

ΔΗΜΗΤΡΗΣ Ι. ΛΟΪΖΟΣ

Ιστορία και Αρχαιολογία
Imaginaire και Réalité

[History and Archaeology. Imaginaire et Réalité]

What is History?
The Historian in the 21st Century

<https://archive.org/details/@dilos>

Anistoriton Freeware Editions
ShareAlike 4.0

Ο τόμος αυτός εκδόθηκε για πρώτη φορά το 2024 από τον συγγραφέα Δημήτριο Ι. Λοΐζο.

Είναι διαθέσιμος για λήψη από την διεύθυνση:

< <http://www.anistor.gr/ellas/Europe-Greece.htm>>

και

<<https://archive.org/details/@dilos>>

Τα πνευματικά δικαιώματα ανήκουν στον δημιουργό: © Δημήτρης Ι. Λοΐζος, 2024.

Ο τόμος έχει εκδοθεί υπό την διεθνή άδεια «Αναφορά Δημιουργού - Παρόμοια Διανομή 4.0 Διεθνές (CC BY-SA 4.0)».

Με αυτήν την άδεια μπορείτε να: (α) Μοιραστείτε — αντιγράψετε και αναδιανέμετε το υλικό με κάθε μέσο και τρόπο (β) Προσαρμόσετε — αναμείξετε, τροποποιήσετε και δημιουργήσετε πάνω στο υλικό για κάθε σκοπό, ακόμα και εμπορικό.

Υπό τους ακόλουθους όρους:

(α) Αναφορά Δημιουργού — Θα πρέπει να καταχωρίσετε αναφορά στον δημιουργό (Δημήτρης Ι. Λοΐζος), με σύνδεσμο της άδειας (δες σύνδεσμο παραπάνω), και με αναφορά στο εάν έχουν γίνει αλλαγές. Μπορείτε να το κάνετε αυτό με οποιονδήποτε εύλογο τρόπο, αλλά όχι με τρόπο που να υπονοεί ότι ο δημιουργός αποδέχεται το έργο σας ή τη χρήση που εσείς κάνετε. Η αναφορά στον δημιουργό πρέπει να περιλαμβάνει τουλάχιστον τα εξής: **Δημήτρης Ι. Λοΐζος, *Ιστορία και Αρχαιολογία. Imaginaire και Réalité*, Αθήνα: 2024. ISBN 978-960-91873-10-9**

(β) Παρόμοια Διανομή — Αν αναμείξετε, τροποποιήσετε, ή δημιουργήσετε πάνω στο υλικό, πρέπει να διανείμετε τις δικές σας συνεισφορές υπό την ίδια άδεια όπως και το πρωτότυπο (CC BY-SA 4.0).

(γ) Δεν υπάρχουν πρόσθετοι περιορισμοί — Δεν μπορείτε να εφαρμόσετε νομικούς όρους ή τεχνολογικά μέτρα που να περιορίζουν νομικά τους άλλους από το να κάνουν οτιδήποτε επιτρέπει η παρούσα άδεια.

Πληροφορίες για την άδεια σε: <<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/deed.el>>

ISBN 978-960-91873-10-9

© Δημήτρης Ι. Λοΐζος / Demetris I. Loizos, 2024

First published in 2024 by the author © Demetris I. Loizos

Available to download free:

< <http://www.anistor.gr/ellas/Europe-Greece.htm>>

και

<<https://archive.org/details/@dilos>>

This book is published under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International licence (CC BY-SA 4.0). This license allows you to:

(a) share - copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format

(b) Adapt - remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially

Under the following conditions:

(a) Attribution - You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use. Attribution should include the following information: **Demetris I. Loizos, *History and Archaeology. Réalité and Imaginaire*. Athens: 2024. ISBN 978-960-91873-10-9**

(b) ShareAlike - If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same license as the original.

(c) No additional restrictions - You may not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits.

Further details about Creative Commons licenses are available at

<<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>>

<<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode>>

ISBN 978-960-91873-10-9

© Δημήτρης Ι. Λοΐζος / Demetris I. Loizos, 2024

αφιερωμένο στον πατέρα μου και στην μητέρα μου

«[Ο ιστορικός] πρὸ τῶν πάντων ἐλεύθερος ἔστω τὴν γνώμην
καὶ μήτε φοβεῖσθω μηδένα μήτε ἐλπίζετω μηδέν»

(Πῶς δεῖ ἱστορίαν συγγράφειν, 38, Loeb)

Λουκιανός (ο Σαμοσατεύς)

(125 - 180 μ.Χ.)

Περιεχόμενα - Contents

Πρόλογος	9
1. Η Ιστορία και η Αρχαιολογία ως Επιστήμες	13
Η Επιστήμη της Αρχαιολογίας	
Αρχαιολογική Χρονολόγηση	
Η Επιστήμη της Ιστορίας	
Ιστορική Χρονολόγηση	
Η Ιστορία του Ευρωπαϊκού Πολιτισμού	
Η Imaginaire και η Réalité	
2. The Historian in the 21 st Century	19
The Historian's Craft	
The Historian as Teacher of History	
The Historian as Researcher	
The Historian as Intellectual, Political Activist, Public Intellectual	
3. What is History in the 21 st Century	59
A personal note you may just skip	
Ancient Lucian, more contemporary than ever	
White's Post-modernism	
Elton's truth	
Carr's optimism for the future	
Are Carr's ideas still useful in the 21 st century?	
Jenkins finally speaks by himself	
Evan's reconsideration of History	
Cannadine's question on History's death	
Gaddi's experience with the two faces of History	
Hugh's macro-History, social sciences and psychoanalysis	
Barzun's psycho-history and quanto-history	
Hobsbawm's Marxist History	
Stone vs Hobsbawm	
Braudel's <i>longue durée</i>	
Beard's American definition of History	
Huizinga's definition of History	
Meinecke's revival of historicism	
Lord Acton and Henri Berr's General Histories	
Walsh's meaning of History	
Toynbee's <i>Study of History</i>	
Trevelyan's Muse	
Collingwood's idea of History	
Croce's true History as contemporary History & Le Goff's Periodization Objection	
Dithley's <i>Geisteswissenschaften</i> & Hermeneutics	
Mommsen's History practicing	
Coulange's History of all epochs	
Plekhanov's individuals in History	
Marx and Engel's historical materialism	
Jean Jaurès, the first socialist historian	
Michelet's patriotism in History	
Carlyle's heroes	
Macaulay's intellectual prodigy	
Von Ranke's «wie es eigentlich gewesen»	
The American (USA) scene of historiography	

Niebuhr's critical method	
Voltaire's <i>siècles</i>	
Vico's new science	
Machavelli's historical machavellianism	
Renaissance & the Middle Ages	
Byzantium	
Finley's view on ancient historiography	
Roman historiography	
Thucydides how it really happened	
Lucian said it all 1800 year ago	
What is History after all?	
4. Αρχαιολογία, Ανθρωπολογία, Εθνογραφία και Προϊστορία	177
5. Ψευδοαρχαιολογία & ψευδοϊστορία, Ελλιπής αρχαιολογία & Ιστορία, τεχνητή νοημοσύνη	181
Ψευδοαρχαιολογία, ελλιπής αρχαιολογία & οι ελληνικές πυραμίδες Προσωρινά Συμπεράσματα: Graecorithesus, η Ευρώπη λίκνο του Ανθρώπου; Η ψευδοϊστορία Προσωρινά Συμπεράσματα: Η χαμένη Ιστορία των Αρχαίων Μεσσηνίων Η ελλιπής Ιστορία Τεχνητή νοημοσύνη	
6. Η Περιοδολόγηση της Ιστορίας	217
7. Ακαδημαϊκός Επαρχιωτισμός	221
Συμπέρασμα	225
Bibliography – Βιβλιογραφία	229

Πρόλογος

Θα διαβάσετε ένα βιβλίο που ένα μέρος του (κεφάλαια 1, 4, 5, 6, 7 και γενικό συμπέρασμα) είναι γραμμένο στην ελληνική γλώσσα ενώ ένα άλλο (κεφάλαια 2 και 3) στην αγγλική γλώσσα. Το τμήμα στην αγγλική αφορά κυρίως στο αιώνιο ερώτημα «Τι είναι Ιστορία» και στον ιστορικό του 21ου αιώνα ενώ το ερώτημα των πρώτων δεκαετιών του 21ου αιώνα «Τι είναι Αρχαιολογία» πραγματεύεται στην ελληνική γλώσσα. Το βιβλίο αυτό θα μπορούσε να είχε και τον υπότιτλο «από την απομόνωση μου» ή το πιο εύλωτο «from my log cabin» για τον απλό λόγο ότι αντικατοπτρίζει προσωπικές απόψεις για την Ιστορία και την Αρχαιολογία μαζί με κάποια αυτοβιογραφικά στοιχεία. Η μελέτη αυτή είναι το αποτέλεσμα πενήντα ετών στοχασμού επάνω στην Ιστορία και στην Αρχαιολογία, επιστήμες τις οποίες, τουλάχιστον για τον Αρχαίο Κόσμο, τις θεωρώ απολύτως αλληλένδετες. Τα θέματα που συζητούνται εδώ, συνήθως δεν βρίσκονται μαζί στο ίδιο βιβλίο καθώς άλλα είναι θεωρητικά και άλλα πρακτικά, από την σκοπιά και του ιστορικού και του αρχαιολόγου καθώς και αυτοβιογραφικά. Επιπλέον, τα κεφάλαιά του ονομάζονται και εναλλάσσονται με ιδιότυπο τρόπο και σειρά. Ωστόσο, το θέμα του είναι η Ιστορία και η Αρχαιολογία και απευθύνεται στον ασκούμενο ιστορικό ή αρχαιολόγο, στον προπτυχιακό και μεταπτυχιακό φοιτητή Ιστορίας ή Αρχαιολογίας, στο υποψήφιο διδάκτορα αλλά και στον ήδη πανεπιστημιακά εκπαιδευμένο ιστορικό και αρχαιολόγο ή και στον σοβαρό ερασιτέχνη ιστορικό και αρχαιολόγο.

