ENLIGHTENMENT AND ENTERTAINMENT: THE INTOLERABLE LIGHTNESS OF PHANARIOT LITERATURE, 1750–1800[1]

PETER MACKRIDGE
(University of Oxford)

In Greece, the second half of the eighteenth century tends to be seen as the beginning of the Greek Enlightenment which paved the way for Greek national independence. Analysing literary texts produced by members of Phanariot circles between 1750 and 1800, I argue that their purpose is predominantly entertainment rather than enlightenment. Finally I argue that these texts, which have been marginalized as being banal and as using an excessive number of Turkish loanwords, allow us to gain important insights into the thought-world of elite members of the Orthodox *millet* who did not envisage a national revolution against the Ottoman empire.

Keywords: Phanariots; 18th century Greek literature; Greek Enlightenment; literature as entertainment; Turkish loanwords in Greek; Orthodox *millet*.

1. INTRODUCTION: DEFINING TERMS

For my purposes Phanariot literature includes literary texts written in Greek[2] by men and women belonging to the exclusive group of Phanariot families, or by people who at one time or another held professional posts that were connected with the Phanariots; and, more broadly, literary texts written in Greek in Constantinople or in the Romanian principalities. Many of the authors were attached to institutions, including the Patriarchate of Constantinople, the courts of the Danubian principalities,

[1] This article started life as a keynote lecture given at the 12th International Congress of South-East European Studies, Bucharest, 2–6 September 2019: *Political, social and religious dynamics in South-East Europe*. The original title began with a choice between two alternatives: "Enlightenment or entertainment?" However, I now acknowledge that these two concepts are not mutually exclusive. I would like to thank Jacques Bouchard, Lia Brad Chisacof, Fatima Eloeva, Paschalis Kitromilides and Constanța Vintilă-Ghițulescu for reading a draft of my text and supplying me with further secondary material.

[2] Some Phanariot songs are written in alternating sections of Greek and Turkish (all written in Greek characters). In addition, some songs entirely in Turkish that are preserved in manuscripts written or copied by members of the Greek Orthodox community were probably written by members of that community. The extent of bilingualism among the Greek Orthodox community in Constantinople in the 18th century remains to be studied. Turkish dialectal evidence suggests that some of the writers of Phanariot texts may have been native speakers of Turkish whose families originated from provincial regions such as Cappadocia; another possibility is that members of the Phanariot circles were taught Turkish by Christian native speakers whose Turkish was marked by regional features.

the Ottoman translation and interpreting bureau, and the European embassies in Constantinople.

A definition of literature for my purposes includes any text in verse, any text consisting entirely or largely of dialogue, and any work of fiction work written in prose.

The reason for specifying my *terminus ante quem* as 1800 is the nationalist turn in Greek culture that took place around that time. Nevertheless, a few later texts might have been included in my survey: for instance, *The Abduction of the Turkey-Hen*, the mock-heroic poem by Iakovos Rizos Neroulos (1816), could be said to be one of the last texts of Phanariot literature, perhaps along with one or more of the three comedies that were written around 1820 in Bucharest and were first published by Lia Brad Chisacof.[3]

2. THE INVENTION OF THE GREEK ENLIGHTENMENT

In the minds of Neohellenists the period I'm concerned with tends to be associated with the so-called Greek Enlightenment. The liberal scholar Konstantinos Dimaras (1904–92) invented the concept of the Greek (or Modern Greek) Enlightenment in 1945,[4] at a time when Europe was emerging from the Second World War and was about to be split into two opposing ideological blocs – a process that had already started playing out violently in his own country in the form of the Greek civil war. At this critical juncture in Greek and European history, Dimaras' promotion of the term Greek Enlightenment was intended to demonstrate that, well before the Greek Revolution, Greek writers and translators had been making significant efforts to align their nation intellectually with the enlightened nations of western Europe.[5]

[3] «Κωμωδία νέα της Βλαχίας», «[Τα αγγούρια του Γενεράλη]» and «Ο χαρακτήρ της Βλαχίας», in Lia Brad Chisacof, *Antologie de literatură greacă din Principatele Române: proză şi teatru: secolele XVIII–XIX*, Bucharest, 2003, p. 377–515. They were published in a new edition by Walter Puchner, *Κοινωνικές σάτιρες στο ελληνικό προεπαναστατικό θέατρο (1800–1820)*, Athens, 2014.

[4] K. Th. Dimaras, «Η Γαλλική Επανάσταση και ο Ελληνικός Διαφωτισμός γύρω στα 1800», *Δημοκρατικά Χρονικά* 1.6 (23 July 1945), 11–12. I owe this reference to Paschalis M. Kitromilides, "Συγκριτικές προσεγγίσεις στον Νεοελληνικό Διαφωτισμό", in Dimitris Apostolopoulos (ed.), *Νεοελληνική παιδεία και κοινωνία: πρακτικά διεθνούς συνεδρίου αφιερωμένου στη μνήμη του Κ. Θ. Δημαρά*, Athens, 1995, p. 567–77 [567–8]. Kitromilides points out that although Dimaras used the term "Greek Enlightenment" in the title, he did not analyse its meaning in the text of his article. Also according to Kitromilides, it was in his *History of Modern Greek Literature* (1948) that Dimaras first developed the concept. In his text Kitromilides carries out an illuminating comparison between Dimaras' *History* and Dumitru Popovici's *La littérature roumaine à l'époque des Lumières* (Sibiu 1945) as major contributions to the study of the Enlightenment in South-East Europe from a non-nationalistic standpoint.

[5] Manolis Patiniotis rightly adds that Dimaras' effort to present Greece as part of (western) Europe goes back to the 1930s, when he and other members of the Greek "Generation of 1930" were attempting to show that "Greece was tied to Europe not as an external body or as a newcomer, but as an intrinsic constituent of European civilization": Manolis Patiniotis, "Greece, Europe, and the making of the Enlightenment in the periphery", in Marja Jalava, Stefan Nygård and Johan Strang (eds), *Decentering European Intellectual Space*, Leiden, 2018, p. 230.

Dimaras was more interested in the history of ideas than in literature as an expression of the culture of a social group, and in the definitive edition of his influential *History of Modern Greek Literature* published posthumously in 2000 (1st edn 1948), out of 120 pages covering the eighteenth century he dedicates fewer than twelve pages to Greek literary texts written in the Ottoman empire, while devoting most of the rest to intellectual history.[6]

The ideologically loaded concept of the Greek Enlightenment has recently been described as "the cornerstone of modern Greek historiography", since the Greek Enlightenment is perceived as having led to the liberation of the Greeks from the Ottomans. In the words of the same commentator, Dimaras claimed that during the Enlightenment period "Greeks began to discover their natural position among Europe's peoples after a long period of self-alienation".[7]

So many Greeks have been taught about the Greek Enlightenment at school and university that it now seems self-evident that the period that began during the eighteenth century[8] and culminated in 1821 with the Greek Revolution is the period of the Greek Enlightenment. Since Dimaras first promoted the concept of the Greek Enlightenment, it has proved to be so dazzlingly bright that it has outshone most of the literary texts produced by Phanariots and members of their circles in the eighteenth century. It has to be said that many of the Phanariot texts that I have been studying[9] only existed in manuscript until they were published for the very first time in the last twenty or thirty years. But most of the Phanariot literary output is not central to the Greek Enlightenment movement, nor can it be classified as being specifically opposed to the Enlightenment. It is primarily designed not to argue or to prove or to teach, but to entertain; and when it sets out to inform, it doesn't necessarily impart information that was intended to be "useful".

[6] Κ. Θ. Δημαράς, *Ιστορία της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας*, 9th ed., Athens, 2000.

