hurt us all very much! Mrs. Valsami has died a thousand deaths. As if she'd crashed over her ears. We haven't eaten, drunk, or slept since noon the other day. What else do you expect? Do you not hear, do you not believe? Are you not a Christian?” (p. 191)

This woman, who expresses her feelings with all sincerity, is not acknowledged by the narrator/author: “Zennos listened calmly [to what Anthusa was telling], but this woman's words seemed insincere and well considered to her. Anthusa, on the other hand, exhausted herself in his *female-specific* eloquent words” (p. 191).^{vi} Anthusa's eloquence, her unique style of expression, is presented as a characteristic unique to all women. The real question that arises here is: Why did Papdiamantis create the character of Anthusa as a maid? Could she not be a close friend or sister of Marina in the same position? To find an answer to these questions, one must look at the understanding of the “New Woman” during this period. As will be mentioned below, the 19th century was a century in which the ruling class persecuted all kinds of actions

and differences that they saw as “threats” to their power. During this time, when the positions and roles of women and men in society were set with thick lines, anyone who stepped out of line was ostracized and in some cases, even prosecuted. Accordingly, the criminologists of the day, the psychiatrists, and the lecturers at the University of Athens, attempted to describe this “New Woman” whom they believed to be a “danger”. These attempts at characterization included theatrical players, labourers, maids, prostitutes, “nymphomaniacs”, “hysterics”, etc. (Τζανάκη, 2019b). Considering this approach of the time, this preference of the author is understandable. Anthusa is an extremely lively and dynamic character, who can easily associate with men, talk to them and, if necessary, rebel against them, who has moral courage and imposes her own will, without taking others into consideration. The author could not create such a dynamic through the “right” woman. And the author could not grant so much feeling, inquisitiveness, will to enlightenment to a male character (e.g. a brother). In this sense, the choice of the maid Anthusa by the author is not accidental. It is very important for a woman to charm a man (p. 116). Why is the attraction of Zennos so important to Kakia? Why is there no similar jealous relationship between Zennos and other sailors? While a close friendship has developed between the men, especially between Zennos and Kotsos, a similar relationship between the women can only be seen between Mrs. Rizu and Mrs. Marconi. The hustle and bustle between these two is more of a benefit-oriented collaboration than a friendship. The truth behind the behavior of Kakia, who does not really love Zennos and is jealous of his interest in Marina and wants to attract that attention, and her mother, Mrs. Rizu, who has vowed to make Zennos her son-in-law, is not initially revealed to the readers. In the pages that follow, we learn that Zennos was favored because he was a wealthy young man. Kakia's pseudo-interest is a false love that comes only from “stubbornness” and “competitiveness”.

When Kakia began to walk around the deck in her nightgown, this behavior is considered strange by her. Even the interest of Kostos, the sailor who began to take an interest in Kakia at this moment, in this woman is damaged (even the beginning of the interest is ironic). Such a woman is not considered worthy to be loved by a man: “He began to see his love for Kakia in its true aspect, as an easy game. This girl seemed to him even lighter than a feather or a light wind that makes his ears tingle once” (p. 142-143). A young man named Gomnos, who works with

Kakia's father, also shows interest in Kakia. The conversation between these two men, who realize that they are interested in the same woman, is quite interesting. They even go so far as to agree to divide Kakia between them: "As far as I can see, there's room for both of us. This girl has a big heart. – Of course, of course, Sir." (p. 143).

There are only three women in the novel who are really introduced positively. Mrs. Valsami, an elderly woman, is a "respectable", "esteemed", and religious woman (p. 120, 149, 151, 183). Similarly, Villios' and Marina's mothers are positioned in the highest terms, being referred to as "saints" (p. 96, 231). These two women, who do not appear as characters in the text, are given this title through the role of motherhood. According to Kakia, Marina is positive but not as sufficient as her aunt Valsami. Valsami's "positivity", on the other hand, derives from the masculine word choice she uses, i.e., she is a symbol of the "masculine relationship" at the lowest level.

Another character worthy of notice is Mrs. Marconi. This Italian-born woman is introduced as the "worst" character. She lies, slanders, jinxes someone, etc. Marconi does not just appear as a drifting anti-heroine during the course of the storey. The narrator/author explicitly states her opinion of Marconi in the first sentences introducing her to the reader:

"Mrs. Marconi is a woman in her fifties who has had four or five legal spouses in her life. Now she is single. So she can use her spare time to help her friends. You can say that she is a very helpful friend. Breaking an engagement or marriage to satisfy her friend was her greatest joy. She spent all her youth getting married and divorced. If she could get all her acquaintances to experience it, she would consider it the best entertainment, the most entertaining game of her advanced age. She was born adventurous. Starting from her native Italy, that in many ways sacred land, she traveled all over the world. She stayed fifteen months in Istanbul, three years in Venice, five years in London, and finally settled in Marseilles from Madrid. There she stayed for five years and married twice. But why did she go to İzmir? She wanted to go there to relax,

because she had heard that Anatolia had the most soothing sages in the world. Maybe she hoped to meet some soft-hearted, compassionate Iranian or Armenian who would fix her messed-up life." (p. 138-139)

In these ironically worded statements, the first thing that stands out is Marconi's marriage. It is also noteworthy that instead of using the word marriage, the author chooses an indirect expression such as "legal spouse". In this way, the reader is made to feel that Marconi is also having extramarital affairs. This European woman, who is perceived negatively throughout, is portrayed as someone who mocks the institution of marriage, travels from country to country, and is quite active outside of her home. Her friend, Mrs. Rizu, while thinking at least as badly as her friend, does nothing that is seen negative except to put a hex Zennos. Preferring Italian Marconi as the most negative character in the novel is directly related to the negative Western/European image.

3. THE MERCHANTS OF NATIONS (ΟΙ ΕΜΠΟΡΟΙ ΤΩΝ ΕΘΝΩΝ, 1882-1883)

The Merchants of Nations, which Papadiamantis published in the journal *Mi Hanese* between 1882 and 1883, is mainly about a love affair. The events take place during the years of Fourth Crusade (1201-1204), when Venetians and Genoese are fighting for the conquest of the Cyclades. Yannis Muhras, a nobleman of Naksos who was also a pirate, rescues Marco Sanudo, the Venetian count, from the Genoese and takes him into his home, but Marco covets Augusta, the beautiful wife of Yannis. With a cunningly devised plan, he kidnaps Augusta to Venice. After some time, while Augusta lives in seclusion in a convent, Yannis comes to Venice and seeks revenge on Marco.