Αυτό το βιβλίο προήλθε από μια προσωπική ανάγκη να ανακαλυφθεί και να διερευνηθεί σε βάθος τι είναι Ιστορία και Αρχαιολογία από την θεωρητική τους άποψη αλλά και κατά την εφαρμογή τους στο πεδίο εργασίας. Αυτά τα ερωτήματα με έχουν δελεάσει από τότε που ήμουν φοιτητής αρχαιολογίας στο Εθνικό και Καποδιστριακό Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών αλλά και ακροατής των αρχαιολογικών διαλέξεων στην Εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογική Εταιρία και στην American School of Classical Studies in Athens αλλά κυρίως από την περίοδο που ήμουν τελειόφοιτος της Ιστορίας στο πανεπιστημιακό κολέγιο Deree College-The American College of Greece και αργότερα μεταπτυχιακός φοιτητής στο Kent State University, στο Οχάιο των Η.Π.Α. Αυτό το εγχείρημα προσπαθεί να απαντήσει σε κάποιες ερωτήσεις που έκανα στον εαυτό μου ακόμη και στα λυκειακά σχολικά μου χρόνια στο ιδιωτικό σχολείο Ηράκλειος Σχολή, στο Νέο Ηράκλειο, στην Αθήνα, και πολύ περισσότερο αργότερα κατά τη διάρκεια των πανεπιστημιακών σπουδών αλλά κυρίως τα τελευταία τριάντα χρόνια άσκησης της Ιστορίας ως συγγραφέας στην νεοελληνική και αγγλική γλώσσα αλλά και ως αντικείμενο της διδασκαλίας μου στο Deree College-The American College of Greece.

Στο παρόν βιβλίο η λέξη Ιστορία τυπώνεται με κεφαλαίο I ώστε να διακρίνεται από την ιστορία/ιστορία/ιστορίες που δεν έχουν καμία σχέση με την επιστημονική Ιστορία. Η αναφορά σε αυτό το βιβλίο γίνεται στις επιστήμες της Ιστορίας και της Αρχαιολογίας, αυτό που ορισμένοι συγγραφείς ονομάζουν αληθινή Ιστορία και Αρχαιολογία σε αντίθεση με την ψευδοϊστορία και ψευδοαρχαιολογία, οι οποίες επίσης συζητούνται και αναλύονται διεξοδικά.

Στο αγγλικό τμήμα του βιβλίου προσπάθησα να χρησιμοποιήσω απλά αγγλικά, την γλώσσα του προπτυχιακού αγγλόφωνου φοιτητή, αν και ειδικά στο κεφάλαιο «What is History in the 21st Century» η γλώσσα που χρησιμοποιείται είναι πολύ κοντά σε αυτή των στοχαστών που μελετήθηκαν και επομένως μπορεί να περιέχει πολύπλοκα νοήματα που σε ορισμένες περιπτώσεις θα χρειαστεί προσπάθεια εκ μέρους του

αναγνώστη για να γίνουν κατανοητά. Η συγγραφή αυτού του τμήματος στην αγγλική ήταν αυθόρμητη. Δηλαδή, διαβάζοντας τα θεωρητικά έργα των στοχαστών που επέλεξα για την θεωρία της Ιστορίας αυτόματα κατόρθωσα να κατανοήσω ότι θα μπορούσα πολύ καλύτερα να εκφράσω τις απόψεις τους εάν συνέγραφα την σύνοψη των ιδεών τους στην αγγλική γλώσσα παρά μεταφράζοντάς τες στην ελληνική. Μου αρέσει να παρουσιάζω τις ιδέες και τις απόψεις μου σε μια απλή, σαφή, εύκολα κατανοητή γλώσσα καθώς η Ιστορία, εκτός από τη θεωρία της Ιστορίας, δεν είναι μια φιλοσοφική πραγματεία. Είναι ένας κλάδος που παρουσιάζει και εξηγεί στον αναγνώστη του γεγονότα του παρελθόντος ως ιστορικά γεγονότα μαζί με την ερμηνεία τους. Άρα, η γλώσσα που χρησιμοποιείται για τη συγγραφή της Ιστορίας πρέπει να είναι σαφής και να αντιπροσωπεύει το καθαρό μυαλό του ιστορικού. Είναι σαν ένα παιχνίδι καλαθοσφαίρισης (μπάσκετ): μόνο η ομάδα με την καλύτερη προπόνηση, με καθαρούς στόχους και καθαρό μυαλό κατά τη διάρκεια του παιχνιδιού θα κερδίσει.

Η μελέτη *Ιστορία και Αρχαιολογία. Réalité και Imaginaire* θα ήθελε ακόμη να δείξει ότι ο ιστορικός και ο αρχαιολόγος δεν πρέπει απλώς να λάβει μεταπτυχιακό ή διδακτορικό δίπλωμα, να γίνει απλός δάσκαλος ή ανασκαφέας και να σταματήσει να μελετά, να αναζητά, να διερευνά θέματα terra incognita στην Ιστορία και στην αρχαιολογία σε μικρή ή μεγάλη κλίμακα. Το σημαντικότερο όλων είναι ότι πρέπει να αυτο-εκπαιδευτεί συνεχώς και πέρα από την τυπική μεταπτυχιακή ερευνητική εργασία ή διατριβή του, την οποία είναι υποχρεωμένος να ολοκληρώσει για το μεταπτυχιακό του ή το διδακτορικό του, αλλά και την καθημερινή του ακαδημαϊκή δραστηριότητα. Η καμπύλη μαθήσεως ενός ιστορικού ή αρχαιολόγου δεν κλείνει και τελειώνει με την ολοκλήρωση ενός πτυχίου ή διπλώματος Ιστορίας ή Αρχαιολογίας ή την εξεύρεση εργασίας αλλά διευρύνεται συνεχώς επί των γνωστικών αντικειμένων του αλλά και ταυτοχρόνως επεκτείνεται στη γνώση συναφών ή σχετικών κλάδων όπως, η κοινωνιολογία, η οικονομική ιστορία, οι αρχαίες γλώσσες και πολιτισμοί ή ακόμη και σε μακρινότερους κλάδους, όπως οι φυσικές επιστήμες και η τεχνολογία.

Η αξία αυτού του βιβλίου μπορεί να αποφασισθεί μόνο από εσάς, τους αναγνώστες του. Εγώ, το μόνο που μπορώ να πω είναι ότι μου άρεσαν πάρα πολύ οι ώρες, οι ημέρες, τα χρόνια που πέρασα μαζί του κατά την συγγραφή του. Θυμηθείτε! Η Ιστορία και η Αρχαιολογία είναι μεν επιστήμες αλλά μπορεί να γίνουν ΚΑΙ πολύ διασκεδαστικές κατά την μελέτη, την συγγραφή και την ανάγνωση!

Αυτός, Αυτή και...

Από βιολογικής άποψης, ένας άνθρωπος γεννιέται είτε με αρσενικό είτε με θηλυκό φύλο, αλλά σε ορισμένες περιπτώσεις ένα ενήλικο άτομο μπορεί να υποβληθεί σε χειρουργική επέμβαση αλλαγής φύλου και να αλλάξει σωματικά το φύλο του/της. Επίσης, υπάρχουν μερικά ανθρώπινα όντα που είναι αρσενικά αλλά προτιμούν να ντύνονται θηλυκά και να συμπεριφέρονται έτσι και μερικά θηλυκά που προτιμούν να ντύνονται αρσενικά και να συμπεριφέρονται με αυτόν τον τρόπο. Επιπλέον, υπάρχουν ανθρώπινα όντα που έχουν διαφορετικό σεξουαλικό προσανατολισμό από αυτόν μιας τυπικής σεξουαλικής έλξης αρσενικού και θηλυκού. Ακόμη, υπάρχουν άνθρωποι που προτιμούν να ταυτίζονται με πράγματα και να παρουσιάζονται ως δέντρα, κολοκύθες, σπαθιά και άλλα άψυχα αντικείμενα. Όλες οι παραπάνω ομάδες ανθρώπων μελετώνται ή θα μελετηθούν από διάφορους επιστημονικούς κλάδους συμπεριλαμβανομένης και της Ιστορίας. Σε αυτό το βιβλίο και για λόγους συγγραφικής οικονομίας, αναφέρομαι σε ανθρώπους και ιστορικούς μόνο στη βιολογική τους μορφή και συνήθως χρησιμοποιώ αυτός/η και αυτόν/ήν και αποφεύγω άλλες κοινωνικές αναφορές σε ανθρώπους ή οποιαδήποτε άλλη μη βιολογική ταύτιση. Σε οποιαδήποτε περίπτωση πάντως υπάρχει αναφορά σε πρόσωπο με την αρσενική ταύτιση της ελληνικής γραμματικής πρέπει να εκλαμβάνεται στην απρόσωπη εκφορά της ιδιότητας του προσώπου

στο οποίο αναφέρεται. Δηλαδή, «ο φοιτητής» περιλαμβάνει οποιονδήποτε έχει την ιδιότητα του φοιτητή και όχι μόνο τον άνδρα/αρσενικό φοιτητή. Προσωπικά, σέβομαι απόλυτα την αυτοδιάθεση κάθε ανθρώπου. Όμως, ο ιστορικός είναι ιστορικός και ο αρχαιολόγος, αρχαιολόγος πάνω από όλες τις άλλες ιδιότητες!

S/he, Him/Her... etc

From a biological point of view, a human being is either born a male or a female but in some cases a grown up person may undergo a sex/gender reassignment surgery and have his sex/gender physically changed. Also, there are some human beings who are males but prefer to be dressed as females and behave so and some females who prefer to be dressed as males and behave in that way. Moreover, there are human beings who have a different sexual orientation from that of a typical male to female sexual attraction. Even more, there are human beings who prefer to be identified with things and present themselves as trees, pumpkins, swords and other lifeless items. All of the above groups of human beings are studied or will be studied by various disciplines including History. In this book and in favor of the economies of writing, I refer to human beings and historians in their biological form only and I use s/he and him/her and avoid other social references to human beings or any other non biological identification. Personally though, I fully respect the self-determination of any human being. After all, a historian is a historian no matter what!

Ευχαριστίες

Στο κείμενο αυτής της μελέτης, έχω κάνει αναφορές σε εκείνους τους στοχαστές και μελετητές, από την αρχαιότητα έως τον 21ο αιώνα, που με ενέπνευσαν να γράψω αυτό το βιβλίο. Η έρευνα, η ανάλυση, ο σχεδιασμός του ήταν ένας μοναχικός και δύσβατος πνευματικός δρόμος, στοχασμός πενήντα ετών.

Κεφάλαιο 1

Η Ιστορία και η Αρχαιολογία ως Επιστήμες

Αρχικά, η Ιστορία εθεωρείτο ότι ήταν μέρος της φιλοσοφίας, όπως άλλωστε και όλες οι τέχνες και οι επιστήμες. Αργότερα, ως συγγραφή κατατάσσεται στις φιλοσοφικές-φιλολογικές επιστήμες. Τελικά, στον 20ο αιώνα αυτονομήθηκε τελείως αν και υπήρξε αμφιβολία εάν ήταν τέχνη ή επιστήμη. Πλέον, δεν υπάρχει αμφιβολία ότι είναι επιστήμη ως προς την έρευνα και την μελέτη της και τέχνη ως προς την συγγραφή της. Η Αρχαιολογία είναι επιστήμη ως προς την ανασκαφή, την μελέτη των ευρημάτων και τους συσχετισμούς τους και τέχνη ως προς την συγγραφή των αποτελεσμάτων της ανασκαφής και της εποχής τους.