[7] Patiniotis, *op. cit*., p. 233.

[8] The fact that the Greeks trod a "long road to Enlightenment", as Paschalis Kiromilides puts it in the title of ch. 1 of his *Enlightenment and Revolution: the Making of Modern Greece*, Cambridge, MA, 2013, means that it is impossible to determine a date at which the movement began. In two separate essays collected in his volume entitled *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός* (Athens 1977), p. 1, 14 and 27, Dimaras suggests three different possible starting points: (1) 1774 (the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca), (2) "around 1750" and (3) "around 1750 or, more precisely, between 1709 and 1774" – 1709 marking the beginning of Phanariot rule in the Romanian Principalities. Bouchard sees the Modern Greek Enlightenment proper as starting in 1780, with the years 1669–1780 as being the period of the Early Modern Greek Enlightenment («Νεοελληνικός Πρώιμος Διαφωτισμός: ορισμός και περιοδολόγηση», *Κ, Περιοδικό Λογοτεχνίας και Τεχνών,* Athens, no. 11 (July 2006) [*Αφιέρωμα: Κ. Θ. Δημαράς*], p. 35-47; a corrected version of the same text was issued in Montreal in 2007).

[9] Most of my work on these texts so far has focused on their language, e.g. my glossary of the anonymous translation of ten comedies by Carlo Goldoni and my corrections and additions to the glossaries included in the editions of other published texts. It is noticeable that a very large number of the words of Turkish origin used in Phanariot texts are recorded in dictionaries of Romanian but not in dictionaries of Greek.

3. THE NAME OF THE ROSE: THE GARDEN IN ΦΙΛΟΘΕΟΥ ΠΑΡΕΡΓΑ, THE VOSPOROMACHIA, AND KALLINIKOS' MEMOIRS

Φιλοθέου πάρεργα (*Les loisirs de Philothée* as Dimaras and Jacques Bouchard translate the title)[10] was written in Ancient Greek[11] by Nikolaos Mavrokordatos between 1716 and 1719. However, as Bouchard points out in the introduction to his edition of the text, Mavrokordatos uses ancient language to talk about the modern world. The word *πάρεργα* in the title of his book – "subordinate or secondary business" according to Liddell and Scott's Lexicon of Ancient Greek – suggests it is a "diversion" from the author's main work, whether that was ruling a Romanian province or writing serious non-fictional works.[12] Dimaras, who calls *Φιλοθέου πάρεργα* "the first modern Greek attempt to write a novel", points out that it contains the first Greek references to Bacon, Hobbes, Machiavelli and La Rochefoucauld.[13] Dimaras also calls *Φιλοθέου πάρεργα* "the prefigurement of the Greek Enlightenment".[14]

In *Φιλοθέου πάρεργα* Dimaras hears "the early voices of the Phanariot world as it comes to the forefront of our history, as it sets out to relay to the Greek East the 'lights' of Western civilization… [Here] begins the first act of the work that will give us back our freedom and independence".[15] This claim, that Mavrokordatos' book stands at the beginning of a century-long process that culminated in the Greek Revolution, is exaggerated, not only because Mavrokordatos' book wasn't published until 1800 – more than eighty years after it was written – but also because most of the Phanariot literature that came after *Φιλοθέου πάρεργα* did not share the same overt commitment to the European Enlightenment.[16]

The Genevan theologian Jean Le Clerc planned to translate Mavrokordatos' book under the title "Οι κηποσοφισταί, ou Conversations ingénieuses de quelques gens d'esprit dans un jardin de Constantinople":[17] the word κηποσοφισταί [the

[10] C. Th. Dimaras, *La Grèce au temps des Lumières* (Geneva: Droz 1969), p. 23, n. 9; Nicolas Mavrocordatos, *Les loisirs de Philothée: texte établi, traduit et commenté par Jacques Bouchard* (Athens and Montreal 1989). As Bouchard points out (*op. cit.*, p. 52, note 19), the French title was first proposed by Fustel de Coulanges in 1861.

[11] Bouchard prefers to label Mavrokordatos' language as *grec littéral* or, in English, "refined Attic Greek" (Jacques Bouchard, "Refined Attic Greek: hallmark of the emerging Phanariot nobility", in Ruxandra Vidu and Ala Mindicanu (eds), *Proceedings of the ARA Congress* (pdf, Montreal 2016), p. 11–17.

[12] See also Bouchard's introduction to Mavrocordatos, *Les loisirs de Philothée*, p. 52.

[13] Dimaras, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, p. 265, 273.

[14] *Op. cit.*, p. 8.

[15] *Op. cit.*, p. 265.

[16] It is possible that the meaning of the toponym Phanari 'lighthouse, lantern' acted subconsciously on Dimaras, suggesting to him that it was the beacon of Enlightenment.

[17] The title proposed by Le Clerc was first made public by the Anglo-Swiss scholar Annie Barnes, *Jean Le Clerc (1657–1736) et la République des lettres*, Geneva, 1938, p. 181 (= her 1935 Oxford DPhil thesis, p. 227). See now Jean Le Clerc, *Epistolario*, vol. IV: *1719–1732 e indici generali*, ed. Maria Grazia and Mario Sina, Florence, 1997, p. 88 and 96.

garden philosophers] was coined, probably by Le Clerc, on the analogy of *Δειπνοσοφισταί* [the dinner philosophers], to indicate that some of the discussions between the fictional characters take place while they are strolling in a garden. But whereas the third-century "Deipnosophists" of Athenaios, in their discussions round a dinner table, make references to specific foods, drinks and recipes, Mavrokordatos (or his narrator Philotheos) refuses to identify the flowers growing in Iakovos' garden because they have names of Turkish origin. The narrator tells us that Iakovos' garden is full of flowers of many species and variegated colours that give off intoxicating scents. However, "The kinds, the colours and the names of the flowers were so varied that even an expert would hardly be able to distinguish them. In order to name them precisely, we would need to make use of a whole host of new terms, of recent formation, borrowed from the local Turkish idiom."[18]

Ironically, the verb that Dimaras uses for Philotheos' strolling, σεριανάει,[19] is of Turkish origin. Philotheos and his companions are *flâneurs* in the imperial city of Constantinople and its environs, as are Caspar Ludwig Momarts and Patriarch Kallinikos, the authors of some slightly later Phanariot literary texts, who (unlike Mavrokordatos) very frequently use the verb σεριανίζω and the noun σεριάνι ('stroll' < Turkish *seyran*), as well as the etymologically related noun σεΐρι ('walk, excursion; entertainment, spectacle' < T *seyir*).[20] For Momarts and Kallinikos, curiosity, exploration and observation are a source of enjoyment: they engage in *flânerie* in search of beauty and wonder. They see Constantinople and its environs as the site of beautiful, fascinating and magnificent spectacles, both natural and manmade, which they set out to describe in specific detail.

Both the *Vosporomachia* [Quarrel over the Bosporus] by Momarts and the verse memoirs of Kallinikos contain descriptions of gardens in and around Constantinople. It is unlikely that these authors had read *Φιλοθέου πάρεργα* (which only existed in manuscript), but it is almost as though they perceive Mavrokordatos' inability to name the flowers as a challenge, to which they respond by defiantly using Turkish words to name the numerous species of flowers that grow in these gardens. To quote a single couplet among many:

> Λαλέδες πολυποίκιλοι, νακίλια, ζουμπούλια,
> μουσκιουρουμιά και γιασουμιά με αμπερμπόγια, φούλια.[21]

[18] Mavrocordatos, *Les loisirs de Philothée*, p. 84–5.

[19] Dimaras, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, 270.