In the novel where the relationship between lust and religious identity is highlighted, religious identity seems to "wear out" as lust increases. Augusta's going to the convent and confessing to the Fathers (εξομολόγηση) can be explained by the religious turmoil and her indomitable lust, rather than the distress of an illegitimate love affair (Μικέ, 2009, p. 169). While Augusta is in a convent on Patmos, a nun wants to make a "confession". She expresses that "she never loved her husband with youthful passion", she loves Marco and does not feel remorse for it in any way (p. 227-228). According to Foucault, Christianity has two unalterable historical presuppositions. One is "access to light", and the

other is “the obligation imposed on every Christian to manifest the truth about himself”, in other words, the “making of truth” (Foucault, 1993, p. 212). Focusing on the second of these characteristics, the philosopher explains the act of confession through an example as follows:

“A correspondent of Cyprian in the middle of the third century writes, for instance, that those who wish to do penance must, I quote, ‘prove their suffering, show their shame, make visible their humility, and exhibit their modesty.’ And, in the *Paraenesis*, Pacian says that the true penance is accomplished not in a nominal fashion but finds its instruments in sackcloth, ashes, fasting, affliction, and the participation of a great number of people in prayers. In a few words, penance in the first Christian centuries is a way of life acted out at all times out of an obligation to show oneself. And that is, exactly, *exomologesis*.” (p. 214)

As can be seen, confession is an ecclesiastical practice involving repentance (*μετάνοια*).^{vii} What makes Augusta a “sinner” is her strong feelings for Marco; however, the most important point is that Augusta never repents of these feelings.

Father Ammun, believing that Augusta will never repent, begins to question some things. He wonders if women, men, and even himself have ever made a sincere confession (p. 229). Through his character Father Ammun, the author questions whether the act of confession, which holds a very important place in Christianity, is really meaningful at this point (p.230). Ultimately, Father Augusta glosses over this question, showing the male dominated attitude of the clergy: “[Father Ammun] proclaimed that this woman was led by cunning evil” (p. 230). The author’s questioning of such human relationships continues in the following pages: “The human heart is always inclined to love detested things... Does anyone love morality? No one. One always loves what is the bad. One not only loves it, but worships it. One not only worships it, one consecrates it” (p. 299).

At the end of the novel, Augusta burns to death in a ship sabotaged by Marco, at which he happened to be present. Although the author could have chosen at least three different possibilities^{viii} for Augusta, he prefers Augusta to burn in front of her husband Yannis. Choosing such an ending for Augusta shows

the author’s desire to “redeem” Augusta from all of her “inconsistencies” and the pain that comes with them. Augusta emancipates herself through her death and, in the meantime, through her reckoning with Yannis from afar (As Augusta burns, she looks at Yannis with her husband, who tries to get the picture from afar. When he sees that the person burning is his wife, Yannis forgives her at that moment). The reason the author chose such an ending for her is to completely absolve Augusta of her “sins”, and even other “sins” (starting a new life with Marco), that she might have committed had she lived. This character, who is neither positive nor completely negative, is perceived as a being who has discrepancies simply because she is female. While no information is given about how she married her husband Yannis, how their marriage went, or even what her feelings were for him, she is portrayed as a woman very much in love with Marco, who suddenly meets her one night. On the other hand, it can be said that the author is in love with Augusta even though he disapproves of her. Papadiamantis questions how honest a person can be even to himself:

“I know, no one dares to look into himself, as into a deep and bottomless pit. One can mirror another’s mistake and simply act. I advise you against hypocrisy. Besides, this advice of mine is redundant. As much as I advise you to be sincere, it is not possible in this world. Our hypocrisy is so transparent that, we cannot hide it from ourselves nor can anyone else reflect it back on us.” (p. 249)

Are we really gullible enough? To what extent do we take responsibility for our actions and how much do we pity those we are convinced are untruthful? Augusta honestly admits her “sin”; but she cannot fulfil the second requirement of Christianity, repentance. Yet she does not dissemble and shows the courage to confess that too.

The only thing that “overshadows” the peaceful family life of Yannis and Augusta is that they have no child. Augusta’s maid Sendina bows to her Madame but she is “curious” and “evasive”. Indistinctly, she hears Augusta's words as she converses with the Sister Filikiti. Sadina makes up a story in her own way and gossips with the cook of the house, Ralu.^{ix} The old lady (Ralu) is always portrayed as someone who is more balanced:

- Do you know, Aunt Ralu;
- What do I know?

— There's something wrong with the Madame.
She's no good.

— What's wrong with her?

— Only the Sister can know the answer, to whom Madame talks to.

— Then why the hell are you telling me this?

— If I tell you something, you will not tell on me, will you?

— No. What do I care!

— Listen please, Madame has lost her hope and will not make another baby.

— So what?

— I mean, she does not want to make a baby of her husband.

— What then?

— It will cost her a lot.

— So what?

— She's trying to find a way out.

— A way out of what?

— The way that will allow her to make a baby.

— So, with the drugs?

— With the drugs? No. How many drugs are there in the world for that, the woman's used them all up.

— So how is she gonna make a baby?

— Innocently, just like you, Ralu!

— I do not understand what you are saying.

— Of course you do not understand.

— What do you mean?

— Without drugs.

— How is that possible?

— The way all women do.

— You are confusing me. I do not understand anything anymore.

— Just you wait! Let's give an example.

— Then let us give an example.

— When Uncle Ralio was alive, God rest his soul, if you could not make a baby and you knew it was not you, it was him, what would you do, Aunt Ralu?

— What would I do?

— If you were still willing to make a baby?

— Nothing.

— How come, nothing?

— Nothing, I say.

— If you were very rich, like Madame?

— Nothing.

— On the contrary, you'd call the Sister and make yourself understood, discuss your thoughts with her.

— What thoughts?

— Your desire to have a baby.

— And then?

— You'd like to ask her if it's a sin.

— What would be a sin or not?

— Having a baby.

— Having a baby?

— Yes, having a baby.

— But that's not a sin.

— But by another man than your husband!