Η Επιστήμη της Αρχαιολογίας

Η αρχαιολογία συνδυάζει με τον καλύτερο τρόπο και μαζί την θεωρητική και την θετική κατάρτιση ενός επιστήμονα, για να χρησιμοποιήσουμε παρωχημένους όρους αναφοράς στις επιστήμες. Στον 21ο αιώνα, ο αρχαιολόγος πρέπει να γνωρίζει γιατί και με ποιον τρόπο θα ανασκάψει μία θέση, να περιμένει ότι μπορεί στον ίδιο τόπο να φέρει στο φως ευρήματα πολλών διαφορετικών εποχών (συνήθως από την Νεολιθική μέχρι και την Μεσαιωνική ή Βυζαντινή Εποχή), να είναι έτοιμος να χρονολογήσει τα ευρήματα του ή να γνωρίζει πώς η σύγχρονη μηχανική, η φυσική, η χημεία, τα μαθηματικά και φυσικά η συνεχώς αναπτυσσόμενη τεχνολογία μπορούν να δώσουν λύσεις και απαντήσεις στα αναρίθμητα προβλήματα και ερωτήματα που προκύπτουν από μία ανασκαφή. Η αρχαιολογία ασχολείται με τον υλικό πολιτισμό του ανθρώπου από την προϊστορική εποχή μέχρι και τις μέρες μας αλλά μελετά και κατάλοιπα νεκρών ανθρώπων και ζώων και τις δραστηριότητάς τους μαζί με το φυσικό περιβάλλον στο οποίο έζησαν. Οι αρχαιολόγοι χρησιμοποιούν πλέον όρους όπως πολυπολιτισμική εξέλιξη, διάχυση, εκείνοι και εμείς, διεύρυνση, ανασύνθεση, αποδημία, γενετική ταυτότητα και DNA, πολιτισμική οικολογία. Φυσικά δεν ξεχνούν την παραδοσιακή σχετική χρονολόγηση, απόλυτη χρονολόγηση αλλά και τις άλλες χρονομετρικές μεθόδους χρονολόγησης (λ.χ. ραδιοχρονολόγηση άνθρακα C-14 ή ¹⁴C). Με απόλυτη επιστημονική ακρίβεια ως προς την μέθοδο ανασκαφής και καταγραφής των ευρημάτων, η αρχαιολογική εργασία επί τόπου, στο όρυγμα της ανασκαφής, μοιάζει με το παλιό μπαούλο που ανοίγεται αργά-αργά και με μεγάλη προσοχή ανασύρονται από μέσα του ένα-ένα τα αντικείμενα που περιέχει, καθαρίζονται και καταγράφονται (πλέον ηλεκτρονικά) λεπτομερώς. Στον τόπο της αρχαιολογικής ανασκαφής, τα στρώματα που έχουν συσσωρευθεί με το πέρασμα του χρόνου το ένα επάνω από το άλλο, αφαιρούνται ένα-ένα χωρίς να αναταράσσονται για να αποκαλυφθεί η κάθε αρχαιολογική εποχή ξεχωριστά. Ταξινόμηση και τυπολογία είναι οι πρώτες κυρίαρχες λέξεις στην επιστήμη της ανασκαφικής αρχαιολογίας και μετά καταγραφή και καθαρισμός-συντήρηση. Κατόπιν έρχεται η αναλυτική αρχαιολογία, η μελέτη και ο συσχετισμός των ευρημάτων μίας ανασκαφής μεταξύ τους αλλά και με άλλες ανασκαφές ή φιλολογικά ή άλλα κείμενα. Οι αρχαιολόγοι, όμως, ενδιαφέρονται και για τις επιπτώσεις κλιματικών αλλαγών, μεταβολές στην φυσική κατάσταση της υδρογείου σφαίρας που επηρέασαν ανθρώπους προηγούμενων εποχών, τον τρόπο διαβίωσης των ανθρώπων που έζησαν στο αρχαιολογικό όρυγμα που ανασκάφη αλλά και την διατροφή τους. Έτσι, γεννήθηκαν νέα παρακλάδια της επιστήμης: παλαιοκλιματολογία, παλαιοβοτανική, παλαιοζωολογία, βιοαρχαιολογία, αρχαιομετρία, αρχαιοσεισμολογία.

λογία, γεωαρχειολογία, αρχαιολογία τοπίου. Τέλος, έρχονται οι δημοσιεύσεις της ανασκαφής, συνήθως από κάθε έναν (ή περισσότερους) από την ανασκαφική ομάδα και ανάλογα με την ειδικότητά του, υπό την επίβλεψη και την επιμέλεια του/της επικεφαλής ανασκαφέα. Η τελική δημοσίευση μιας αρχαιολογικής ανασκαφής είναι κανονικά διεξοδική (συχνά πολύτομη), εξαιρετικά λεπτομερής, και αρκετές φορές συγκριτική και συσχετιζόμενη με ευρήματα σε άλλη (ή και άλλες) συναφή αρχαιολογική θέση. Οι Έλληνες αρχαιολόγοι ανασκαφείς, όμως, των τελευταίων εκατό ετών συνήθως δεν χρησιμοποίησαν/χρησιμοποιούν τις λεπτομερειακές ανασκαφικές μεθόδους των αρχαιολόγων από τις Ξένες Αρχαιολογικές Σχολές στην Ελλάδα ενώ οι δημοσιεύσεις τους είναι συχνά προσωρινές. Έτσι, με εξαίρεση ορισμένους αρχαιολόγους ανασκαφείς που εξέδωσαν τελικές δημοσιεύσεις των ανασκαφών τους στην ελληνική γλώσσα (λ.χ. Ιακωβίδης, Ανδρόνικος, Ντούμας), πολλές φορές οι αναφορές των ανασκαφών είναι γενικόλογες, περιληπτικές και σε ορισμένες περιπτώσεις ασαφείς. Παρ' όλα αυτά, αρχή δική μας είναι ότι στην περιγραφή και ερμηνεία των ευρημάτων μιας ανασκαφής, τον κύριο λόγο έχει ο/η ανασκαφέας (ο/η επικεφαλής αρχαιολόγος μιας ανασκαφής). Εκείνος/η ήταν που είδε πρώτος επί τόπου τον χώρο και τα αντικείμενα που ανέσκαψε και έκανε τις πρώτες σχέσεις συσχετισμού των. Ευθύνη όλων μας είναι, όμως, να καταγράψουμε, να περισώσουμε, να διατηρήσουμε και να περιγράψουμε τα επιτεύγματα των ανθρώπων που έζησαν πριν από εμάς.¹

Αρχαιολογική Χρονολόγηση

Κατά κύριο λόγο, η αρχαιολογική χρονολόγηση δεν είναι απόλυτη, δηλαδή τα ευρήματα των ανασκαφών δεν είναι δυνατόν να ενταχθούν σε συγκεκριμένο έτος. Συνήθως, οι αρχαιολόγοι προσδιορίζουν την αρχαιότητα των ευρημάτων σε συσχέτιση με το αρχαιολογικό στρώμα από το οποίο ανασύρθηκαν. Τις περισσότερες φορές, το κάθε αρχαιολογικό στρώμα, το οποίο προσδιορίζεται στις κατακόρυφες ανασκαφικές τομές από την επιφάνεια προς το εσωτερικό του εδάφους, ξεχωρίζει από το είδος και την τεχνοτροπία της κεραμικής (συνήθως θραύσματα αγγείων) την οποία περιέχει και η οποία χρονολογείται σε σχέση με παρόμοια χρονολογημένη κεραμική σε άλλη θέση. Η χρονολόγηση αυτή βασίζεται στην τεχνοτροπία κατασκευής και διακοσμήσεως των αγγείων. Έτσι, συντάσσονται χρονολογικοί πίνακες περιόδων με χρονικό εύρος αρκετών ετών ή δεκαετιών. Μεγαλύτερη χρονική ακρίβεια για τα ευρήματα κάθε στρώματος μιας ανασκαφής μπορεί να επιτευχθεί με την παρουσία οργανικών υπολειμμάτων (π.χ. ξύλινων τεμαχίων ή οστών ζώων/ανθρώπων) των οποίων η ηλικία μπορεί να προσδιοριστεί με μεγαλύτερη ακρίβεια με μεθόδους ραδιοχρονολόγησης. Συχνότατα, λοιπόν, για τον χρονολογικό προσδιορισμό αρχαιολογικών ευρημάτων γίνεται αναφορά σε Πρώιμη, Μέση, Ύστερη περίοδο, η κάθε μία από τις οποίες υποδιαιρείται σε μικρότερες περιόδους. Για τον ηπειρωτικό ελλαδικό χώρο αλλά και για τα νησιά και τα ανατολικά παράλια του Αιγαίου έχουν προσδιοριστεί αρχαιολογικές χρονολογικές περίοδοι κυρίως για την Β' χιλιετία π.Χ. (Πρώιμη Ελλαδική/Μινωική, Μέση Ελλαδική/Μινωική, Ύστερη Ελλαδική/Μινωική), οι οποίες εφαρμόζονται σε όλες τις ανασκαφικές θέσεις. Συνεπώς, οι αρχαιολογικές αναφορές πρέπει να γίνονται με βάση αυτή την ορολογία. Πολύ συχνά, κατά την ανασκαφή ορισμένης θέσεως οι

¹ Για όλα αυτά μπορείτε να διαβάσετε λεπτομέρειες στο Brian M. Fagan and Nadia Durrani, *Archaeology. A Brief Introduction*, [396 pages], 12th ed. (London; Routledge, 2016). Χρήσιμο είναι και το συντομότερο Lawrence Bowkett and Stephen Hill and Diana & K.A. Wardle, *Classical Archaeology in the Field: Approaches*, [138 pages] (London: Bristol Classical Press/Duckworth, 2001). Η ομάδα των αρχαιολόγων που ανασκάπτει την Αρχαία Κόρινθο έχει εκδώσει το υποδειγματικό Guy D. R. Sanders and Sarah A. James and Alicia Carter Johnson, *Corinth Excavations. Archaeological Manual* (Grand Forks, ND.: The Digital Press at the University of North Dakota, 2017). Για την επιστήμη της αρχαιολογίας γενικώς διαβάστε John Bintliff, ed., *A Companion to Archaeology* (Malden, MA.; Blackwell, 2004).