[20] Momarts uses the noun σεριάνι 87 times and the verb σεριανίζω 41 times, and Kallinikos 10 and 30 times respectively. The word *seir* was used in Romanian too, in the sense of 'view, spectacle' (though not **seiran*, it seems).

[21] This passage appears in both the *Βοσπορομαχία*, Lepizig, 1766, p. 88–89, and Kallinikos' memoirs (*Καλλίνικου Γ΄ Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, Τα κατά και μετά την εξορίαν συμβάντα*, ed. Agamemnon Tselikas, Athens: MIET, 2004, p. 172). We can't be sure whether Kallinikos copied the passage from the *Vosporomachia* or whether he wrote it himself and inserted it into the manuscript of the *Vosporomachia*. The version of the text I have quoted here is an amalgam of the two very slightly different versions.

> Multifarious *lâle* (tulips), *nakıl* (phlox), *zümbül* (hyacinths),
> *müşkü rumi* (grape hyacinths) and *yasemin* (jasmines) with *amberbuy*
> (sweet sultans) and *fulya* (jonquils).

The Turkish names of the flowers contribute to the evocative and indeed exotic effect of this ekphrasis: the authors perhaps consider their use of language to be a work of botanical expertise and artistic virtuosity that emulates the prowess of the gardeners whose handiwork they admire.

The lexical luxuriance of these descriptions is in stark contrast with what even Dimaras calls the "linguistic poverty" of Mavrokordatos' text.[22] This contrast highlights the difference between the "enlightener" (and therefore idealizer) Mavrokordatos, who writes in Ancient Greek and is too squeamish to name the flowers, and the less overtly enlightened Momarts and Kallinikos, who write in contemporary Greek and enthusiastically call a spade a spade. The use of abundant Turkish words for flowers was part of the entertainment: these authors have taken the trouble to learn the names, they relish their sensual sound, and they want to share their enjoyment with their readers.

There is thus a contrast between *Φιλοθέου πάρεργα*, on the one hand, in which the modern setting is filtered and censored through the medium of a pretentious ancient linguistic form, and the sparkling humour and lively colloquial language of later Phanariot literature on the other.

An important group of Phanariot texts consists of satires, most of which are directed against one of two categories of target: either a particular voivode of the Danubian principalities, or a particular group of churchmen. I shall call these "satires on princes" and "clerical satires" respectively.[23] (However, I should add that the most famous and outrageous of the Phanariot satires, known variously as *The Anonymous of 1789* and *True History*, satirizes so many different targets that it is impossible to assign it to either of these two categories.[24]) The clerical satires were written by certain churchmen in order to ridicule certain other churchmen who insisted that Christians of other denominations who wished to be received into the Orthodox Church needed to be rebaptized; this was the cause of a serious crisis in the Constantinople Church in the 1750s. The satires on princes date from the 1780s. Each of the satires was written by someone who had both personal and ideological reasons for wishing to present the target(s) of his satire in a negative

[22] Dimaras, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, 252.

[23] I owe the term "clerical satire" to Walter Puchner, *Greek Theatre between Antiquity and Independence: a History of Reinvention from the Third Century BC to 1830*, Cambridge, 2017, p. 258.

[24] «Ο Ανώνυμος του 1789» was the title Dimaras gave the text in his first edition of the work (in his *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, p. 417–460), whereas the manuscript bears the title «Αληθής ιστορία» (echoing the famous second-century satire *Ἀληθῆ διηγήματα* by Lucian of Samosata), which is the title by which it is usually known today. For an analysis and a French translation of the text see Lia Brad Chisacof, "Un portrait-robot de l'*Anonyme de 1789*", *Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών* 11, 1995–6, p. 99–119.

light. The title of the anonymous clerical satire in verse "Comedy of true events in Constantinople in the year 1755"[25] explicitly states that it concerns real events that took place in a particular place at a particular time. The authors of most of the Phanariot satirical texts have no desire to idealize; they specify their targets by name, and they often use slang and vulgar expressions that lend vividness to their subversive representations.

4. CRITICAL ASSESSMENTS OF PHANARIOT LITERATURE BY OTHER SCHOLARS

The texts of Phanariot literature have been the victims of prejudice on the part of certain Greek scholars, who have marginalized them because they do not appear to be sufficiently influenced by the Enlightenment and are not related to the Greek national independence movement. The chief stumbling blocks to the critical acceptance of Phanariot texts have been the following:

- The *Vosporomachia* [Quarrel over the Bosporus], one of the earliest works of a continuous Phanariot literary tradition, was written between 1748 and 1756 by someone who was neither a Greek nor even an Orthodox Christian, but a Levantine Catholic: Caspar Ludwig Momarts (1696–1761), chief dragoman of the Austrian embassy in Constantinople – though he could perhaps be considered to have been an honorary Greek, since he wrote his poem in the Greek language, albeit using Latin characters.[26] As a Constantinople-born dragoman, Momarts was a cultural mediator between western Europeans, Orthodox Greeks and Ottoman Muslims.[27]

[25] "Κωμωδία αληθών συμβάντων εν Κωνσταντινουπόλει τω *αψνε΄*ω έτει". Evangelos Skouvaras («Στηλιτευτικά κείμενα του ΙΗ΄ αιώνα (κατά των Αναβαπτιστών)», *Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher* 20 (1970)) claims that this and *The Repentant Afxentian* are the work of the teacher Ananias of Antiparos, but Iosif Vivilakis (*Αυξεντιανός μετανοημένος [1752]*, ed. Iosif Vivilakis, Athens, 2010, p. 57–58, 61–71, 281, has argued fairly convincingly that Kallinikos played a major role in their composition, either as the original author whose work was edited by others, or as the editor of a text originally written by Ananias.

[26] Albrecht Berger points out that Momarts' use of the word "Franks" to refer to western Europeans implies that he writes from a Greek viewpoint ("Ο Ευγένιος Βούλγαρις και η Βοσποροµαχία", in Eleni Angelomati-Tsougaraki (ed.), *Ευγένιος Βούλγαρης. Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Επιστημονικού Συνεδρίου, Κέρκυρα, 1-3 Δεκεμβρίου 2006*, Athens, 2009, p. 420.

[27] Although they were Catholics of ultimately western European descent, the dragomans of the European embassies in Istanbul wore a distinctive form of Ottoman dress, whereas the non-native officials with whom they worked normally wore European dress. My spelling of the author's surname follows the spelling that appears in the entry for his baptism in the register of the parish of Santa Maria Draperis in the Rue de Péra, Constantinople; the name appears in various other sources as Momars (as on the title page of the first edition of the *Vosporomachia*) and Momartz. In his baptismal record, which is written in Italian, his forenames appear as Gasparo Lodovico. I am grateful to Savvas Tsilenis for supplying me with an image of the relevant page from the baptismal register.

- Some of the works of Enlighteners such as Voltaire and Diderot are among the comic masterpieces of world literature. By contrast, the vast majority of the texts that have traditionally been included in the corpus of the Greek Enlightenment are generally of a pedagogical nature and are notable for their earnestness.
- Phanariot literary texts are not intended to be educational or didactic: the deliberate lightness of Phanariot literature[28] has proved to be intolerable, both for Greeks of the Enlightenment and independence movements, and for a number of later Greek scholars: the label "fleeting poetry", suggesting something insubstantial and evanescent, was attached to Phanariot verse by Dimaras.[29]
- These texts make abundant use of loanwords. Dimaras wrote the following about Phanariot song lyrics: "Their language, a faithful depiction of the language spoken at the time in Phanariot circles, often contains an intolerable proportion of Turkish words".[30] One wonders what proportion of loanwords from Turkish would have been considered "tolerable".