— By another man! Tut-tut! What are you saying, Sendina! (p. 160-162)

According to Sendina, women who have no children may get the idea that they could get pregnant by another man. "All women" do! The supernatural scares everyone, but especially the "sick individual". The narrator/author says of Augusta, "Despite science and all positive arguments, the mysterious sensation of the supernatural world has always affected the hearts of people, especially the sick ones" (p. 152). This characterization of the narrator/author clearly shows how he feels about women.

Papadiamantis divides love into sensual-somatic and spiritual love, again, as in *The Emigrant*. Sensual-somatic love is considered a pathological case and attributed to the devil. The Sister Filikiti says, "Sensual love is the most tormenting of all passions because it contains a trap that attracts us, our bodies" (p. 160). Earthly love is "deficient". What really matters is spiritual love, but the greatest obstacle to that love is the body.

To kidnap her, Marco Sanudo invites Augusta to the ship for dinner with her husband Yannis. He regrets for a moment letting them both pass out by mixing their drink with a drug, and says, "What's the matter with you, Sanudo? I wonder if you feel any remorse? Where is your firm attitude? What has become of your hot-blooded desire? I wonder if you hesitate like a woman?" (p. 174)^x. As the quote suggests, extremely humanitarian situations such as hesitation, procrastination are identified with a single gender, woman. Marco thinks that if he abandons his decision and releases the couple, Mirhan, his slave who helped him with this plan, will no longer respect him and will find him comical and belittle him. He does not even want to think about the possibility of a

black person belittling him (p. 175). To a man, another man's thoughts are vital, even if he is a slave to him. African Mirhan's judgment of women is also noteworthy. During a conversation with Marco, his Master, pointing to Augusta, he says: "I know the feelings of black and white women. Never can a woman remember her man too long" (p. 179). With these words, Mirhan creates a dualism between the concept of gender (female-male), race (black-white), and the feelings that are actually inherent in all people. He claims that women are "unfaithful".

The concept of honor, which is a phenomenon that must be kept under control, is associated only with woman. In this way, a direct connection is made between the honor of the man and the woman. When Yannis is lying ill in the house of Nurse Forkina after falling overboard, he says the following about Marco, who has kidnapped Augusta: "He stole my treasure, my honor, my happiness" (p. 218). In the following pages, we see that Yannis equates honor with happiness:

— Never mind, my Master, the world of mortality. He who expects to be happy here's a fool.

— Minas, don't tell me that. One mustn't expect to be happy, but honor!... For me, honor means my happiness. (p. 292)

Marco begins to quarrel with Yannis on his ship. Yannis is injured in the quarrel, falls overboard, and disappears. To make sure he is dead, Marco, through his slave Mirhan, tags two men who are guests at Kokkinu's pub. These two friends, named Skiathos and Marozonis, dive into the sea at night and set out to find a body. In order to get the reward to be paid by Marco, Skiathos kills his friend Marozonis and appears before Marco. The only person who noticed this incident in the pub is old Kokkinu. Kokkinu senses this with her intuitive aspect attributed to the woman; however, instead of uncovering this truth and serving justice, she confiscates Skiathos' money. Because of these qualities, Kokkinu is "both bright and cunning as a woman and bartender and cunning as a woman" (p. 310). In this way, a woman serving in Augusta and Yannis's house is described as "old and respectable" (p. 149), while Kokkinu, the old bartender, is considered "cunning". This situation is due to Kokkinu's activity outside the home.

The European woman, Venetian Kekilia, is presented much more negatively than Kokkinu. She is "cunning", "angry", "strange", "ambivalent", and "the odd phenomenon of womanhood" (p. 240, 265, 266). On the other hand, the most negative character in the novel is the Venetian count Marco Sanudo. On

the other hand, Yannis appears as Marco's antagonist. Augusta pretends to be an ideal woman only when she is with her husband Yannis. In addition to the European, African Muslim Mirhan also has a negative connotation. He is called various names, such as "base seed", "beast", "smart aleck", "damn black", "heathen", "whoremonger", and "dumb" (p. 168, 178, 216). It is not clarified in the novel whether Mirhan's negativity stems from the fact that he is a black African or a Muslim. The similarities between Marco and Augusta are that they do not regret their actions (Marco) and feelings (Augusta). These characteristics of the two reinforce their negative image quite well.

It is no accident that the author chose a historical figure, Marco Sanudo, rather than a purely fictional character. In the opening pages of the novel, Marco is said to be the nephew of the famous Venetian doge Enrico Dandolo. As is well known, it was the declared intention of the Fourth Crusade, which started from Venice in 1202, to reconquer Jerusalem; however, Enrico Dandolo changed course to Constantinople (Istanbul) and besieged the city, devastated it, and established a Latin Empire (1204-1261). The period when Constantinople is not under the rule of Orthodox Hellen is not considered positive. In the period when the city is in the hands of the Venetians (1204-1261), there is in the city a "Frankish king", a "diplomat of the Duke of Venice", a "quasi-Orthodox, quasi-Latin patriarch", and "Thomas Morosinis,^{xi} appointed by Venice": "It seems that at that time in the city of Constantinople the Great these four species of animals were bred, just like the dogs that today are revered by the Muslims and enjoy the privileges granted to them" (p. 301). People with a Catholic-Latin identity are negative; however, it is noteworthy that reference is also made to the Ottomans/Turkish people, who need not be mentioned as of the time in which the events took place. The main target of this very indirect reference is the Phanariots. The negative image of the Phanariots that appears in the story of Papadiamantis called *the Marriage of Karahmet (Ο Γάμος του Καραχμέτη*, 1914) is also emphasized here. It can be said that the negative perception of the Phanariots emerged at the end of the 18th century, that is, at a time when Greek nationalism in its present sense was only beginning to emerge. Millas explains this situation as follows: "...Phanariots, who are the practitioners of the way of peaceful coexistence with the Ottoman Empire in practice, embraced unequal conditions and saw coexistence in terms of an understanding of inequality" (Millas, 2003, p. 176).

On the other hand, the Phanariots, who settled in Greece after the Greek nationalist movement, differed from the other Greek-speaking Orthodox Christians, who emigrated from the Ottoman Empire, in terms of education, culture, and economy. The Phanariot intellectuals, who thanks to these characteristics occupied a more privileged position within the newly established nation-state, were perceived and marginalized as “non-natives/those who come from outside (ετερόχθονες)” (Σκοπετέα, 1988, p. 41-63).