αρχαιολόγοι χρησιμοποιούν και τοπικές διορθώσεις των χρονολογικών ορίων μιας περιόδου όταν αυτές δεν συμπίπτουν με την χρονολόγηση συγκεκριμένης εποχής που εφαρμόζεται γενικά σε μία περιοχή. Δηλαδή, ανάλογα με τα ευρήματα σε μία θέση ή περιοχή, η Αρχαϊκή Εποχή μπορεί να φθάνει και μετά το μέσο του Ε' αιώνα π.Χ. όταν πια γενικά στον ελλαδικό χώρο έχουν ήδη αναπτυχθεί τα αναγνωριστικά στοιχεία της Κλασικής Εποχής. Γενικώς και σε ορισμένες περιπτώσεις, το εύρος των ετών που έχουν ορίσει οι αρχαιολόγοι για κάθε υποπερίοδο, λόγω χάριν της Εποχής του Ορειχάλκου (Bronze Age) ή Χαλκοκρατίας, μπορεί να φθάνει και τον ενάμιση αιώνα μια που ορισμένοι δέχονται χαμηλότερη και άλλη υψηλότερη χρονολόγηση για την κάθε μία υποπερίοδο. Σκοπός της αρχαιολογικής χρονολογήσεως είναι να τοποθετήσει τα ευρήματα επάνω στην γραμμή του χρόνου. Πόσο μακριά στο παρελθόν είναι αυτά από εμάς σήμερα (απόλυτη χρονολόγηση) ή πώς συσχετίζονται με άλλα στην ίδια ή άλλη αρχαιολογική θέση (σχετική χρονολόγηση). Οι χρονολογίες εκφράζονται πολλές φορές σε έτη πριν από σήμερα (στην αγγλική, BP=Before Present) ή στο σύστημα προ Χριστού/προ κοινής εποχής (π.Χ., BC=Before Christ ή BCE=Before Common Era) και μετά Χριστόν/κοινής εποχής (μ.Χ., AD=Anno Domini ή CE=Common Era). Εν τέλει, ο αναγνώστης αρχαιολογικών μελετών πρέπει να κατανοήσει ότι η αρχαιολογική χρονολόγηση έχει ένα μικρό ή μεγάλο εύρος ετών σε αντίθεση με το εύρος της ιστορικής χρονολογήσεως το οποίο συνήθως περιορίζεται σε ένα ή δύο έτη.

Η Επιστήμη της Ιστορίας

Η επιστήμη της Ιστορίας έχει τις ρίζες της στην φιλοσοφία και για αυτόν τον λόγο η θεωρητική της πλευρά εξετάζεται από την Φιλοσοφία της Ιστορίας. Η συγγραφή της Ιστορίας, όμως, είναι διαφορετικό θέμα. Από την Αρχαιότητα μέχρι τις μέρες μας έχουν εκφραστεί διάφορες θεωρητικές/φιλοσοφικές απόψεις για το τι είναι η Ιστορία, τι πραγματεύεται και πώς μελετά τα θέματά της. Μερικοί νομίζουν ότι είναι μόνο πολιτική Ιστορία, άλλοι πιστεύουν ότι πρέπει να ασχολείται και με τις ανθρώπινες κοινωνίες, υπάρχουν κάποιοι που νομίζουν ότι πρέπει να υποτάσσεται σε μία ιδεολογία (λ.χ. φιλελευθερισμός, συντηρητισμός, σοσιαλισμός/μαρξισμός, ρατσισμός και αντι-ρατσισμός) ενώ άλλοι πιστεύουν ότι είναι στην ουσία παρακλάδι της φιλολογίας και πρέπει να ενώνεται με μύθους. Ορισμένοι υποστηρίζουν ότι τα ιστορικά τεκμήρια δεν είναι απαραίτητα για την συγγραφή της Ιστορίας ενώ η συντριπτική πλειοψηφία των ιστορικών επιμένει, όπως μας δίδαξε ο Θουκυδίδης, ότι κάθε γραμμή της πρέπει να στηρίζεται σε γραπτά και/ή αρχαιολογικά κατάλοιπα. Για εμάς, Ιστορία είναι το σύνολο της ανθρώπινης δραστηριότητας μέσα στους αιώνες και η βάση της συγγραφής της τα τεκμήρια που άφησαν οι άνθρωποι πίσω τους. Δεν είναι απλώς μία καταγραφή συμβάντων αλλά η τεκμηριωμένη συζήτηση και ανάλυση των γεγονότων έτσι ώστε να κατανοήσουμε σήμερα καλύτερα το παρελθόν μας. Η Ιστορία δεν είναι φιλολογία και δεν ασχολείται με φαντασιώσεις και αποκνήματα φαντασίας (imaginaire). Είναι η réalité που πρέπει να ανακαλύψει, να ξεχωρίσει και να αποκαλύψει ο ιστορικός μέσα από τις διάφορες imaginaires των ανθρώπων του παρελθόντος και των καταλοίπων τους. Είναι το τεντωμένο σχοινί επάνω από τον Σηκουάνα που πρέπει να περπατήσει επιτυχώς ο ιστορικός χωρίς δίχτυ προστασίας μέχρι την απέναντι όχθη για να συγγράψει ένα άξιο λόγου έργο. Είναι η συγκέντρωση όλων των επιμέρους μελετών σε ένα πολύ μεγάλο ψηφιδωτό γεμάτο με μικρά σχέδια που αποδίδουν την δραστηριότητα λαών, ομάδων και μεμονωμένων ανθρώπων αλλά και της αλληλεπιδράσεώς τους, από τον ταπεινό δούλο/δούλη και τον θεατρίνο μέχρι τον πολίτη και κάτοικο της ελληνικής Πόλεως και της Ρώμης και μέχρι τον αρχηγό, τον ηγεμόνα, τον βασιλιά, την βασίλισσα, τον αυτοκράτορα, την οποιαδήποτε προσωπικότητα. Στην Ιστορία πρέπει να υπάρχει και υπάρχει χώρος για όλους.

Ιστορική Χρονολόγηση

Η ιστορική χρονολόγηση έχει τους ίδιους σκοπούς με την αρχαιολογική χρονολόγηση, την τοποθέτηση των γεγονότων επάνω στην γραμμή του χρόνου. Βασίζεται σε χρονολογικούς πίνακες απόλυτους και συσχετίσεως ιστορικών γεγονότων, οι οποίοι έχουν συνταχθεί μέσα στους αιώνες. Αν και δεν υπήρχε ένα κοινό σύστημα ιστορικής χρονολογήσεως στις διάφορες περιόδους και στους πολιτισμούς στον ελληνορωμαϊκό κόσμο, στην Ανατολική Μεσόγειο και στην Αρχαία Εγγύς Ανατολή, σιγά-σιγά από τον 6ο αιώνα μ.Χ., περισσότερο μετά το 1600 μ.Χ. και τέλος συστηματικά από τον 18ο αιώνα μ.Χ., οι ιστοριογράφοι και ιστορικοί χρησιμοποιούν το σύστημα προ Χριστού (γεννήσεως, π.Χ.), και μετά Χριστόν (μ.Χ.) θέτοντας την γέννηση του Χριστού ως ένα χρονολογικό ορόσημο για τον προσδιορισμό του τρέχοντος και του παρελθόντος χρόνου. Ήδη από τον 18ο αιώνα μ.Χ., ορισμένοι ιστορικοί και ιστοριογράφοι αντί των προσδιορισμών προ Χριστού και μετά Χριστόν χρησιμοποιούν τους προσδιορισμούς, για παράδειγμα, στην αγγλική, Before the Common/Current Era (BCE) και Common/Current Era (CE) ή μεταγραμμαμένοι στην ελληνική, προ κοινής εποχής (π.κ.ε) και κοινής εποχής (κ.ε.). Στα δύο προαναφερθέντα συστήματα, που ουσιαστικά είναι ένα και το αυτό, δεν υπάρχει το έτος 0 (μηδέν) αλλά από το 1 π.Χ./π.κ.ε. μεταβαίνουμε στο 1 μ.Χ./κ.ε.

Οι κατάλογοι βασιλέων και ηγεμόνων που έχουν συνταχθεί ήδη από τους πρώτους αιώνες της καταγεγραμμένης Ιστορίας, η σειρά των ολυμπιάδων και ολυμπιονικών, η θητεία των Αθηναίων πρυτάνεων (που συνήθως αποδίδεται με διπλή χρονολογία, για παράδειγμα 275/4 π.Χ.) και των Ρωμαίων υπάτων, οι χρονολογικοί πίνακες που συντάχθηκαν κατά την Μεσαιωνική και Βυζαντινή Εποχή αποτελούν σημαντικά βοηθήματα για την απόλυτη ή σχετική χρονολόγηση γεγονότων στο σύστημα π.Χ./π.κ.ε. και μ.Χ./κ.ε. Οι ιστορικοί προσπαθούν να είναι όσο το δυνατόν πιο ακριβείς στις ιστορικές χρονολογήσεις τους αλλά όταν, όμως, η χρονολόγηση δεν είναι δυνατόν να είναι απόλυτη χρησιμοποιούν τις λέξεις ή φράσεις: περίπου/περί το έτος, στις αρχές, στην αρχή, στα μέσα, στα τέλη, προς το τέλος του αιώνα.

Η Ιστορία του Ευρωπαϊκού Πολιτισμού

Η Ιστορία του πνευματικού πολιτισμού της Ευρώπης αρχίζει με τις βραχογραφίες των πρώτων κατοίκων της ηπείρου σε σπήλαια αλλά και στην ύπαιθρο. Με ένα τρίγωνο ζωγραφισμένο στον βράχο, μια παλάμη, ένα ζώο, κυνήγι ζώων, σύμβολα σε λιμναίους οικισμούς οι Ευρωπαίοι προσπαθούσαν να διηγηθούν μια ιστορία με εικόνες. Με αυτόν τον τρόπο έγραψαν το πρώτο ποίημα, διήγημα, μυθιστόρημα, την Ιστορία τους. Με ένα σχέδιο και λίγο χρώμα εξέφρασαν την καλλιτεχνική τους ψυχή, πόνο, χαρά, λύπη, απελπισία, τάση για φυγή. Αργότερα, τα σύμβολα άρχισαν να γίνονται λέξεις και να αποτυπώνονται σε πέτρα και πάπυρο. Τα απλά σχέδια έγιναν όμορφες εικόνες σε αγγεία. Οι άνθρωποι, από την Ισλανδία μέχρι και την Μικρά Ασία και από την Φινλανδία μέχρι και την Κύπρο, οικοδόμησαν όμορφα κτήρια και πόλεις. Οι Έλληνες άρχισαν να έχουν απορίες για το σύμπαν, τον βίο τους, την οργάνωση της ζωής τους και γέννησαν την φιλοσοφία ενώ οι Ρωμαίοι οργάνωσαν το ενιαίο αλλά πολυεθνικό κράτος τους με τους ίδιους νόμους για όλους τους ελεύθερους πολίτες. Όλες οι γραπτές τέχνες και επιστήμες που γνωρίζουμε σήμερα γεννήθηκαν στην ελληνορωμαϊκή Αρχαιότητα μαζί με μεγάλες τεχνολογικές προόδους. Πολλά πολιτικά συστήματα εναλλάχθηκαν μεταξύ τους μέσα στους αιώνες και η Αρχαιότητα βασίλευσε κυρίως με βασιλεία και αυτοκρατορίες. Η κοινωνική οργάνωση μεταλλάχθηκε πολλές φορές και η ευρωπαϊκή Αρχαιότητα είχε δούλους και ελεύθερους, απλούς ανθρώπους και ηγεμόνες, παράνομους, πόρνες, πλούσιους και φτωχούς, εγγράμματους και αγράμματους, πολιτισμένους και βάρβαρους (;). Η Ιστορία του ευρωπαϊκού αρχαίου πνεύματος είμαι μια συνεχής πάλη, κυρίως των Ελλήνων, με τα όρια της ανθρώπινης

σκέψεως: *citius, altius, fortius* σε όλες τις εκδοχές της. Μετά την Αρχαία Εποχή, ο Ευρωπαϊκός Πολιτισμός αναγεννήθηκε και εξελίχθηκε στα γράμματα, στις τέχνες, στις επιστήμες.