Prefacing his 1955 anthology of Phanariot poetry, the generally open-minded scholar Leandros Vranousis wrote that the *Vosporomachia* "was in a way the model – in terms of subject-matter, versification and linguistic form – for the arid pedestrianism of the versifiers of Byzantium [i.e. Constantinople]". He continued:

> It is with difficulty that we have selected a few verses that are bearable to the modern reader. Almost all the way through, the text teems with Turkish words, and the long-winded descriptions of the locations and landscapes of the Bosporus with their ugly-sounding names are difficult for us to follow today.[31]

Elias Voutieridis made a factual and more objective assessment in his *History of Modern Greek Literature* (1927), which however seems to have been the origin of some of Vranousis' wording:

> In the history of modern Greek literature, as it was cultivated by the Phanariots, the *Vosporomachia* occupies a special place, since it acted, for these poets, as a model for the language and for certain poetic techniques. It is the first poem of the Phanariot school, in which the popular language makes its appearance, mixed with ancient forms and words from Ancient Greek, Turkish and Italian.[32]

[28] In a preface to the clerical satire *The Repentant Afxentian*, Kallinikos stresses that the comedy is intended to be enjoyable rather than didactic: see Vivilakis' introduction, p. 83, and the section "On enjoyments", p. 285–286, where the editor states that *The Repentant Afxentian* distances itself from "Byzantine earnestness".

[29] K. Th. Dimaras, «Φευγαλέα ποίηση», *Ο Ερανιστής* 13, 1976 [1977], p. 49–60.

[30] Δημαράς, *Ιστορία της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας* (2000), p. 223.

[31] L. Vranousis (ed.), *Οι πρόδρομοι* [Βασική Βιβλιοθήκη, 11], Athens, 1955, p. 31.

[32] E. Voutieridis, *Ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας, από των μέσων του ΙΕ αιώνος μέχρι των Νεωτάτων Χρόνων μετ' εισαγωγής περί της Βυζαντινής Λογοτεχνίας*, vol. 2, Athens, 1927, p. 88–94 (90).

I should add that one of the reasons why Voutieridis was favourably disposed towards the *Vosporomachia* may have been that he wrongly supposed that Momarts, like himself, was of French descent.[33] Voutieridis adds perceptively that the poem shows that Turkish had not only influenced the Greek spoken by the common people, as is commonly supposed, but also penetrated the language of the learned.

Some non-Greek scholars too have evaluated Phanariot literature in positive terms. The German Ottomanist Johann Strauss, for instance, wrote in 1995: "Quant à la riche littérature phanariote du XVIIIe siècle, avec ses auteurs parfois remarquablement féconds, elle est toujours insuffisamment étudiée".[34] These words are almost equally valid today.

In the introduction to her recent edition of the 132 poems that were included in the volume of short stories *The Consequences of Love* (first published in Vienna in 1792), Natalia Deliyannaki writes that the characteristics of Phanariot songs were fully formed by the late 1760s, but more recently she has been able to locate these characteristics a good deal earlier.[35] Voutieridis' suggestion that the *Vosporomachia* served as a model for later Phanariot literature is borne out by Deliyannaki, who talks of a "chain" in the tradition of Phanariot songs: there is a possibility that some songs quoted in the *Vosporomachia* and in Kallinikos' memoirs were genuine Phanariot songs;[36] but it is a certain fact that some material from the *Vosporomachia* was recycled in *The Consequences of Love* (published about half a century later), in which praise of Constantinople is converted into praise of the beloved.[37]

The abundance of Turkish loanwords, many of which would have been unfamiliar to Greeks living outside Phanariot circles, is an indication not only that the authors of these texts saw Turkish as a prestige language and enjoyed showing off their knowledge of it, but also that they were writing for a rather restricted circle of readers. In most of the texts (what I would call "hard-core" Phanariot texts), there is little evidence of any effort to standardize the vocabulary in order to make them more readily consumable by outsiders.[38] But it also shows that members of the Phanariot circles possessed enough confidence in their own culture to see it as self-sufficient. The use of abundant linguistic features borrowed from

[33] *Op. cit.*, p. 93. Albrecht Berger suggests plausibly that the origin of Voutieridis' mistaken belief was the statement by A.-R. Rangabé, *Histoire littéraire de la Grèce modern*, Paris, 1877, vol. 1, p. 73, that Momarts was "un Pérote, français d'origine" (Albrecht Berger, "Die Bosporomachia des Senior Momars", in Lars M. Hoffman (ed.), *Zwischen Polis, Provinz und Peripherie*, Wiesbaden, 2005, p. 755).

[34] Johann Strauss, "Diglossie dans le domaine ottoman: évolution et péripetiés d'une situation linguistique", *Revue du monde musulman et de la Méditerranée* 75-76, 1995, p. 221-255 (228).

[35] Natalia Deliyannaki (ed.), *Έρωτος αποτελέσματα (1792): τα στιχουργήματα*, Athens, 2018, p. 18, 45.

[36] "The songs written or recorded by Momarts and Patriarch Kallinikos perhaps reflect links in this chain": *op. cit.*, p. 39, n. 23.

[37] Song 92: see *op. cit.*, p. 32.

[38] There are however many "soft-core" Phanariot song texts, in the sense that they do not contain loanwords from Turkish.

Turkish is an expression of local pride, of group identity, of a sense of belonging to the higher echelons of the Greek-speaking Orthodox Christian community of Constantinople, the Capital (Βασιλεύουσα) of the Mighty Empire of the Ottomans – "higher" from a cultural point of view, which presupposed a knowledge of Turkish and Ancient Greek and the language of the Greek Church, but also of one or more western European languages, especially Italian if not French.[39] A Constantinopolitan was a cosmopolitan. As Agamemnon Tselikas expresses it, although Patriarch Kallinikos was born in what is now Greece, he felt that he belonged to Constantinople and that Constantinople was the centre of the world.[40]

5. REALISM AND SENTIMENTALISM

Cornelia Papacostea-Danielopolu wrote of an "explosion of sentimentalism" towards the end of the Phanariot era, which she described as a "preromantic period".[41] "Sentimentalism" can be seen as being opposed to the Enlightenment "cult of Reason".[42] As Alexandru Duţu put it, "in the psychology of authors and readers sentimentalism occupies the field that has been spared by the wisdom transformed in ethical law. […] This literature concerns itself with the right to be happy".[43] The pursuit of happiness on earth is indeed an endeavour characteristic of the Enlightenment; but its goal is more likely to be achieved if the pursuit is accompanied by a reasonable dose of entertainment.

Apart from the sentimental trend in Phanariot literature, there is also the satirical drive, which I see as being a kind of realism. But whether sentimental or satirical, most of the Phanariot texts are concerned with the quotidian, with the here and now: neither with hope for a better future on earth (e.g. political independence) nor with hope for an eternal future in heaven. In the clerical satirical comedy *The Repentant Afxentian* (1752), the author doesn't write allegorically: he uses the real names of living individuals, together with their tics of speech. This is also the case in the comedy *Το σαγανάκι της τρέλας* (*The Tempest of Madness*, 1786), which presents a satirical portrait of Nikolaos

[39] The dual sense of belonging to the Ottoman empire and to the Greek Orthodox Church is indicated in Konstantinos Mavrokordatos' self-description on the title page of his book *Ιστορία ιερά, ήτοι Τα Ιουδαϊκά* [*Sacred History, or Judaica*, 1716]: "Grand Logothete of the Great Church of Christ and Secretary to the Mighty Empire of the Ottomans [Κραταιά Βασιλεία των Οθωμανών]".

[40] Tselikas, in *Καλλίνικου Γ΄ Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*, p. 42.