Who are these "merchants of the nations", who give the novel its name? At first glance, the “merchants” are seen as someone who cares too much about and only plunders for money, kills people, spies for someone, and delivers messages; however, with careful reading, it becomes clear who is meant by “merchants”. Kekilia asks Yannis and her friend Minas about Augusta. When they remain silent, she becomes enraged and orders the Venetians waiting at the door to "arrest these two in the name of the Republic". To Yannis's reply, “What Republic? The Republic of Thieves?”, things get pretty crazy (p. 262). After a while, Yannis turns to the islanders present and calls out to them:

“Brothers, have you heard what this woman said? She said, “In the name of the Republic! You are independent! ...” Breathing heavily, Yannis repeated, you are independent! They are trying to arrest us in your independent country. They are trying to arrest us, your countrymen and fellow believers, in the name of the Republic of Venice! How is it that you tolerate in this goings-on!” (p. 264)

There is a negative perception of the historical Republic of Venice and thus of the Catholic identity. This perception is directly related to Zambelios's historical interpretation. According to Zambelios, Venetian rule is the period when the “struggle against the foreigners” intensifies (Μυκέ, 2009, p. 55). In fact, Zambelios accepted the Church and the people as “national elements” in the Byzantine Empire and defined this consensus as a “democratic element”. For him, the consensus of clergy and people was the “mystical element” of Greekness and Christianity (Koumbourlis, 2009, p. 61; Σταματόπουλος, 2009, p. 54). This idea of consensus led Zambelios to create a synthesis that unites both Christianity and Greekness: Orthodox Christianity (ελληνορθοδοξία) (Mackridge, 2013, p. 232; Σταματόπουλος, 2009, p. 51-63; Δημαράς, 2009, p.

403). Who exactly the author means by the “merchants of the nations” will become clear in the following pages:

“What does Venice want by sending these warships into the Aegean? Whatever the executioner wants from his victim... to satisfy its hunger, it wants the flesh and bones of the victim. ... Venice has imagined itself a civilization; but it has sons of tyrants. It has appointed them to rule on earth. The pedigree of politics is continuous and pure after the ancestors. Unemployment caused poverty, poverty caused hunger. Hunger caused appetite. Appetite led to despotism, despotism to theft, and theft to politics. This is the unmistakable origin of the beast. Then and now, always the same. Then it was by force, now by fraud and violence. These acrobats, gypsies, clowns, these monkeys (I shout to those who call themselves politicians) never change. In their endless workshops, making black, copper shackles for the nations...” (p. 276)^{xii}

In view of all this, it becomes clear why the author chose such a period and whom he referred to as merchants. The author makes an analogy between the past and the time in which he lives and expresses his views. Italian dukes such as Marco Sanudo are referred to as “tyrants”. These tyrants did not change even in Papadiamantis's time, and they left their places to the “politicians” and continued to “produce black copper fetters for the peoples”.

4. THE GYPSY GIRL (Η ΓΥΦΤΟΠΟΥΛΑ, 1884)

The novel *The Gypsy Girl*, published in the newspaper *Akropoli* in 1884, begins with the rescue of a girl about to be plunged into a waterfall. Ayma, whose origins and biological parents are unknown, was raised by a gypsy family. When she is an adult, she is sold by her stepfather, the Chief Gypsy. The young woman, who is imprisoned for a time in the convent, listens during this time to the stories told about her origins.

In the novel, set in the last weeks of Byzantine Empire, events unfold around the protagonist Ayma. Thanks to the action that takes place between ordinary people, we learn how society views the Gypsies and get to know human emotions such as

curiosity, passion, selfishness, lies, power and itchiness. The women in the neighborhood think Ayma is “weird” just because she is a Gypsy girl. They perceive all Gypsies, including their skin color, as negative. There is no end to the neighbor women’s gossip about these people. The neighbor women constantly rant about these people who are considered “nullifid”, “irreligious” and “unnatural” (p. 382-384). When she goes to the seaside to wash clothes, Ayma is pelted with stones by street children. She is slandered on the pretext of having stolen the clothes of another woman who was there. The conversation between the women is a good example of how Gypsies are marginalized:

- What a shamelessness!
- The devil daughter.
- She cares for nothing.
- She doesn’t tell, though she steals.
- And to make matters worse, she lies!
- She lies to our face!
- Oh, those Gypsies!
- Cursed people.
- Thieves and liars.
- The heathens. (p. 441)

The point in question here is that gossip is only done among neighboring women. Among men sitting in coffee houses, which are considered a manly place, this kind of “talk” is not found.

It can be said that the narrator/author has an empathetic attitude towards the Gypsies. In the face of the slanderous attitude of the neighboring women, especially Eftalutru^{xiii}, towards Ayma, he says the following: “Was humanity so bad or this girl worthy of hatred?” (p. 388). Similarly, elsewhere he mentions how Gypsies are ostracized by society. The stranger who commissioned an outfit from the Old Gypsy explains during a conversation that his master (Plithon) is a very nice person but is disliked by people because he has a lot of money and worships the false idols and that he has been accused of being a witch. He then makes an analogy between gypsies and his master. The following dialog takes place with the Chief Gypsy:

- Perhaps I have reminded you of your own pain [with what I said to you].
- To me?
- Yes. After all, your race suffers the same.
- What race?
- Gypsy race, said the stranger. Is it a lie that the people hate you too?

- That’s right, said the Gypsy, confused.
- And for no reason.
- Without reason, of course.
- What evil have you done to these people?

You work honestly and decently, too, do not you, and do not fool anyone.

- That’s right, the Gypsy muttered in confusion (p. 418).