H imaginaire και η réalité

Η μελέτη και συγγραφή της Ιστορίας με την βοήθεια της Αρχαιολογίας είναι στην πραγματικότητα η αποκάλυψη της *imaginaire*, η εύρεση, ανάλυση και εξέταση της *réalité* όλων των εκφάνσεων της ιστορικής πορείας του ανθρώπου. Στον υπότιτλο του βιβλίου χρησιμοποιούνται αυτές οι δύο γαλλικές λέξεις διότι εκφράζουν με απόλυτη σαφήνεια και ευκρίνεια το γενικό πνευματικό πλαίσιο στο οποίο κινούνται και πρέπει να κινούνται η Ιστορία και η Αρχαιολογία. Η χρήση της λέξεως *imaginaire* προέρχεται από την κωμωδία του Μολιέρου *Le malade imaginaire* (*Ο κατά φαντασίαν ασθενής*). Όπως ο ήρωας του Μολιέρου φαντάζεται ότι πάσχει από διάφορες ασθένειες και πειθει τον εαυτό του ότι όντως πάσχει από αυτές, έτσι και μέσα στους αιώνες οι πρωταγωνιστές της Ιστορίας διακατέχονται από φαντασιώσεις. Μερικά παραδείγματα θα διευκρινίσουν αυτή την άποψη. Ο Μέγας Αλέξανδρος πίστευε ότι καταγόταν από θεούς και ότι ήταν και ο ίδιος θεός, ιδέα που την πίστευαν και άλλοι από όσους τον γνώρισαν όσο ζούσε ή έγιναν κοινωνοί της φήμης του για αιώνες μετά. Η Κλεοπάτρα πίστευε ότι ήταν τόσο σαγηνευτική γυναίκα που μπορούσε να υποτάξει μέχρι και τους καίσαρες της Ρώμης. Οι συμμετέχοντες στην ονομαζόμενη Σταυροφορία των Πτωχών (1309) ήταν απόλυτα πεπεισμένοι πως με την δύναμη του Θεού θα κατάφερναν να φθάσουν στους Αγίους Τόπους και να νικήσουν τους Άραβες. Η Ιωάννα της Λωρραίνης (1412-1413) πίστευε πως άκουγε θεϊκές φωνές που την παρότρυναν να τεθεί επικεφαλής γαλλικού στρατού για να παλινορθώσει την γαλλική μοναρχία. Το έναυσμα για την Γαλλική Επανάσταση το 1789 έδωσε η πεποίθηση των Γάλλων ότι στην φυλακή της Βαστίλης στο Παρίσι ήταν κλεισμένοι χιλιάδες φτωχοί άνθρωποι. Κατά τον 19ο αιώνα αλλά και μετέπειτα ήταν διάχυτη ανάμεσα στους Έλληνες η πίστη ότι τους έσωσε από την οθωμανική κατοχή 400 περίπου ετών το κρυφό σχολειό που διοργάνωναν Χριστιανοί μοναχοί και ιερείς για να διδάξουν στα μικρά ελληνόπουλα την ελληνική γλώσσα. Ορισμένες ομάδες Εβραίων, Χριστιανών, Προτεσταντών Χριστιανών, Μουσουλμάνων πιστεύουν ότι η δικιά τους θρησκευτική ομάδα και μόνο είναι η περιούσια του Θεού και ότι αυτοί και μόνο γνωρίζουν και ενστερνίζονται την πραγματική και μόνη σωστή επί της Γης θρησκεία. Σοσιαλιστές και Κομμουνιστές πιστεύουν ότι το μόνο πολιτικο-οικονομικό-κοινωνικό σωστό σύστημα για την ανθρώπινη κοινωνία είναι αυτό που οι ίδιοι ευαγγελίζονται. Πολλοί Έλληνες πιστεύουν ακράδαντα ότι το 1973 και κατά την φοιτητική εξέγερση στο Εθνικό Μετσόβιο Πολυτεχνείο, εντός του ιδρύματος, από δύο μέρες πριν αλλά και το βράδυ της εισβολής του άρματος μάχης (τανκ) από την πύλη του σκοτώθηκαν εκατοντάδες φοιτητές.² Πολλοί Αμερικανοί πείσθηκαν το 2021 από τον πρώην πρόεδρο Donald Trump ότι έπρεπε να εισβάλουν και να καταλάβουν το κτήριο τη Βουλής (Capitol) διότι η ήττα του Ρεπουμπλικάνου πρώην προέδρου στις εκλογές υπήρξε αποτέλεσμα κάποιου είδους νοθείας. Παραδείγματα *imaginaire* στην αρχαιολογία μπορεί να αποτελούν ο μυστικισμός των Μάγια, ο αρχαιολογικός εθνικισμός, οι ελληνικές πυραμίδες, η χαμένη Ατλαντίδα, ο/οι ταφέντες στο ταφικό μνημείο στον Λόφο Καστά στην Αμφίπολη της Μακεδονίας. Ιστορικοί και αρχαιολόγοι προσπαθούν, λοιπόν, να απο-

² Η αλήθεια είναι ότι δεν σκοτώθηκε κανείς εντός του ιδρύματος, όπως επιβεβαιώνει ο Μίκης Ανδρουλάκης που ήταν εκεί: «Δεν είχαμε[...] πυρά μέσα σ' εμάς στο Πολυτεχνείο. (Οι νεκροί [που] φονεύθηκαν] είναι απ' έξω. Εμείς [μέσα στο Πολυτεχνείο] δεν είχαμε κανέναν νεκρό [Ακου στην θέση 1:1:20-1:2:32 ώρα, στην συνέντευξη του Μίμη Ανδρουλάκη στον Αρη Πορτοσάλτε, 2 & 9 & 16 Δεκεμβρίου 2023, "1973-2003: 50 χρόνια Πολυτεχνείο] στην <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Zrx-u4s-EYx4>>».

καλύψουν αυτήν την ανθρώπινη ιστορική και αρχαιολογική *imaginaire* και να ανακαλύψουν την κρυμμένη *réalité*.

Η ιστορική και αρχαιολογική *réalité* δεν είναι άλλη από τον επιστημονικό ρεαλισμό που πρέπει να επιδεικνύουν ιστορικοί και αρχαιολόγοι όταν ασκούν το λειτούργημά τους. Οι επιστήμονες πρέπει να είναι αφιερωμένοι και προσηλωμένοι στο έργο τους μακριά από δικές τους ιδεολογικές, πολιτικές, κοινωνικές, θρησκευτικές δοξασίες ή από πιέσεις από τα διάφορα ακαδημαϊκά και μη περιβάλλοντα στα οποία είτε είναι υποχρεωμένοι να εργάζονται είτε επιθυμούν να διαβιούν. Για παράδειγμα, δεν μπορεί έγκριτος ιστορικός αλλά όχι επί της Αρχαίας Εποχής και όχι αρχαιολόγος να επιμένει για πολλά χρόνια ότι ο Αλέξανδρος Γ' (Μέγας) της Μακεδονίας είναι θαμμένος στην Βεργίνα ενώ οι ίδιοι οι ανασκαφείς των ταφικών συγκροτημάτων στην περιοχή αντικρούουν τις θεωρίες με αρχαιολογικά επιχειρήματα. Ακόμη, δεν πρέπει να συγχέεται η επιστήμη με την θρησκεία, έτσι ώστε ο/η ιστορικός ή αρχαιολόγος να είναι αρεστός/ή σε θρησκευτικούς κύκλους. Πολύ περισσότερο, δεν πρέπει ο επιστήμονας να προσπαθεί εκ των προτέρων να εγκιβωτίσει τις υποθέσεις εργασίας, την έρευνα του/της και τα αποτελέσματά της σε συγκεκριμένη πολιτική ιδεολογία για να είναι αρεστός στο φιλικό του ακαδημαϊκό περιβάλλον. Η ιστορική και αρχαιολογική *réalité* είναι απολύτως ωμή. Είναι τα ανοικτά τραύματα των σκοτωμένων στις μάχες που κινηματογραφούνται λεπτομερώς όσο αποκρουστικά και εάν είναι. Είναι τα γεγονότα και τα τεκμήρια που πρέπει να ανακαλύψουν και να αποκαλύψουν ιστορικοί και αρχαιολόγοι ακόμη και εάν είναι αντίθετα με τις αρχικές τους υποθέσεις εργασίας, με τις πεποιθήσεις τους, με τις αντιδράσεις από τα περιβάλλοντά τους. Η αλήθεια που αποκαλύπτεται πρέπει να διατυπώνεται πάση θυσία!

Chapter 2 The Historian in the 21st Century

[Works referred to in this chapter can be located in the Bibliography]

“Becoming a historian requires training, hard work, and the fulfillment of scholarly and professional obligation,” wrote in 1981 (Preface, p. v) Melanie S. Gustafson, a historian at the University of Vermont, USA, and in one sentence she covered both the process of becoming a Historian and the historian's work. “Historian. A writer of history; *esp* : one that produces a work of scholarly synthesis as distinguished from a compilation of chronicle (an historian and not a mere chronicler,.)” is how *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* (3 vols, 1976 ed.) defines the professional. Historian and history are of course linguistically related and are derived from the Greek word istor or histor, “ἵστωρ” or “ἵστωρ,” the person who knows the laws, arbitrator, a judge, as first appears in Homer (*Iliad*, XVIII, 501, Loeb). It seems that Aristotle in his *Poetics* [IX (1451b.1)] first uses the word historian (“ἱστορικὸς”) referring to Herodotus and with the meaning of the History writer. The word History was used in Latin in the form of *historia* and the historian was the *historiae scriptor* (writer of history). After ancient times, with the Middle Ages chroniclers, the Byzantine and the Renaissance historians in Italy, History emerged as an independent discipline in the late 18th and mainly in the 19th century. It is only in the 20th century that historians have used the principles and methods of their discipline that are traced back to Thucydides and have bypassed the literary and philosophical modes that had been applied on historical matters in previous centuries.