[41] C. Papacostea-Danielopolu, "'Eros' dans la littérature phanariote des Principautés", *Cahiers roumains d'études littéraires* 3, 1988, p. 32–43 [32]. She sees Eros as ultimately an allusion to ancient Greek myth by way of European Arcadianism and Neoclassicism. It is worth noting here, however, that allusions to ancient myth are rather scarce in Phanariot literature.

[42] C. Papacostea-Danielopolu, *Literatura în limba greacă din Principatele Române*, *1774–1830*, Bucharest, 1982, p. 194.

[43] A. Duţu, "Ethics scherzi and delectation: a chapter in the history of South-East European mentality", *Balkan Studies* 13.2, 1972, p. 274, 276.

Mavrogenis, voivode of Wallachia.[44] In such texts we are dealing with direct social criticism. But even when a character is satirized, the criteria by which he is judged are based on the moral doctrines of Christianity rather than on concepts that are particular to the Enlightenment. However, there is surprisingly little specifically religious content in Phanariot literature – even in the clerical satires. Given that in his *History of Modern Greek Literature* Dimaras sees intellectual secularization as being at the heart of the Greek Enlightenment project,[45] the secular nature of Phanariot literature may be seen as an Enlightenment feature.

If we look beyond satire now, the deposed Patriarch Kallinikos gives us realistic pictures of life in Constantinople and its environs. And even within the fanciful fictional framework of the *Vosporomachia* – the dispute between the sister queens, Europe and Asia, as to which of the shores of the Bosporus is the more beautiful – Momarts too describes landscapes and locations in realistic detail.

In fact, neither Momarts nor Kallinikos set out to write literature.[46] The initial motivation for their writing was what I would call verse therapy: for them, the writing of verses was a psychologically therapeutic exercise, both a recreation (a re-creation of the soul or the self) and a διασκέδασις (meaning 'a scattering, dispersion' in Ancient Greek) of troubles and cares; the same word in Modern Greek means 'entertainment'; thus a diversion or *divertissement*, a way of turning one's attention away from cares.

Momarts wrote the *Vosporomachia* to take his mind off the premature death of his (considerably younger) wife. It was his doctor Ioannis Rizos Manes, also a poet as well as a natural philosopher and inventor, who prescribed that Momarts should summon up the Bosporus as it had been imprinted on his memory, embark on a tour of its villages in his imagination, and write a detailed description of them in verse.[47] The *Vosporomachia* is a kind of guide book in which Momarts uses his two mouthpieces, Queen Europe and Queen Asia, to express the love and wonder engendered in him by the natural beauties of the Bosporus, its villages and its other sights.

After serving as patriarch of Constantinople for a mere six months in 1757, Kallinikos was dethroned and exiled to Mount Sinai by the Sultan, but he returned clandestinely to Constantinople in disguise. There, living incognito and in considerable danger, he consulted his doctor, Manolakis Manos, a friend of Dr Rizos, about a cure for the "melancholy" (his depression, in modern terms) caused by being bereaved of his patriarchate. Manos prescribed three activities: reading, writing and excursions. Kallinikos took up this advice with enthusiasm, and much

[44] Lia Brad Chisacof (ed.), *Ρήγας. Ανέκδοτα κείμενα*, Athens 2011. The editor, on the basis of evidence examined by expert palaeographers including Agamemnon Tselikas, claims that the author of the *Saganaki* was Rigas Velestinlis. For the dating see *op. cit.*, p. 31 and 35.

[45] Kitromilides, "Συγκριτικές προσεγγίσεις στον Νεοελληνικό Διαφωτισμό", p. 568.

[46] "I certainly didn't set out to compose a Poem," writes Momarts in his address to the reader (*Βοσπορομαχία*, 1766, p. 5).

[47] *Βοσπορομαχία*, 1766, p. 2.

of his writing consists of detailed descriptions of his wanderings around the City and his excursions up the Bosporus.[48]

In the case of both Momarts and Kallinikos, at least, the entertainment value of their work was primarily intended to be for their own benefit. However, while dedicating the *Vosporomachia* to his friend Dr Rizos, Momarts also expresses the hope that when his two young daughters grow up they will read his poem and learn about the beauties of the world.[49] Yet despite the deeply personal nature of Momarts' inspiration and motivation, two progressive clerics among the readers of the *Vosporomachia* found it sufficiently entertaining that one of them, Kallinikos himself, transcribed the text into Greek characters and copy-edited it in collaboration with the author, and another, Evgenios Voulgaris, published it in 1766 after Momarts' death.[50]

Both the *Vosporomachia*, then, and the verse memoirs of Kallinikos were πάρεργα, and Kallinikos at least was very much a φιλόθεος (devout Christian).[51] In fact, several men who held important positions in the Orthodox Church, such as the future Bishop of Patras, Germanos, the chief cantor Iakovos (known colloquially as Yakoumakis) and the Lampadarios of the Patriarchal church known as Petros the Peloponnesian, are among those who wrote the words and/or the music of Phanariot songs. As the text of *The Consequences of Love* and many manuscripts make clear, almost all Phanariot songs were sung to Byzantine and Ottoman modes, with no apparent influence from western European music.[52]

6. FREEDOM, TYRANNY AND FASHION

One way of testing the extent of Enlightenment attitudes in Phanariot literature is to examine its use of the concepts of freedom and tyranny.

In his revolutionary poem "Thourios", inspired by the French Revolution and published in 1797, Rigas Velestinlis used the terms *ελευθερία* (freedom) and *τυραννία* (tyranny) in a political sense, calling upon the subjects of the Sultan to take up arms against tyranny in order to achieve their liberty. But if we look at the

[48] Cf. Tselikas, in *Καλλίνικου Γ΄ Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*, p. 62–63.

[49] *Βοσπορομαχία*, 1766, p. 3.

[50] Dimaras described Voulgaris as "the earliest eminent figure of the Greek Enlightenment" (*Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, p. 15). The first edition of the *Vosporomachia* actually consists of three literary texts, one by each of Momarts, Kallinikos and Voulgaris; see for instance Peter Mackridge, «Ο Βούλγαρης φαναριώτης στιχουργός; Σκέψεις για τον τσελεμπή Μέμνονα», in Chariton Karanasios (ed.), *Ευγένιος Βούλγαρης. Ο homo universalis του Ελληνισμού*, Athens, 2018, p. 257–259. Voulgaris' own contribution to this volume is his translation of Voltaire's entertaining Enlightenment story, *Memnon*.

[51] See also Bouchard's introduction to Mavrocordatos, *Les loisirs de Philothée*, p. 53.

[52] In a number of manuscript song collections the tunes are recorded in Byzantine notation, which proved to be a convenient method of committing Ottoman music to paper. I should add that there are indications that a small number of Phanariot songs were sung to European (or European-style) tunes.

numerous uses of *ελευθερία* in Rigas' collection of short stories *The School for Delicate Lovers*,[53] published only seven years earlier, we find that there the word is always used in a non-political sense: it denotes a lack of hesitation or inhibition in the behaviour of an individual: speaking frankly and openly towards those who are perceived to be in a socially dominant position (a son or daughter to their parents, an employee to his employer, or a lover to his beloved).[54] I note here, however, that, according to Dimaras, the Greek Enlightenment aimed at "reaching up to all kinds of freedom";[55] from this point of view, the two different senses of the word *ελευθερία* (the private and the public; the freedom of the individual and the liberty of the nation) in Rigas' works can be seen as two steps towards the same goal.