This empathy for Gypsies changes when it comes to women. It can be observed that the traditional view that women are “sinful by nature” is maintained. The women who live in the convent where Ayma was imprisoned are negative. Sister Veati is a “rumor-monger”, “fabulist”, “snoop”, and “indiscreet” woman. She is also not on good terms with the church (p. 502, 503). Although she is not described as negatively as Veati, a close reading reveals that Nurse Sikstina, who came to the room where Ayma was locked up and informed Ayma about her past, also has a negative image in reality. This woman, who has known Ayma from a young age, believes that she can find peace in the convent where she used to live if she does not interfere and lives a quiet life; but even her excessive silence cannot prevent her from being “tested with sin”: “At the end of five days, Nurse Sikstina had passed through all the stages of sin. These included having bad things on her mind, being able to think of these clever things without difficulty, thinking them applicable, and struggling. The fifth and last stage, passion, she had almost reached” (p. 516). The absence of a man who has been similarly “tested with sin” is very noticeable in the novel. However, Sikstina is a representative figure for all women: Whatever she does, a woman feels a tendency to sin! In the following pages, when Sikstina tells a strange man that her curiosity about little Ayma at the time was greater than her pity for her, the man addresses her thus, “Women! Women! You always care for little things with passion” (p. 535). Since passion is considered the fifth and greatest “sin”, it is inferred from these words addressed to all women that they are “by nature” prone to this “sin”. The most interesting of these women is Sister Pia. About Pia’s body, which is considered a “defect”, we read, “Her whole body was like a bell. As if she had no neck, no waist, no pelvis. The lower part of her body was wider than the upper part. It was not clear whether this width belonged to her body or to her dress” (p. 538). Pia is different not only with her body but also with her thoughts. This woman, portrayed as a man-

hater, has been bored with the bearded saints in church since she was ten years old and wants to get a barber and have them shave her. These thoughts, incidental at first glance, are important because they are the thoughts of a Catholic Nun. The convent is not an Orthodox convent, but a Catholic one. Among the women who live there, there is not a single positive woman in the proper sense.

In the novel, the only woman who really has a positive image is Ayma. In many places it is said that Gypsies do not belong to any religion and are even atheists (p. 383, 388, 400, 407, 441). This fact, which can be taken as a compliment or an insult depending on one's point of view or belief, is presented as a negative feature in the text. Ayma, however, wants to pray: "She did not know how to pray because she had not been taught religion. Nevertheless, she usually felt within herself that she should murmur a prayer" (p. 388). This heartfelt desire of Ayma is related to the fact that she is not actually a Gypsy, but more so to the possibility of being a Christian: "Hey Mother, have I been baptized? I do not know, said the Gypsy woman without hesitation [...] This answer drove Ayma to be certain about everything she doubted. She did not know whether her daughter had been baptized, for she was not the mother of her" (p. 389). As can be seen from the quote, it remained unclear whether Ayma was baptized. However, the heartfelt desire to pray is a strong indication that she was baptized.^{xiv} In this case, if Ayma is considered a sensible woman, it is consistent with her sympathy for religion. Ayma's stepmother is not considered good or evil, but she makes no noise for what her husband does Chief Gypsy.

The 19th century was not only a time when nationalist movements were on the rise, but also when different gender identities were ideologically persecuted. In the 19th century, sexuality was first made a pathological case and categorized by disciplines such as (forensic) medicine and psychiatry (Foucault, 2018, p. 38). Homosexuality, supposedly not treated by the state until the 1870s, was placed by the French by the French physician Auguste Ambroise Tardieu (1818-1879) in a category of "diseases" whose "symptoms" could be defined psychologically and anatomically (Tzanáki, 2019b). Tardieu, whose thoughts were very influential in Greece, argued that criminal sanctions should be imposed on people who, in his opinion, suffered from this type of "disease" (Tzanáki, 2019a, p. 15). With a series of publications from this period, paranoia, insanity, feminization, and

hermaphroditism became terms directly associated with criminality. When they returned to Greece in the 1870s, doctors who had studied in Paris on a scholarship awarded by the Greek state demanded that the state take action against "castrates", anarchists, artists, prostitutes, and people they considered "perverts" (Tzanáki, 2019b). The dissertation of one of these doctors, Ahilleas Georgandias, is important for the evaluation of different sexualities as "crimes". With this dissertation, this has become a matter of state in Greece (Tzanáki, 2018, p. 137-138). The aim of the dissertation was not to sincerely examine different individuals within society, but to consolidate the power of the ruling class, as Tzanaki points out (Tzanáki, 2018, p. 151). In the 19th century, any action by individuals who defined themselves differently from the values and criteria of the ruling class was considered an "unnatural perversion" (Tzanáki, 2018, p. 152-153):

"The main troubling issue at this time was the encroachment of power, that is, who decides right from wrong. Thus, in a society where the patriarchal nuclear family is needed – especially at a time when other possible patterns are mentioned in various publications^{xv} – a feminine life is considered a crime." (Tzanáki, 2018, p. 149)

In this connexion, the advice of the Old Sister Karmili to Ayma is important:

"Protect your mind, your heart, and parts of your body from every kind of defilement. Do not give place to devilish love, earthly and passionate things in your dreams. Do not give way to bodily pleasures or you will soon fall into sin. Imagination leads to lust, lust causes sin. There are many kinds of sin: Perversion, looks, pornographic signs, hot-blooded breaths, sighs, touching, kissing, falling into another's arms...

Lesbianism, natural but indecent sexuality, unnatural perversions, incestuous relationships, bestiality... Not everyone commits all these sins at once, but falls into one of them. Say it better, my daughter, protect yourself from all this!" (p. 567).

It is noteworthy that Papadiamantis places tribadism (homosexuality among women) among other intolerable situations such as incestuous relationships and bestiality, without mentioning homosexuality among men. This approach of the author is closely related to the image of women at that time. A feminine life was perceived as a "communal enemy" and had to be subordinated to the masculine subject. The persecutions that took place in this sense were not directly aimed at sexual practice. A man could have homosexual experiences as long as he was "masculine", that is, active, as long as he could keep his hormones in check and immediately report for duty when called upon by the nation-state. Passive, that is, feminine life, a life based on personal pleasure rather than the nation-state, was perceived as "arrogance", "rudeness" and "selfishness" (Τζανάκη, 2018, p. 152-154). The disapprover, then, was passive, i.e., feminine homosexual male, rather than the homosexual male.

It is well known that radical changes in society do not take place all at once. In the various periods of change through which tradition and especially faith pass, the old and the new continue to coexist for a time. This coexistence can change depending on the power elite and often manifests itself in the new pursuing the old and the old resisting the new. Although Georgios Gemistos/Plithon (1355-1452), a real historical figure, another hero of the plot, has a regular church father, he wishes to continue the pagan tradition. When he tries to represent this belief in public, he is persecuted by the church. This bicultural structure of the time is literally reflected in the novel. Sometimes we come across marble sculptures of the Ancient Hellenic culture in a dilapidated house, and sometimes we come across a sacred monastery complex.