The Historian's Craft

The historian is the writer of History, in capital H in this book as it so signifies historical work produced with the usage of historical methodology. There is a distinction between the chronicler and the historian. Chroniclers existed before the historians and in Mesopotamia and Egypt recorded the successions of rulers and a basic chronological sequence of major events. The historian is defined in Aristotle's times as the person who narrates events, describes customs of peoples, characterizes rulers, synthesizes the past. Herodotus (c. 484-425 BC) was the first historian who fulfilled the above description and he is usually named “the father of history.” In the same century, Thucydides (c. 460-400 BC) wrote his history of the Peloponnesian war investigating the events carefully with a methodology that today we would characterize more scientific compared to that of Herodotus. A number of Greek historians, historians of the Roman period who wrote in Greek and Roman historians, such as Xenophon, Diodorus Siculus, Livy, Polybius, Plutarch, Tacitus, just to mention a few known names, wrote their histories throughout the period that we call “Ancient Times” in a variety of historical modes.

Nowadays, “historian” should be named the person described by Melanie above. However, this is not always the case and the general public names “historian” anybody who writes anything on a historical topic. Therefore, we need to distinguish between university trained historians and amateurs. An amateur historian is not by definition a bad historian and a trained historian is not by definition a person to be trusted in his/her writings without any investigation. What is true though is that the trained historian has been exercised in the writing of history and therefore should have no excuse for mishandling evidence and facts and for proposing unsupported conclu-

sions and interpretations. The amateur historian may be a story teller in dramatic tones, exactly what will entertain his/her audience. Sometimes, the great and important events are minimized or hidden behind love affairs or personal stories and the emphasis is on what the trained historian will mention in passim or bypass. In other cases, great events such as wars, political, and social movements, well known personalities are treated in great detail in lengthy multi-volume books and both the writer and the reader lose the forest for the tree. There are though some amateur historians who behave from a scholar's point of view as trained historians either because they have been trained in a similar discipline such as political science or analytic journalism or because they have been taught historical methodology themselves. Therefore, we should generally criticize a work on History judging it on the basis of the final product and not on who the author is although most of the times the work is characterized by its writer. In any case, in my discussion in this work, the reference is to the university trained historian and not to the amateur.

Some believe that the historian is born and no training whatsoever will make a person a historian but we should not define the rule by its exceptions. There are personal qualities that will make one person a better historian than another but those who followed their training closely can produce at dissent History writing even if they are not the big stars of research and writing among the historians. A technical History work written by a little known historian and read by few historians only may add so much to our historical knowledge and understanding that cannot be surpassed by a popular work written by a well known historian and read by hundred of thousands of readers. For example, a study of a fragment of an ancient inscription or of the finances of a medieval estate or on the journal of a Jew shopkeeper during the 1930s may change entirely our conception of a group of people or of an era or open new roads in their study. Anyway, the historian's life begins with university training in the study and writing of History although a historian-to-be may have not decided at the beginning of his college studies whether this is the function in the society or the profession s/he would like to do in his entire life. History is a life venture and does not stop when a historian retires or sometimes even when s/he dies as s/he lives through his/her work. A number of historians have worked until the very last moment of their lives and some of them have left their Histories unfinished because they died while working on them. Thucydides' "History of the Peloponnesian War" is the most ancient example of an unfinished History.

History is a very popular topic to be read, listened to or watched by the general public but a very unpopular one when it comes to its serious study. Out of personal experience, a great number of people in the street when asked will reply that they like History without dates and details but they deny an offer to study it professionally. How then and when during his/her life can one suspect that s/he could become a historian and that this is the discipline whose study and practice would make him/her happy in life? A would-be-historian must have certain distinct personality characteristics: must be curious; interested in investigating matters to their maximum possible depth; very careful; methodical; rational; logical; able to analyze and synthesize information from various sources; use his/her intellectual mind in order to draw conclusions and produce interpretations. Apart from an investigator, the historian is also a writer and therefore s/he must be good at writing and expressing his/her investigation and its results in a clear and organized way. Being a historian means very hard intellectual work.

Not all university History graduates do the same job. Some become school teachers, others teach in post secondary education or two-year colleges and still others are university professors. Some just teach while others balance teaching, researching,

and writing. There are even some whose main occupation is the writing of History books while a great number of History graduates are employed in related or unrelated jobs such as museums, cultural organizations, businesses. Nevertheless, all share a love for History.

A would-be historian needs to be able to reply to himself and others to the question why s/he wants to become a historian. We live in a diverse world in which some peoples and nations have shared experiences while others are deeply separated by lack of understanding. As there is no single truth and life should not be black or white, the historian is asked to use his/her knowledge of the past in order to make the worlds of the past as well as today's world comprehensible to the general public. Understanding each other may lead to peaceful coexistence and sharing in the world we live in. Also, reading and writing History is great fun in a number of ways. While reading History you will come across a number of amusing incidents. You will be entrained, for example, by the description of how Julius Caesar treated his captors and how his captors treated Caesar in the 1st century BC (Plutarch, *Lives*, "Caesar," 1-2, Loeb). The work of the historian includes a lot of research that involves investigation in archives, in printed sources, in other historians' work. Doing research for a topic in History is similar to an investigator's work. Historians frequently become Sherlock Holmes and Hercule Poirot when they need to search and find the evidence and then interpret them in order to reach a conclusion. This is a lot of fun if you like uncovering information that has never been discovered or touched upon before. Also, it's fun to recognize differences in cultures, perceptions, ways of living, technological changes in different historical times. Above all, for those who like teaching, History is fun to be taught to different generations of students as they may react to the teacher/professor's stimuli in various ways. When I began teaching college History, my first year students knew very well what the Soviet Union (Russia was part of it) was, where it was located and what were the differences between a communist and a non-communist country. A few years later, after the collapse of real Socialism regimes in Russia and East Europe, all of those matters were unknown to my new students and I had to explain everything from scratch. If you like explaining History to others, you will love teaching History.

Practicing and teaching History will be very rewarding from a psychological point of view but do not expect to earn a lot of money and become rich. You can definitely live a dissent life and support a family but the equation between time investment and financial reward is always an unbalanced one. You will need to invest a lot of your free time in the study and writing of History in addition to the required professional time with teaching and administrative duties. If you plan to have a family, it is a good idea to be married to a person who is also employed or financially independent. A double salary or income will make the life of both a lot easier. By studying History you make an investment to yourself, to your personality, to your understanding of what is going on in local, national, and international politics, economics, society. This will be very useful to you in case you enter the business world and this knowledge may make you wealthy. On the other hand, teaching or writing about the past in relation to the present or even for the past's own sake only, that is, for just the enhancement of human knowledge, is an invaluable function in the society. The historian is not just a professional or a civil servant, he performs a certain function in the society and this is his/her reward for all the effort in studying and practicing History. It is the happiness of the completion of a work by writing or teaching History that will be useful to a number of other human beings in the local, national, or international societies. You may make people understand their present local, national, international position in the current world as well as make them comprehend the views of other people in

the local, national, or world communities. Writing or teaching History is the performance of a social function rather than just a profession or a job that must be done just for money.

In friendly or family gatherings, in professional meetings, in parties, your function or profession may not be recognized as anything important. This made Richard C. Carrier of Columbia University summarize in 2002 the role of the historian in the society. The usual accusation for the work of the historians is that they do nothing important as professionals as they do not fight in court for the truth as lawyers do; do not save lives as doctors do; do not build houses as civil engineers or architects do; do not make technology as computer scientists do; do not contribute to the economy; they have no or very little social utility; they are –we are– “nonessential.” Why do we spend so much energy and institution or government funds in “historical study, teaching, and research, especially about events in the remote past”? Why do we learn and teach dead languages, deciphering ancient texts from inscriptions and papyri? Hasn't everything about the past being studied and interpreted? After all, “Does it matter what really happened in the past?”

Human memory is very important and useful as without it or with true memories replaced by false memories (fantasies, idealizations, myths) human beings can become puppets in the hands of those who want to control life, our lives. A society that is dominated by collective psychoses such as religious fanaticism or perseverance in totalitarian regimes is “doomed.” Historians, therefore, act as the “memory cells” of the human race. Human beings cannot function and live in a society with Alzheimer, without their accurate memory, and this is where historians enter the picture. They sustain an entire culture needed by the society by studying, teaching, doing research in History. “To know who we are, we have to know who we were: what we used to be, how we got here, and the progress we have made, even the progress we haven't.” This is what historians do by doing History. The society we live in must learn from past experience such as the Athenian Democracy and the Greek Leagues, the Roman Republic and Empire, the spread of Christianity, the world of Islam, the Asian, American, African and Oceanian civilizations, authoritarian and totalitarian regimes, social, economic, technological developments. This way, we will be inspired for new innovations and solutions to new problems, we will “better understand humanity” as a whole. This statement, writes Carrier, leads to the conclusion that “we cannot do without” historians.

On the other hand, people are uncertain whether History is an art or a science. History may be categorized along with the humanities as we use it to understand facts and “external cause and effect.” Historians analyze texts not from a literary point of view but in an attempt to understand what writers of the past were trying to say. Establishing historical truth, continues Carrier, is a science “but interpreting it, and conveying it to society in an intelligible and engaging form is an art.” Although historians do not do experiments, control conditions or study repeated phenomena, they “seek specific truths about particular events” by sorting out the false or the subjective. They employ objective checks against error, they are precise in their terminology, accurate and thorough in documenting and analyzing their findings. In most of the cases, historians work with incomplete information in their sources, some of which are even of uncertain reliability, “making historical judgments is often as much art as science.” Thus, historical truth needs to be found among myths, false information, and errors. There are ways to separate historians from pseudo-historians, those who fail to document their statements, fabricate evidence, do not really provide the evidence needed in order to prove their conclusions. They will use a number of old and new fallacies in

their interpretations and dismiss immediately the criticism of historians with a variety of excuses.

Historians provide every possible reference to their sources so that they may be verified by their readers. They inform their readers when they use speculation trying to put together a History with incomplete evidence and keep separate facts from interpretations. They support their conclusions with evidence in their attempt to understand “why things happened the way they did.” They provide all evidence available without concealing anything so that their readers are able to reach their own conclusions about the truth. They keep an open mind in critiques by other historians and are constructive in their criticism of the works of others. The scientific historian is needed for a society that wants to have a deep, accurate, sharp, reliable and above all honest memory. Such expertise requires many years of highly specialized training.