Similarly the word 'tyranny' is used in *The School for Delicate Lovers* to refer to the behaviour of a father who is determined to impose his choice of marriage partner on his children, no matter what their own inclinations might be, while in Phanariot songs 'tyrant' is often used by a male lover addressing a young woman who resists his advances.[56]

A letter sent by Prince Nikolaos Karatzas of Wallachia to Prince Alexandros Mavrokordatos of Moldavia in 1782 about a nephew who refuses to marry the woman chosen for him by his mother shows that the situations described in Rigas' *School*, as well as in some of the comedies by Molière and Goldoni that were translated by Phanariots,[57] were closely relevant to the realities of Phanariot culture. These literary texts present clashes between the will of the parents and the wish of their children regarding the choice of marriage partner – clashes which are often caused by the mismatch between the financial interests of the family and the love (or lack of it) between two individuals. The way Karatzas describes the conflict makes it sound like a clash between Enlightenment values such as reason and individual freedom, which he promotes, and the more traditional ideas – the rightful submission of the socially inferior individual to the will of the socially superior, both within the state as a whole and within each family – that are

[53] *The School for Delicate Lovers*, published in Vienna in 1790, consists chiefly of translations of six stories from the huge series entitled *Les Contemporaines* by Rétif de La Bretonne. However, Rigas interspersed the stories with Phanariot song texts. Rigas' book provided a model for the anonymous author of the collection *The Consequences of Love* (possibly Athanasios Psalidas), published in the Austrian capital two years later, who interspersed his three original stories with no fewer than 132 songs texts and poems.

[54] Rigas Velestinlis, *Σχολείον των ντελικάτων εραστών* (Vienna 1790), *passim*.

[55] Dimaras, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, p. 25

[56] Velestinlis, *Σχολείον*, p. 33, 148, 207 (tyranny), 31, 297, 310, 320, 332 (tyrant). The phrase "the barbarous command of your master" (p. 6) is used to refer to the behaviour of a character's employer; since the same word for master (αυθέντης) was also commonly used for the voivode of one of the Danubian principalities, it is just possible to read a political connotation in this phrase as used here.

[57] The chief edition of the Molière translations is Anna Tabaki, *Ο Μολιέρος στη φαναριώτικη παιδεία: τρεις χειρόγραφες μεταφράσεις* (Athens 1988). The Goldoni translations are published in Anna Gentilini et al., *Dieci commedie di Goldoni tradotte in neogreco (Ms. Bruxelles Bibl. royale 14612)* (Padua: La Garangola, 1988). For more details of these Molière and Goldoni translations see below.

supported by his "brother prince".[58] This is similar to the way such clashes are depicted in the literary texts.

Papacostea-Danielopolu sees Eros in Phanariot verses not only in terms of "delectation" but also as serving an "ethical and political function" related to ideas of the French Enlightenment and the French Revolution.[59] She may be right to claim that *The School* is a "veritable manifesto of Rigas' democratic convictions" – equality, freedom of thought and the "affirmation of the individual" – all of which were new to South-East Europe at the time. But I think she exaggerates when she claims that the poems about Eros recall, beyond their "pleasing" form, the ethical norms and patriotic programme of a people struggling for its liberty.[60]

Let us now look at some meanings of the word *ελευθερία* (freedom) in other works of Phanariot literature. *Philotheou Parerga* refers several times to the freedom of an individual from slavery and imprisonment, but on one occasion the narrator advises men to allow freedom to their womenfolk instead of shutting them away at home; it is significant that Bouchard translates *ελευθερία* here as "liberté de mouvements".[61] The *Vosporomachia* contains frequent expressions of a desire for greater social freedom both for men and (perhaps especially) for women: not freedom from slavery or forced labour, but freedom from restrictions of movement, action and speech, freedom from the Morality Police known as the "market gardeners" (the *bostancı*s), who used to arrest anyone who in their view was publicly contravening laws and conventions regarding dress and behaviour in public: women not properly veiled, women out of doors at a time when the Sultan has forbidden it, men and women keeping company together.

Such freedom is perceived to be geographically relative: according to Momarts, there is greater freedom up the Bosporus and on the Princes' Islands than in the city centre, and greater freedom in the countryside than in the villages;[62] according to the author of *The Consequences of Love*, there is greater social freedom at Stavrodromi, north of the Galata tower, than there is in areas of the city south of the Golden Horn;[63] in *The Tempest of Madness* a maidservant of the prince's wife, speaking to her mistress, laments the lack of freedom accorded to the women of the princely household even in Bucharest, but observes that the local women don't have to be veiled when going out in public there, unlike in Constantinople.[64]

[58] This long and fascinating letter is published in Nicolae Iorga (ed.), *Documente greceşti privitoare la istoria Românilor* [Eudoxiu de Hurmuzaki (ed.), *Documente privitoare la istoria Românilor*, vol. XIV, part III], Bucharest, 1936, p. 223–229.

[59] Papacostea-Danielopolu, "'Eros' dans la littérature phanariote des Principautés", p. 37.

[60] *Op. cit.*, p. 38–39.

[61] Mavrocordatos, *Les loisirs de Philothée*, p. 150.

[62] In reality the *bostancı*s patrolled areas outside the city of Istanbul as well as within it: public gardens, promenades, meadows, forests, and the shores of the Bosporus, the Golden Horn, the Sea of Marmara, the Black Sea and the Princes' Islands: Shirine Hamadeh, *The City's Pleasures: Istanbul in the Eighteenth Century*, Seattle, 2008, p. 127.

[63] *Έρωτος αποτελέσματα* (Vienna 1792), p. 34.

[64] Brad Chisacof (ed.), *Ρήγας. Ανέκδοτα κείμενα*, p. 128.

The word *ελευθερία* appears in two of the 132 poems of *The Consequences of Love*, and it is significant that one of these poems celebrates the apparently new-found freedom of young people to choose their own marriage partners.[65] The cause for celebration was the Church's abolition of the *τράχωμα*, a particularly Constantinopolitan custom that demanded that the bride's father pay an amount of cash to the bridegroom over and above the items that made up the bride's dowry. The *trachoma* made marriage even more of a commercial transaction than it might otherwise have been, and it placed great power in the hands of the bride's father, who could make or break a match by agreeing or refusing to pay the *trachoma*. The *trachoma* was felt to be such a burning issue that the word is used, in tandem with the word *προίκα* or *προίκισμα* (dowry) to translate the word *dote* (dowry) in the Phanariot translations of Molière and Goldoni.[66]

Occasionally *ελευθερία* is used to mean sexual freedom. In one of the princely satires, *Ο Αλεξανδροβόδας ο ασυνείδητος* (*Alexandrovodas the Unscrupulous*), written in 1785, Georgios N. Soutsos (a member of a rival Phanariot family) presents a portrait of the voivode of Moldavia Alexandros Mavrokordatos as a libertine whose idea of the freedom offered by life in "Europe" is the freedom to keep a mistress quite openly while being married.[67] This is similar to the idea of freedom expressed two years later by Mozart and Da Ponte's Don Giovanni, whose proclamation "Viva la libertà", means not only that *tutti quanti* (all and sundry) should feel free to enjoy themselves at his party, but that he himself should be free to seduce any woman present.

"Tyranny" is another keyword in the discourse of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution, alongside freedom. We only have to recall Voltaire's wonderfully witty article "Tyrannie" in the French *Encyclopédie* of 1764 (which however begins with the following rather restrained definition: "On appelle tyran le souverain qui ne connaît de lois que son caprice"). The word *τυραννία* appears no fewer than seven times in the verses of *The Consequences of Love*, but always apparently in a metaphorical, non-political sense, referring to the cruel and capricious behaviour of the female object of desire who responds negatively to her admirer's expressions of love:

> Το βλέμμα σου το εχθρικόν, τάρζι το ηγεμονικόν…
> "Your hostile glance, your princely manner…" (no. 70)[68]

[65] The song in *Έρωτος αποτελέσματα*, 1792, p. 155 (Deliyannaki (ed.), *Έρωτος αποτελέσματα*, song no. 107) is addressed to young women, while another song on the same theme (no. 99) is addressed to young men.