Looking at Papadiamantis' stories and novels, it is clear how important Orthodoxy is. While characters with a different religious faith or sect are easily ostracized and marginalized in the texts, what could be the reason for seeing this character with a pagan worldview in a positive light? This is directly

related to the Greek official historical narrative. This narrative, which builds its theses on an understanding of "continuity" it believes to exist between Ancient Greece (Hellene), Byzantine (Romaioi), and Modern Greece, has defined its national identity with the connection it has established through ancient Greek civilization and language, Byzantine and Orthodoxy. The positive image attributed to Gemistos/Plithon should be understood from this perspective. Plithon is pagan, but "one of the few who have a national consciousness and are loyal to their country" (p. 469). In fact, Plithon provides the first examples of a nationalist definition of identity, he uses the expression "we...are Hellenes as a race" (Millas, 1999, p. 49). The significance of this expression in terms of national understanding can be further understood through the research of Tasos Kaplanis. Using the database of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, Kaplanis determines the frequency of use of the words "Hellene- Romaioi -Greek" in texts written between the 10th-17th centuries A.D. According to this, during this period, the words "Romaioi", "Greek", and "Hellene" are used as a designation of identity in the texts by 96.5%, 3.2%, and 0.3%, respectively (Kaplanis, 2014, p. 93). Despite his pagan worldview, the positive perception of Plithon for Papadiamantis, who did not ignore the element Ancient Greek in defining of Greek nationalist identity, is natural from this perspective.

According to Thanasis Bades, the suffering life of Ayma is the same as that of the Greeks, who were "enslaved" by the accession of İstanbul (Constantinople) to the Ottoman Empire. Both of them sprang from "fate". Thus, the death of Ayma in an earthquake is equated with the "fall" of İstanbul (Μπαντιές, 2015). The analogy between the death of Ayma and the conquest of İstanbul by the Ottomans/Turkish people can be understood as both being based on "fate". Indeed, we find statements in the novel that support this myth (p. 469, 477, 478, 618). On the other hand, the lives of Ayma and the Greeks do not coincide with the traditional narrative. According to this narrative, Greece, considered feminine, was punished by God because of the increasing "corruption" in the last period of the Byzantine and became a "slave" in the Ottoman Empire. This punishment according to the will of God should be accepted in all courtesy. When we examine the situation of Ayma, we see that she is distinguished by her innocence rather than being a "sinner". Therefore, her death at the end of the novel is not a "fall" or the torment of hell that comes with

it (Greek's becoming “slaves” in the Ottoman Empire), but a redemption. Had Ayma not died in the earthquake, she would have been forced to marry her stepbrother Mahtos, to whom she felt no emotional attachment. This forced marriage can be considered true slavery. Death in this case was portrayed as true redemption for Ayma. On the other hand, Mahtos also dies with Ayma. This ending chosen by the author for Mahtos can again be interpreted in the context of redemption. This male hero, who has become a slave to his love and passion for Ayma, emancipates himself from all kinds of mental and physical passions by dying with Ayma. He is transferred from earthly/mortal love to divine/celestial love.

CONCLUSION

We see in the texts of Papadiamantis that religion (Orthodox Christianity) is the most important element in the construction of national identity. Although he writes his stories and novels in accordance with the Greek official national narrative, he follows a very different path from the Megali Idea (the Great Idea), the irredentist politics of the time. Although the author believes in the existence of a subjugated, that is, “slave” nation, he does not believe that this nation should be saved within the framework of the Megali Idea. The Megali Idea, the irredentist discourse of the time, is not found in his stories or in the three novels he wrote. He sees the Greeks as the “natural inheritors” of Istanbul in cultural terms (Καργάκος, 2003, p. 7). Because of this heritage, the Greeks had to politically lead all Orthodox Christians in Anatolia and the Balkans. According to him, the Rum^{xvi} (Ρωμοσύνη) was a concept that included Hellenism (Ελληνισμός). In this context, the “national question” included all Greek Orthodox Christians in Anatolia and the Balkans. According to Kargakos, Papadiamantis dreamed of a different political structure, as Ion Dragumis would later express.^{xvii} Accordingly, a Christian empire consisting of Slavs, Orthodox Albanians, and Muslims was to take the place of the Muslim Ottoman Empire (Καργάκος, 2003, p. 7).

Emphasizing Orthodox Christian identity is important. In all three novels, characters with a Catholic-Latin identity have negative connotations. The Italian-born Marconi in *The Emigrant*, Venetian Kekilia and Marco in *The Merchants of Nations*, and all the nuns living in a Catholic convent in *The Gypsy Girl* are portrayed negatively. With the addition of Byzantine to the official narrative, the Orthodox sect was brought to the fore, and with the advent of Greek

folklore (λαογραφία), on the other hand, attempts were made to find elements of Ancient Greek culture in Byzantine, that is, in the Orthodox tradition. In line with all these developments, Europe was accepted as one of the components of Greek nationalist identity, but could not be adopted in all aspects. Kasinis notes that Western lifestyle and thought aroused the curiosity of the public between 1845 and 1896 and that the translations from Western literature of that period were read “with enthusiasm”. These translations were rejected for the following reasons: 1) corruption of morals, especially the morals of youth, 2) disintegration of the family structure, 3) translations of Western literature encouraging fornication, and 4) increasing abandonment of time-honored traditions and customs with the entry of Western, foreign traditions into the country (Κασίνης, 1998, p. 69). With the exception of the women in the convent^{xviii}, the European characters in the novels of Papadiamantis all exhibit these characteristics. In this case, it can be said that, unlike the positive or neutral Western characters that appear in these translations, the author has created anti-heroes who should be of great interest, especially to female readers.

With the exception of Ayma, the other two female protagonists (Marina and Augusta) are not portrayed positively in the full sense. Both women are characterized by antagonism and contradictions “by nature”. At the end of the novels, all three women die. This ending, chosen by the author for his characters, shows his effort to save them from the hardships of earthly life. As Sakellariou points out, death is “a redemption for the suffering innocents, from the injustices and passions of this world” (Σακελλαρίου, 2013, p. 33-34). However, the ways in which the women die are different. Marina falls ill from her passion triggered by Zennos’s expulsion, and dies peacefully after days of suffering. Augusta suffers because she does not regret her passionate love for a man other than her husband, and is burned before the eyes of her husband Yannis. Ayma, on the other hand, who has been denied such passions, dies in an earthquake. In his novels, the author kills the first two women by punishing them lightly (Marina dies of a days-long illness, and Augusta burns to death in pain) to save them from passion, considered the deadliest sin, and from their past; Ayma, on the other hand, he wants to save from an unhappy future, from marriage to a man she does not love. Ayma’s “positivity” is due to the fact that her feelings never reach the level of passion.