Carrier summarizes the six unique benefits that historians provide to society: (1) historians solve big problems or correct or improve solutions to problems proposed by other historians and are related to the understanding of ourselves and the past; (2) they offer non-specialists, the general public, and in non-technical terms the outcomes of historical research; (3) historians train future historians as the profession requires that the scholar is at the same time a teacher; (4) they convey their knowledge to a broad spectrum of future citizens, who receive accurate knowledge of human history in order to become informed and competent, essential for the function of a free democracy; (5) historians solve problems of a technical historical nature that they publish in specialized journals to be used by other historians in order to solve the big problems. Thus, more accurate Histories are written for the general public and more accurate information is conveyed to the student-future-citizen; (6) historians and other scholars of related disciplines (archaeologists, paleographers, classicists, egyptologists, hieroglyph specialists), who specialize in the language and literature of past and dead to us cultures, act as a vital link between the past cultures and us. We will be unable to understand that past without the reading of that dead literature. To historians and the related disciplines scholars those languages and literatures of the past are fully alive and vibrant and still radiate their cultures.

The common idea that everything has been translated and there is no need for philologists, experts of dead languages, any more is wrong. There is a vast number of documents of those dead cultures that await our reading, commentary, and publication (for example, a great number of scrolls in Greek and Hebrew.) Also, there are new discoveries of dead literature evidence every year all around the world that need to be examined and that after they are read they might slightly or completely alter our view of a specific or a general aspect of those cultures. Translations in modern languages can never transmit the exact meaning of certain words or phrases or concepts of a past culture and therefore a historian needs to consult the original document in the original language. Also, I would add to Carrier's argument that there are still ancient scripts that have not been deciphered, such as Minoan linear A, which if read may alter our conception of past dead cultures and civilizations.

Moreover, historians can be very useful to government and non-government agencies that try to understand why there is a crisis or civil strife or real war in Nigeria and, I add, in the Balkans, in East Mediterranean, in Myanmar, in Brazil or Mexico. Carrier believes that “a command of history, especially the ability to explode myth, is key to fruitful political diplomacy and progress around the world, the historian is more important in our world now than ever before.”

Historians publish specialized monographs that are to be read mainly by other historians and popular general history works for the general public. All History work is definitely done for the benefit of the people, so that popular publications are as ac-

curate as possible when read by the general public. On the other hand, this cannot be achieved unless technical historical papers and monographs with the results of specialized work are produced. The most important function of History and historians though is the publication of popular articles and books. “These educate the public about what really happened in our collective past, and make historical facts and knowledge available and comprehensible to society as a whole.” As historical knowledge changes, these need to be rewritten every so often in order to incorporate new findings and interpretations. They must be written in such a way so that they are true, simple and fully readable by the general public without the background assumptions or jargon found in the historical technical papers and monographs.

Carrier concludes his study by declaring that “the ideologue, demagogue and myth maker are not historians, and pseudohistory cannot benefit society. But real history can, and it requires well-trained and experienced historians.” Otherwise, society will suffer a “memory disorder” and may be lead to “confusion, despair, and self-defeating behavior.” History is not theological conviction but science which can be checked by facts and “objectivizing” methods that are applied to all evidence. Pseudohistory can be used to manipulate society by those in power while true History will help us see who we really are, will help us understand humanity away from the distorted lens of one culture, may teach out to avoid past mistakes and learn from past successes. Therefore, the historical craft must be honored.

A very interesting aspect of the study of History is that a minor or major event can be seen by historians from different perspectives and may eventually lead to entirely different interpretations. As Spencer R. Crew (“Why Become a Historian?”) explains, the institution of slavery in the US that was once viewed by a group of influential historians as an overall beneficial institution for the slaves who were introduced to Western civilization was reexamined later by other historians and it was not found “such a good thing.” Facts can be seen by historians from different perspectives depending on their life experience and view of the world and that is why it is important and useful for new historians to enter the discipline. Crew decided to become a historian because he wanted to discover and share “different ways of interpreting historical data.”

It is really fascinating when a graduate student has finally decided what s/he is going to focus on in writing a thesis or a dissertation and gets to the archives. As Natalie Zemon Davis describes (“Why Become a Historian?”), holding the 16th century French documents in her hands “was a special form of communication with those long-dead people I wanted to bring to life again in my writings.” The historian studies in the archives the voices of the people of the past. The Athenian resolutions of the 5th century BC, the papyri in Hebrew, the 17th century British pamphlets, the 18th century publications during the French Revolution, the 19th century diaries and memoirs of the soldiers of Napoleon, the 20th century documents in the archives of the countries of Europe and those of the USA are just some short or long moments of history that the historian is asked to discover and offer to his/her present audience. Not as they are found but in their historical context and with comments and interpretations, wherever it is required. Davis confirms that the historian is guided by the sources in order to arrive to his/her conclusions.

Finally, you have become a History teacher and during your first lessons in the senior high school or lyceum a student of yours asks the fatal question: “Why do we have to study these dead people?” Robert Gutierrez (“Why Become a Historian?”) had to find an immediate, simple, and convincing reply. We do study those dead people so that we understand why people think and behave the way they do today and because we might be able to determine how they might behave. Historians are basically inter-

ested in people and unlike social scientists (anthropologists, sociologists, economists, ethnologists) they are interested specifically “about the individual lives, places, intrigues, conflicts, loves, and passions of people.” As police detectives do, historians try to interpret facts by analyzing information and as philosophers they pass judgments on what was successful or unsuccessful in the past. With History we understand our world and we explain “to nonhistorians why our world is the way it is.” History does not provide easy answers to crucial questions regarding the past and historians are engaged in endless discussion and debate in order to find replies.

History is not a static discipline which has achieved and completed its goal in society. On the contrary, it is an ever evolving art and science as collective memory of the past is not stagnant. What once seemed to be a total failure, some years/decades later could appear to be a success or still be considered a failure. For example, in general simplified terms, Brexit is a general national success for half of the British but for many others in Britain and abroad it is seen as a failure of British politics and may have a deep negative impact on the British economy in the 21st century. Future historians, therefore, will have to study the past (Brexit) in the light of the future-present correlation in order to decide whether that event of 2020 was beneficial or catastrophic for Britain and the European Union. In other words, historians continuously try to find answers to past questions, pose new questions and try to answer them, study new historical sources, re-evaluate known sources, reinterpret the past in order to be able to understand it better. This explains why historians insist that their interpretations of the past may be tentative and may be subject to minor or major alterations. Skeptics may conclude that because of the tentative character of history there is no reason for any person to learn what may not be true tomorrow. “It is a waste of time!” they shout. But at the same time the world is becoming more and more “complicated and diverse,” we actually live with “uncertainty and probabilities” and at the end “the changing perspectives of historical understanding are the very best introduction we can have to the practical problems of real life” as well as to confusing world events. The study of History, therefore, immediately becomes “essential” for every human being. (McNeil, 1985).

Generally, the lay person believes that the function of the History proficient person as well as the historian is to remember all the facts and the dates when events happened. This is reinforced by the types of answers required in History examinations at school level and even at first year post-secondary education institutes in the great majority of the states of the world. Alternatively, there are country examination systems that require the facts and the interpretations printed in the school textbook(s) to be reproduced by the student exactly as they are stated even in the case that a combination of facts employed will make an answer fully complete. This is because the examiners are not able or are not allowed to accept a variety of replies that can be considered as correct according to the current state of historical knowledge. This phenomenon is generally minimized at university level as the professor is more knowledgeable of the subject under examination. Contrary, then, to what is generally believed, the historian's role is to use the History laboratory with facts (data) and interpretations (experiments) and help lay persons understand how and why peoples and societies behaved or behave the way they did or do. The historian bases his/her statements on the study of the human experience of the past. The results of a devastating war of the past cannot be understood during or after a long period of peace unless History is employed. The speed of technological advancements throughout time and their respective effect(s) on human life cannot be understood unless a person realizes, for example, the different time speed of news/knowledge transmission that was realized in prehistoric, ancient, medieval eras, in the 15th century, the 18th century, the 19th century, the 1930s,

the 1960s, the 1990s, the 21st century. In reality it was decades or centuries at prehistoric times to fractions of seconds in the 21st century. The historian's work, therefore, is necessary so that we all understand how societies functioned in the past and function today.

The study of human behavior has shown that “the past causes the present, and so the future” (Stearns, 1998). When we try to understand why a political, social, economic, military event or change happened we need to investigate for factors or causes of change that took place earlier in time, in the short or longer past, before the fact under investigation. This can be done only through the study of History by historians. Moreover, History provides identity (Stearns, 1998) and this explains why nations encourage its teaching by historians. The evidence of personal, local, and national History can show how families, groups of people, or countries were formed and evolved in time. Social History can show why and how groups of people were initially organized, behaved, evolved, and possibly dissolved. Business and economic history will show the fluctuations in the financial and economic course of corporations, small businesses and counties. The historian's function is to study aspects of human activity as they are revealed in political, diplomatic, social, economic, technological and science History.

The historian develops certain skills that are required in the History profession but they are also generally useful in one's professional and personal life. S/he is trained in ways of accessing evidence that apart from History they can be proven to be instrumental in research journalism, for instance. The many examples include the search for specific ideas/statements in parliamentary records, speeches of politicians and diplomats, other social, economic, technological and scientific evidence. The historian learns how to distinguish between the partial, fragmented and the complete record/speech/idea, its meaning and usefulness in constructing arguments. When a person expresses an opinion based on somebody's partially accessed statement(s) without having knowledge of the complete text/speech, s/he may arrive at the wrong conclusion either deliberately or unintentionally. Also, a trained historian learns that evidence can be found in different forms (printed, three-dimensional, media) and how to combine different kind of evidence (public records, private records, structures, numerical/statistical data, audio visual) in order to arrive at coherent arguments and sound interpretations. Writing History requires the examination of often diverse and many times conflicting interpretations of the same fact. Historians learn “how to identify and evaluate conflicting interpretations” (Stearns, 1998), which is also a very important citizenship skill and leads to critical thinking. Sound critical thinking has been and will continue to be in the 21st century the main requirement in decision making in any political, administrative, or business position. It is also this skill that distinguishes best historians. Moreover, the study of changes in the past helps the historian develop the ability to assess changes, their magnitude, importance and possible impact on societies and nations. S/he is trained to be able to see the continuities and discontinuities in political, social, economic, technological transformations and their causes, combinations of factors of change, and effects. It has been very rightly written that “to study history is to study change.” (“Why should you study history?”). One of the historian's goals of great significance is to write and teach History so that citizens are well-informed and acquire an understanding “of how the world works.” (Stearns, 1998).