[66] Tabaki, *Ο Μολιέρος στη φαναριώτικη παιδεία*, p. 45; Gentilini et al., *Dieci commedie di Goldoni*. p. 204. The *trachoma* is also mentioned in *The Repentant Afxentian*.

[67] "I'm not accustomed to being enslaved to one woman alone," he proclaims. "Anyone who has learned to live in Europe wants his freedom": Georgios N. Soutsos, *Αλεξανδροβόδας ο ασυνείδητος,* ed. Dimitris Spathis, Athens, 1995, p. 19. The verb "wants" here is equivalent to both "demands" and "needs".

[68] The song numbers here refer to Deliyannaki (ed.), *Έρωτος αποτελέσματα* (2018).

Με σχήμα ηγεμονικό, με κοίταγμα τυραννικό
"with princely mien and tyrannical glance" (no. 112)

Αυτό ορίζει φανερά, με εξουσίαν σταθερά·
Βέβαια βασιλεύει, αν θέλει, και φονεύει.
Το τάχτι έχει στην καρδιά και, με ολίγα λακιρδιά,
Ό,τι αποφασίζει, οπίσω δεν γυρίζει.
"My light [το φως μου, i.e. my beloved] commands openly, with firm authority. She rules with certainty, and she kills if she wishes. Her throne is in the heart and, whatever verdict she delivers in a few words, she never goes back on it." (no. 90)

Yet is there perhaps a possibility that such images actually have political connotations that don't appear at first sight? May the metaphorical tyranny of love be allegorical for the tyranny of political power? By appearing to use political vocabulary (the relationship between subject and sovereign) in a metaphorical way, is the poet *ostensibly* referring to the relationship between lover and beloved, and yet allowing the literal, political sense of 'tyranny' to be perceived as well?

In the last poem quoted above the abundant use of Ottoman terms, e.g. τάχτι 'throne', might conceivably be read as a clue that the amorous relationship is an allegory for the political, since the beloved and the tyrant appear to exercise the same ruthless yet capricious authority.

The motif of the tyrannical, cruel or indifferent beloved is common in Ottoman poetry, which plays on parallels between love and political power, as well as religious mysticism.[69] But Phanariot love poems also contain echoes of the western European tradition of Petrarch and Torquato Tasso (and perhaps especially Metastasio, who was especially popular among Greeks in the late eighteenth century), including the depiction of "la bella crudele", the beautiful beloved who, like a tyrant, is cruel and pitiless, constantly displaying her displeasure and anger towards her lover. In the Italian tradition this was not, as far as I know, used as an allegory for political power.[70] I believe, then, that the motif of the tyrannical beloved in Phanariot songs is a literary convention rather than a coded attack on the

[69] For the parallels between love for an individual, love for the sovereign and love for God in Ottoman poetry see Walter G. Andrews and Mehmet Kalpaklı, *The Age of Beloveds: Love and the Beloved in Early-modern Ottoman and European Culture and Society*, Durham, NC, 2005; I note that the word *zalim* 'tyrant' is frequently used to refer to the beloved who refuses to reciprocate the poet's love. I am grateful to Matthias Kappler for recommending this book to me. Kappler (personal communication) mentions other echoes of Ottoman poetry in the Phanariot song lyrics, such as the motifs of the moth and the flame and of the nightingale and the rose-bud. One major difference between Ottoman and Phanariot love poetry is that in Ottoman poetry, while the sex of the beloved is usually unspecified, the object of love usually seems to be a young man, whereas in Phanariot poetry, apart from the frequent instances where the beloved is referred to with the use of neuter phrases (το πουλί μου 'my bird', το φως μου 'my light'), she is described with feminine adjectives.

[70] See repeated keywords in Phanariot love songs such as αγριώνω, θυμώνω (both meaning 'to get angry'), εβζάς ('negative gesture or behaviour'), and βαδές and τσεχρές (both denoting angry, frowning facial expressions).

tyranny of the Sultan. Besides, the noun *τυραννία* was and is commonly used in Greek to mean 'mental anguish', while the verb *τυραννώ* often means 'to torment' someone.[71]

One of the symptoms of Enlightenment attitudes diagnosed by Dimaras in Greek texts of the eighteenth century is the reference to *fashion*, whether by means of the word μόδα (French *mode,* Italian *moda*) or with the use of Greek paraphrases. But a love of innovation isn't a sure sign of Enlightenment influence; it is a symptom of a desire to be entertained. Besides, the concept of something being modish or "modern" wasn't confined to western European culture at the time. The word μόδα itself is absent from the majority of Phanariot literary texts; it is first attested in a private letter written around 1787 by a lady in Constantinople informing the wife of the voivode of Moldavia about the latest fashion in the Ottoman capital;[72] but Phanariot literary texts frequently use the *Turkish* phrase *yeni çıkma* ('just out') to refer to items that represent the latest fashion, albeit corresponding to the English adjective 'fashionable' rather than to the abstract concept 'fashion'. This term (written *γενί τσικμά* in Greek) is used in texts originally written in Greek such as the *Vosporomachia* and the memoirs of Patriarch Kallinikos as well as very frequently (seven times) in the anonymous Phanariot translations of comedies by Goldoni, where the original has *alla moda*. Elsewhere Phanariot authors rendering the phrase *alla moda* resort to Greek paraphrases meaning literally 'new invention', starting with an early Phanariot translation of Molière[73] and continuing in *The Repentant Afxentian* (1750s) and the Goldoni translations.

Despite Dimaras' stress on the Phanariots' close relations with French culture,[74] it is telling that in the two major translation projects of European

[71] It is telling that on two occasions in the *Σχολείον* Rigas uses *τυραννία* to render the French words *supplice* (mental torment) and *irrésolution* (the torment of indecision): *Σχολείον* (1790), p. 33 and 148 respectively. Having said that, I can't help wondering whether the use of abundant loanwords from Turkish in Voulgaris' translation of Voltaire's *Memnon* might have made the Greek reader of the time think that the unjust sufferings of the innocent but hapless hero in ancient Nineveh were not so far removed from the situation in which Greeks found themselves in the Ottoman empire.

[72] Dimaras locates the first Greek attestation of this word in the satirical story *Ανώνυμος του 1789/Αληθής ιστορία* (*Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, p. 35). However, Ilia Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister («Χρυσά σιρίτια και μπαλωμένα παπούτσια: ο λόγος περί μόδας στον νεοελληνικό Διαφωτισμό», *Τα Ιστορικά* 32, no. 62 (2015), p. 55-80 [55–56]) locates the earliest use of the word μόδα in a letter written from Constantinople to Bucharest by Mariora Tyaniti (Dr Iakovos Rizos' sister) published in Iorga (ed.), *Documente greceşti*, vol. XIV, part III, p. 250–252, where the editor dates the letter "1787?" Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister also finds the word in Vendotis' trilingual dictionary of 1790 («Χρυσά σιρίτια και μπαλωμένα παπούτσια», 73). The word μόδα appears in the anonymous and undated Phanariot translation of Goldoni (Gentilini et al., *Dieci commedie di Goldoni*, p. 437), where the (Italian) character says that all fashions come from France. The word is used several times in the earliest Greek newspaper, the *Εφημερίς* (published in Vienna in the 1790s) and three times in Konstantinos Kokkinakis' translations of four dramas by August von Kotzebue published in Vienna in 1801. Constanța Vintilă-Ghițulescu ("«La mode vient de Constantinople»: les boyards roumains entre Orient et Occident (XVIII^{e} siècle)", *Études Balkaniques-Cahiers Pierre Belon* 16.1, 2009, p. 109–126) uses Mariora's letter as evidence that modern fashions tended to reach the 18th-century Romanian nobility from (or at least via) the Ottoman capital rather than from the West.