All three novels do not end with a happy ending. The author divides love into earthly and heavenly love and believes that the latter is the true love. Earthly love is perceived as diabolical, while heavenly love is perceived as divine.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Αποστολίδου, Β. (1995). Η Συγκρότηση και οι σημασίες της εθνικής λογοτεχνίας. In Επιστημονικό Συμπόσιο Εταιρείας Σπουδών Νεοελληνικού Πολιτισμού και Γενικής Παιδείας (Eds.), *Έθνος-κράτος-εθνικισμός* (pp. 15-39). Εταιρεία Σπουδών Νεοελληνικού Πολιτισμού και Γενικής Παιδείας.

Βεϊκος, Θ. (1999). *Εθνικισμός και εθνική ταυτότητα*. Ελληνικά Γράμματα.

Γκέφου-Μαδιανού, Δ. (2006). Εννοιολογήσεις του εαυτού και του "άλλου": ζητήματα ταυτότητας στη σύγχρονη ανθρωπολογική θεωρία. In Δήμητρα Γκέφου-Μαδιανού (Ed.), *Εαυτός και "Άλλος"* Εννοιολογήσεις, ταυτότητες και πρακτικές στην Ελλάδα και την Κύπρο (pp. 15-110). Gutenberg,.

Δημαράς, Κ. Θ. (2009). *Νεοελληνικός διαφωτισμός*, Ερμής.

Καργάκος, Σ. (2003). *Η πολιτική σκέψη του Παπαδιαμάντη*. Άρμος.

Λιάκος, Α. (1994). "Προς επισκευήν ολομελείας και ενότητας": Η δόμηση του εθνικού χρόνου. Σκλαβενίτης, Τριαντάφυλλος Ε., 1948- (Eds.), *Επιστημονική Συνάντηση στη μνήμη του Κ. Θ. Δημαρά* (pp. 171-199). Ινστιτούτο νεοελληνικών ερευνών (Ε.Ι.Ε./Ι.Ν.Ε.).

Μικέ, Μ. (2009). *Έρωτος (αντ)εθνικός. Ερωτική επιθυμία και εθνική ταυτότητα τον 19^ο αιώνα*, Πόλις.

Μπαντές, Θ. (2015, April 26). Ο Παπαδιαμάντης, η γυφτοπούλα και η χρησιμοθηρική όψη του ρατσισμού. *Ερανιστή*.

<http://eranistis.net/wordpress/2015/04/26/%CE%BF-%CF%80%CE%B1%CF%80%CE%B1%CE%B4%CE%B9%CE%B1%CE%BC%CE%AC%CE%BD%CF%84%CE%B7%CF%82-%CE%B7-%CE%B3%CF%85%CF%86%CF%84%CE%BF%CF%80%CE%BF%CF%8D%CE%BB%CE%B1-%CE%BA%CE%B1%CE%B9-%CE%B7-%CF%87%CF%81%CE%B7/>

Παπαδιαμάντης, Α. (1997). *Άπαντα*. Δόμος.

Σακελλαρίου, Σ. (2013). *Νόσος και θεραπεία στην πεζογραφία του Αλέξανδρου Παπαδιαμάντη* *Αποδελτίωση και σχόλια*. (unpublished master's thesis). Πανεπιστήμιο Πατρών.

Σκοπετέα, Έ. (1988). *Το "Πρότυπο Βασίλειο" και η Μεγάλη Ιδέα: όψεις του εθνικού προβλήματος στην Ελλάδα, 1830-1880*. Πολύτυπο.

Σταματόπουλος, Δ. (2009). *Το Βυζάντιο μετά το έθνος: το πρόβλημα της συνέχειας στις βαλκανικές ιστοριογραφίες*. Αλεξάνδρεια.

Τζανάκη, Δ. (2018). *Φύλο και σεξουαλικότητα*. *Ξεριζώντας το «ανθρώπινο» (1801-1925)*. Ασίνη.

Τζανάκη, Δ. (2019a). "Αναστροφή φύλου" 1816-2007. *Κοινωνικές Επιστήμες 8-9-10*. 276-293.

Τζανάκη, Δ. (2019b, June 16). Από το 1871 μέχρι το 1950: Γενεαλογία φύλου και σεξουαλικότητας. *Εφ.Συν.* https://www.efsyn.gr/ellada/dikaiomata/199863_genealogia-fyloy-kai-sexoyalikotitas?cf_chl_captchaTk=264daa7c130c5c34f1af5d75e8abe21dcc5cf37c-1607253968-0-AYUDnMWgOjoXPWgDLRbcPCw-L-pJ0iD3wkSFCfb7kVrF2Ou8Uzxf_nP7E3Ocb19CGDFTfnzGGxFTLICvcHtWPAKjKftli9rEE_6p6tkaHe5Tt7Lp7hQfH3A0JUml2v3_OwmSRFhSZfaXVsGbem_k4t9_JN3HGAYf-XSpnsOUr6TRSM80hkZM9EJdLPAau-wrdHFb_mJnRS9Vyn1EvpDeSn4_uvfSRux4AQF2hZKNtm6Vz-Nmb1VM50pZtEK3jU84F6l-BTM6fPylv17zV5E1xM0QSbMd33RFhXYBIn36coKr3maDYLCXJEbaur0jHZKEYPQtCSurCvG6FicOxBEfCgo8JvaYL7ZDfwgwhVZ4ThV4mangqB2oKRukOV1cZbN9yTMEI8Og2OWzjS-tU-YvwIbay0t1XVqwYSCzawrytD6dwIIVUctgOEYJM55k--6bITkPa6j-V7VzkLxsacGUEV4r6ne0jzDkPnSpHtEclK3sP198KYy1_Glk9z6BHrxI2XzuMS3hDQlpgPGWGUJ9SPvBa67XD8Y68s1H1wYhK43qfIiw8qQP74ry_Dlw1Eu_v1TB-NSwyu9BLuKxhTIdjarPEsq7rHe1hraEA7popAm_HEttKRbaCMIEksDCVynOfEVIPrveAuMEk7-kFO1h5nUYn_AtSI4XLNb1HEFIAL3

Connell, R. W. (2019). *Erkeklikler*. (N. Koyuncu, Transl.). Phoenix.

Çete, A. (2020). *Yunan Hikâyelerinde Kadın ve Ulusçu Kimliğin Üretimi*. Urzeni.

Foucault, M., & Blasius, M. (1993). About the beginning of the hermeneutics of the self: Two lectures at dartmouth. *Political Theory*, 21(2), 198-227. Retrieved December 6, 2020, from

https://07a6e75f442811d380d2e720fdbf18c26b54cdc4.vetisonline.com/HOL/Page?collection=usjournals&handle=hein.journals/ptxa21&id=183&men_tab=srchresulst

Foucault, M. (2018). *Cinselliğin tarihi*. (H. U. Tanrıöver, Transl.). Ayrıntı.

Jusdanis, G. (2015). *Gecikmiş Modernlik ve Estetik Kültür: Milli Edebiyatın İcat Edilişi*. (T. Birkan, Transl.) Metis.

Kaplanis, T. A. (2014). Antique Names and Self-Identification. Hellenes, Graikoi, and Romaioi from Late Byzantium to the Greek Nation-State. In Dimitris Tziouvas (Ed.), *Re-imagining the Past. Antiquity and Modern Greek Culture* (pp. 81-97). Oxford University Press.

Koumbourlis, I. (2009). European historiographical influences upon the young Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos. In Roderick Beaton, David Ricks (Eds.), *The Making of Modern Greece: Nationalism, Romanticism, and the Uses of the Past (1797-1896)*. Ashgate.

Lloyd, G. (2015). *Erkek Akil. Batı Felsefesinde Erkek ve Kadın*. (M. Özcan, Transl.). Ayrıntı.

Mackridge, P. (2013). *Γλώσσα και εθνική ταυτότητα στην Ελλάδα, 1766-1976*. (Γ. Κονδύλης, Transl.). Πατάκη.
 Millas, H. (1999). *Yunan ulusunun doğuşu*. İletişim.

Triandafyllidou, A. (1998), National identity and the other". *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21 (4), 593-612.

NOTES

ⁱ Hereinafter, referred to as Byzantine.

ⁱⁱ Georgios Metallinos draws attention to Protestant missionaries who came from Britain and America. These missionaries, active since the beginning of the Greek nationalist movement, were active throughout the 19th century in Greece and in regions with Greek-speaking Orthodox populations. See Μεταλληνού Γ., 1999.

Ελληνισμός Μετέωρος. Η Ρωμαϊκή ιδέα και το όραμα της Ευρώπης. Αθήνα, Εκδ. Αποστολικής Διακονίας της Εκκλησίας της Ελλάδος, p. 220-221.

ⁱⁱⁱ 19th century Greek prose marginalizes Jews alongside Catholic/Protestant and Western/European.

^{iv} Giannis Psicharis's *Three Legends (Το Δαχτυλίδι του Γόγγη: Τριμυθία)* is a very good example of this. The protagonist of the story falls in love with a Turkish/Muslim woman in the harem (*seraglio*). Together they flee to Europe, but the woman gets bored in Europe and returns to the Ottoman Empire. The hero, who perceives this behavior of the woman as negative, goes to Venice to forget this experience and falls in love with an English woman. Unlike the Turkish/Muslim woman, the English woman Myrrina is positive in every aspect. In the text, both the romantic relationship between the protagonist and the English woman and the fact that Myrrina's uncle is married to a Greek woman "prove" the European identity of the Greeks.

^v This couple is addressed by their surnames throughout the novel.

^{vi} The emphasis belongs to me.

^{vii} "Η Μετάνοια είναι Μυστήριο, κατά το οποίο ο Θεός δια του Επισκόπου ή του ιερέως συγχωρεί τις μετά το Βάπτισμα αμαρτίες εκείνων που ειλικρινώς μετανοούν και τις ομολογούν." [Repentance is a mystery embodied in the way people sincerely repent and confess their sins after baptism, while God forgives those people through the Bishop or the priest]. See the link.

<https://agiosthomas.gr/index.php/theia-latreia/iera-mystiria/metanoia-eksomologisi/>

^{viii} We can list these options as follows: 1) she could choose to live in seclusion and continue to live in any monastery; 2) she could return to her husband Yannis; and 3) she could start a new life with Marco.

^{ix} A kitchen is a special place where behind the scenes chit-chat takes place and some secrets are exchanged. As a place where servants gossip, the use of the kitchen in this sense is also very common in Turkish TV series.

^x The emphasis belongs to me.

^{xi} The first Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople.

^{xii} The author does not complete the sentence.

^{xiii} The meaning of the name refers to the Black Widow spider, a poisonous species of spider.

^{xiv} According to Christianity, the Holy Spirit descended on man during baptism. Ayma's fervent desire to pray can be interpreted as the Holy Spirit guidance.

^{xv} Some literary texts, especially published in the early 20th century, could easily mention different sexualities. For example; Theoni Drakopoulou's poet *In My Tower [Στον Πύργο μου]* (1914), which is about a lesbian love affair, and Eleni-Neli Kaloglopulu's novel *Her Mistress [Η Ερωμένη της]* (1929), which is about a same kind of love affair. This relative freedom, which is given to such publications for a very short time, would come to an end when a lesbian couple, a Jew and a Christian, was prosecuted in 1931. See Τζανάκη, Δ. (2019, June 16). Από το 1871 μέχρι το 1950: Γενεαλογία φύλου και σεξουαλικότητας. Εφ.Συν.

^{xvi} In the Ottoman Empire, the word "Rum" (Romaioi) was used for all Orthodox members of the Patriarchate, regardless of the language they spoke. In this respect, an Orthodox who spoke Romanian or Bulgarian was considered a "Rum".

^{xvii} Together with Athanasios Suliotis-Nikolaidis, Ion Dragoumis (1878-1920) is the most important representative of Hellenoturkism (Ελληνοθωμανισμός) thought in the 20th century. Hellenoturkism, in its most basic meaning, states that many people with different identities, including Turkish people, can live together under the umbrella of a single state. See Millas, H., 2003, *Geçmişten Bugüne Yunanlılar. Dil, Din ve Kimlikleri*, İstanbul, İletişim.

^{xviii} The nuns in the Catholic convent have qualities such as gossip, curiosity, etc., but not qualities such as passion or fornication.