[73] Tabaki, *Ο Μολιέρος στη φαναριώτικη παιδεία*, p. 50.

[74] E.g., Dimaras, *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός*, p. 13.

theatrical texts into Greek carried out by members of Phanariot circles during the eighteenth century – a set of comedies by Molière and a set of comedies by Goldoni – Molière is translated via Italian.[75]

In contrast to the abundance of loanwords from Turkish, loans from French are very rare in eighteenth-century Greek literature. The only indubitably French loanword that I have found in Phanariot texts is the indeclinable feminine noun *τρες* 'gold braid' (< French *tresse*). This word appears in the work of Momarts and Kallinikos. It is also used in a single anonymous Phanariot poem or song in praise of a woman's hair, which is so golden and is styled in such a way that it gives the illusion of being adorned with various precious ornaments. Yet, aside from this single French loan, the poem teems with Turkish terms.[76] As a display of linguistic virtuosity, this ekphrasis can be compared to the description of flowers in a garden that I quoted earlier.

Thus literature confirms what historians already know, that in the eighteenth century there was an intense desire for novelty in both Constantinople and the Principalities.[77] Yet "Enlightenment" surely consists of something beyond the desire to acquire, display and write about the latest commodities.

CONCLUSIONS

The fact that we may have moral or ideological reasons for disapproving of the behaviour of some of the men and women who belonged to Phanariot circles should not prevent us from studying – and enjoying – the literature they produced,

[75] These Greek translations of eleven Molière comedies, scattered across five manuscripts, have been published in the following editions: Tabaki, *op. cit.*; Gerasimos G. Zoras, «Μια άγνωστη μετάφραση του Μολιέρου στα ελληνικά», *Παρουσία* 7, 1991, p. 61–88; and Konstantinos Minas, *Οκτώ κωμωδίες του Μολιέρου σε ανέκδοτη ελληνική μετάφραση του 18ου αιώνα* (Rhodes 2012; Minas seems to have been unaware of Tabaki's edition when he published his). The three comedies edited by Tabaki were apparently translated in 1741 by Ioannis Rallis at the behest of the voivode of Wallachia Konstantinos Mavrokordatos (Tabaki, *op. cit.*, p. 33–43). All eleven of the plays seem to have been translated from the same edition of Nicola di Castello's Italian version, and it seems probable that they were all part of the same series of translations. The other systematic project consists of translations of ten Goldoni comedies, which are all preserved in a single manuscript and have been published in Gentilini et al., *Dieci commedie di Goldoni*.

[76] The song is published in Dimitris Z. Sofianos, *Η ανέκδοτη φαναριώτικη ποιητική συλλογή του κώδικα 666 Μονής Μεγάλου Μετεώρου (ΙΗ΄ αιώνας)*, Athens, 2011, p. 146–148. Aside from five Turkish terms specifically referring to hair styling and adornments for the head (*μπαγλαμάς* [*bağlama*], *σεργούτσι* [*sorguç*], *τσελέγγι* [*çelenk*], *μπουρμάς* [*burma*] and *τσεκμές* [*çekme*]), the poem contains eleven other nouns and adjectives borrowed from Turkish. It is also significant that the French loan *τρες* is subordinated syntactically to a Turkish loan: "χρυσός τσεκμές με τρες" 'rolled gold with gold braid'.

[77] For the Principalities see, for instance, articles by Constanța Vintilă-Ghițulescu such as "Shawls and sable furs: how to be a boyar under the Phanariot regime (1710–1821)", in Cornelia Aust at al. (eds), *Dress and Cultural Difference in Early Modern Europe* [*Jahrbuch für Europäische Geschichte/European History Yearbook* 20], Berlin, 2019, p. 137–158. There was more freedom of dress in the Principalities than in Istanbul, where sumptuary regulations were stricter (*op. cit.*; and Chatzipanagioti-Sangmeister, «Χρυσά σιρίτια και μπαλωμένα παπούτσια», p. 57–60).

for the same reason that our disapproval of Wagner's racial views should not prevent us from studying and enjoying his operas. It is interesting and instructive to investigate how members of a subjugated minority try to make the best of their situation by collaborating with the political authorities imposed on them by the dominant community.

Phanariot writers express the hybrid culture of elite Greeks under the Ottomans just as Leontios Machairas expressed the culture of Orthodox Christians under the Catholic Lusignan kings of medieval Cyprus, and Georgios Chortatsis and Vintzentzos Kornaros expressed the spirit of the Greek-speaking Cretans under Venetian rule in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It would be instructive to use the development of Veneto-Cretan culture as a basis of comparison with the processes by which Phanariot culture combined Greek culture with features of Ottoman Turkish culture and gradually also adopted features of Romanian culture. There are many loanwords from Romanian in the 1745 verse correspondence between Drakos Soutzos and Konstantinos Karatzas,[78] in the *Garden of Graces* by Kaisarios Dapontes, in *The Tempest of Madness* and in the writings of Alexandros Kalfoglou and Panagiotis Kodrikas. There are also a few but significant examples in the Goldoni translations, including the rendering of his famous title *La Locandiera* as *Η Γκάζδα* (borrowed from Romanian *gazdă*),[79] though loanwords from Romanian are strangely absent from the Phanariot songs as well as from the poems of Athanasios Christopoulos, the best known and most highly regarded of the Phanariot poets. Some Phanariot texts were the work of Romanians (including Alecu Văcărescu and his father Ienăchiță),[80] and many of the manuscripts containing these texts are housed in Romania, including some of the slightly later social comedies that were first published by Lia Brad Chisacof in 2003.

Finally, I would like to emphasize the linguistic and historical value of Phanariot literature. It is the highly enjoyable expression of a fascinating lost world, as seen from the inside. Reading Phanariot literature we hear the voices of eighteenth-century Greek-speaking Orthodox Christians talking about their public and private lives in their own everyday language. In this way we can gain insights into the thought-world of elite members of the Greek Orthodox *millet* who did not hope for, or dream of, an armed revolution against the Ottoman empire that would result in an independent Greek state.

Phanariot literature needs to be studied not only in the context of Greek, Ottoman and Romanian language and social history, but also in the context of

[78] Published by Phaidon K. Bouboulidis, *Έμμετροι επιστολαί Κωνστ. Δράκου Σούτζου και Κωνστ. Καρατζά*, Athens, 1967.

[79] The word *γκάζδα* is already attested in the correspondence just mentioned, in the letter from Drakos Soutzos, who uses it to refer to his landlord (*op. cit.*, p. 224). The word is ultimately of Slav origin, but apparently entered Romanian via Hungarian.

[80] For Ienăchiță as the author of at least one Greek poem see Lia Brad Chisacof, "Closed-doors performances of dancing poetry in Wallachia at the end of the 18th century", *Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes* 45, 2007, p. 207–219.

music and other public and private entertainment in Istanbul and the Danubian principalities: Kallinikos, for instance, gives us some especially fascinating eyewitness accounts of entertainment in the Ottoman capital.

The desire for entertainment in Phanariot society is completely understandable when one considers the precarious circumstances in which its members lived. When Phanariot songs aren't singing of love, they are usually singing of the instability of fortune. People living in that part of the world at the time were constantly threatened by earthquake, fire, plague and war – and, especially in the case of Bucharest, flood. And the more successful and high-profile they became, the more they risked being summarily executed, and their families being deprived of their property: such people were literally gambling with their lives. We can only appreciate Phanariot literature if we see it for what it really is – a form of entertainment that has become an invaluable corpus of historical and linguistic documents – rather than viewing it solely through the distorting lens of the Greek Enlightenment.