Empathy is a quality that is generally required by the historian, who needs to be able to understand or feel what people have experienced when faced catastrophic or happy events and moments in their lives and the reason why they have behaved in a certain way. It may be very important that the historian is capable of mentally placing himself/herself in the position of a historical figure or of a group of people s/he studies. This is the only way for him/her to “appreciate different cultures, ideas, and tradi-

tions” that are not his/her own as well as similarities and differences with his/her ancestors. (“Why should you study history?”). Needless to say that his/her empathy should only serve as a vehicle of understanding the past and not as an emotional drive which will dominate the historian's writing. Empathy is useful when the historian is trying to understand the emotional environment of the past but it must not be used to guide him in writing History because it certainly leads to bias.

Oral History is personal History or a person's perspective of the times s/he lived in, which a number of historians find it fascinating to collect and work on it. The historian may work entirely on an Oral History project or incorporate evidence of Oral History in his/her studies. S/he may collect personal or family stories and discuss them from a historical point of view or use an Oral History example to illustrate a point in a study or his/her teaching in class. A lot of personal stories of Jews who were subject to a genocide during World war II or even earlier have been published in books and studies. A great number of personal stories related to political, military, social, economic events in various places of the world have been collected and published in various printed collections of testimonies or on the web (for example, OHLA). The recollections of about 1,4 million Christian refugees, mostly Greeks, of the Ottoman Empire/Turkey, who were forced to abandon their villages in Asia Minor and moved to Greece in the early 1920s because of the defeat of the Greek army have been recorded during private interviews over a number of years and have been published in five volumes. They show what happened to those refugees personally as well as their thoughts about and after the events. A great number of them expected to return to their homes very soon but this never happened. They worried about an unlocked door or window of the house they abandoned in Turkey, animals they left behind, personal belongings they did not have the time or could not carry with them. On the one hand, this shows the personal and collective memory of this group of people and, on the other, it comprises of pieces of evidence on parts of the social aspect of the results of that war. There are cases, therefore, when the historian may become the primary evidence recorder himself/herself and this is one more aspect of the historian's work.

A professional historian needs to be educated in the study and writing of History at a university college or university in order to become a trained historian. The historian may be a teacher of History, a History researcher, a History writer or a combination of them or even work outside the History profession. In all cases s/he uses the historical skills s/he was taught during his/her training at university. The historian's profession or societal function includes responsibility and it is hard to be fulfilled as apart from his/her practical skills the historian needs to have acquired a number of theoretical skills. Personal qualities are also very important for a historian's success, that is, search and interpret facts without allowing any bias enter his/her methods and research conclusions. History investigation and writing is both an art and a science, which makes the historian's work extremely complicated and difficult but not impossible. The completion of a non-biased work, when it is finally confirmed by his/her colleagues, will fill the historian with happiness and a feeling of self-fulfillment. Any sort of successful study completed by a historian, from an article or a monograph and a General History to just a school textbook or an article in a popular publication or site or electronically published work, is equally important and must be highly praised when it fulfills the relevant academic standards. Do what you love most about History study, research and writing with passion and you will feel that you have fulfilled your life expectations. This is what will really make you happy in life!

The Historian as Teacher of History

During the 20th century and in the 21st century, historians have intensely expressed their thoughts on their History education and on their function as teachers of History. Different nations and educational institutions have used a variety of solutions in order to address the education of historians at university level as well as the training of historians as teachers for schools of primary and secondary education. I will discuss the most recent reconsideration of the education of historians in the US and Europe although there are older views regarding similar topics in the US and in individual European countries without disregarding similar education thoughts and policies in almost any other country of the world.

The American Historical Association published its latest report on the preparation of historians for their profession in 2004. It consisted of a study, ideas and conclusions on the education of historians for the 21st century. The historian is defined as a scholar and a teacher, one who is associated with primary and secondary education, colleges and universities, museums, historical societies. Also, history degree holders may work as journalists, editors, curators, filmmakers, at research institutions, law firms, libraries, government agencies, even as consultants in the private sector. Regardless of their specific work, all History graduates share historical values and knowledge and a responsibility of promoting them in society. However, one of the major matters in the American picture of school education at the turn of the 21st century was that only one third of high school History teachers had History as their major in their studies and only half of them either a major or a minor. This is not uncommon in other countries as well. In Greece, I add, school History of any period is often taught by teachers of classical or modern Greek language and literature or sometimes even by teachers of religious studies! It depends on the availability of teachers. Therefore, a small or large number of high school pupils is most probably rarely or never taught historical values in the event that their teacher has not been trained in History. Moreover, although professional historians in the US do their best to reach the general public and teach students in classrooms, popular amateur historians in combination with commercial productions that may aim at pure entertainment only overshadow their work. Trained historians should not claim that they own History exclusively but they should strive “to bring the depth and rigor” they “value as professionals into the public discussion of historical issues.”

I believe that the success of the popular historians may be due to a certain extent to the great specialization sought or even required by History students at the doctoral level. At certain prestigious universities in the US, in well known European universities and in the greatest majority of high rank universities in the world, History specialization is seen as the only way for a new historian to prove that s/he has made his/her contribution to the progress of the discipline. As it is mentioned in the report, a History department head at a US state university said that this trend produces PhD's “whose knowledge is a mile deep and an inch wide.” I do not claim that there should be no specialization or that it should not be appreciated from a scholarly point of view. But it seems that the profession does not value enough those trained historians who try to see the wide historical picture or write History textbooks for schools, colleges and universities. Their work is as important as that of those who publish monographs or articles in specialized History journals on very specific topics. It is important because working on broad historical subjects they do General History and they try to provide sound historical narratives and discussions on historical matters that interest the general public. At the same time, they offer high school pupils and the first year undergraduate students a broad historical perspective summarizing the results of the research of specialized historical work and interpretations. They are the ones who

are asked to dissolve common historical myths or clarify and explain complex historical issues and notions of the general public and school or college/university students in a few sentences or a paragraph. Summarizing historical knowledge in a clear way for the general public and students may be more difficult than writing a monograph or a specialized article. Therefore, I believe that General History research, writing, and teaching should be part of doctoral programs as it requires replies to the same practical and theoretical questions that a historian asks before and during work on a specialized topic: where to begin and end, how to approach the subject matter, what to include or exclude, the level of detail to be attained, the research required for the period and topics covered, the writing model.

The US report suggests that the historian's role in the 21st century should be to interpret “the historical meaning of the present.” At the turn of the 21st century, the traditional theory and practice of History and especially historical objectivity, its corner stone, have been seriously questioned. Also, the idea of human progress in History, which has been one of the fundamentals of change and dates back to the 18th century, has been challenged again. At least in the West (USA and Western Europe), historians have seen historical progress as the triumph of liberty or as deep social transformation whether in its liberal, Marxist or conservative form. French Historians Marc Bloch (1886-1944) and Fernand Braudel (1902-1985) had objected to this view even from the second quarter of the previous century but US historians began to be doubtful of it after the Second World War when they faced totalitarianism; the possible destruction of humanity by nuclear weapons; Vietnam war; the failure of modernization programs in Latin America, Africa, Asia; the never fully realized welfare state. However, popular History still preserves the idea of historical progress in the mind of the public. The present day historian, though, does not work with this “teleological faith.” Historical studies focus on continuities and discontinuities, discuss special matters and complex contexts or are narratives but they do not aspire to a better future. The 19th century idea of the progress of a nation in History has weakened and historians have realized the historical complexities of a History of a nation as well as the need for continuous contestation over national identity. Because of this, narratives become more challenging and historians increasingly work on “comparative, thematic, and/or transnational histories.” In the US, the goal for the 21st century is that the study of History should become less and less Eurocentric and more global.

After a period in the 20th century during which historians had intense interactions with the social scientists (anthropologists, sociologists, economists, political scientists, statisticians), at the turn of the 21st century, it is evident at least in the style of research undertaken by historians that History leans more towards the humanities rather than the social sciences. This does not mean that the links are or will be cut off as History and the social sciences share certain common grounds of study such as in politics, the economy, foreign relations, war. The historian of the 21st century should be ready to study and understand “important theories and methods that address institutions, social structure, and social transformation.”

At the beginning of the 20th century, it was not assumed that a History graduate with a doctoral degree would certainly become a teacher. The idea was that the historian would enter a variety of professions, become a leader and using independent and creative thinking would “influence public life.” Although there is nothing wrong with one who has studied History to be employed within a different sector of the economy, the doctoral degree in History is not a professional degree but a research degree. The historian's main educational goal at the doctoral level is to be trained to conduct original research. However, in a US survey that was conducted in 2001 and included a great number of advanced History doctoral students, 84 percent of the future histori-

ans declared that they intended to pursue an academic position with a lot of teaching rather than research. Therefore, they seemed to be satisfied with their training in conducting research but complained that the doctoral program did not prepare them for teaching, advising students on academic matters or collaborating with other scholars, librarians, officials in offices of student affairs, colleagues in other disciplines, college/university administrators. What is more alarming though is that “massive anecdotal evidence” show that a great number of History doctoral students “cannot explain the context and significance of their dissertation research.” This is a problem that leads to one's inadequate preparation as a competent researcher and as a job seeker. The report writers believe that History doctoral students are looking for a “research-based teaching degree” that will prepare them equally well for both research and teaching as well as for other activities related to the History profession.

In the view of Debra Stewart, president (2000-2014) of the US Council of Graduate Schools, it appears that historians in the 21st century will be concerned with the ethical implications of their scholarship and there will be more work done along both thematic lines and specific problems. Also, “breadth will be valued as much as depth” in both historical work and across disciplines and there will be more collaborative work within the academy and with collaborators outside the academy. The report writers claim that tight narrowness and specialization in graduate History education may discourage precisely the imagination and intellectualism of those students who could offer new ideas in the progress of the discipline. It is also worth noting that research monographs that represent just mechanical work that has not been previously done for the reason that it may not be needed “devalues” and “weakens” the scholarly claims of the profession. The report bring again to the surface the question whether scholarship means only research based on original sources and publication and its writers reply positively to the questions raised. Research and publication is definitely work that promotes the discipline but historians do not only do that. There are historians whose work is mainly on synthesis and reflection, there are those who put together old and new knowledge from recent research in a new narrative –what I name in this book General History– or even those who write popular History. Also, there are historians who spend much of their scholarly time in creating educational material for the teaching of History at schools and colleges/universities. Moreover, effective teaching at schools and colleges/universities based on continuous research for new educational material and methods must be considered as an aspect of scholarship. Even the occasional involvement of historians in local or national policy issues and legislation drafting should constitute scholarship. The historian in the 21st century may be involved in at least some of the above scholarly activities which will help him/her “gain fresh insights and uncover new themes” to be eventually used in his own or other scholars' primary research.

In Europe, in the European Union, historians are free to work on their Histories that touch national, European, or international matters and each one of the countries has developed its own national historiography. Some historians have published histories of Europe in the 20th century but the thorny issue has been the teaching of history at schools. In the second half of the 20th century, French and German politicians and historians have managed to arrive at an agreement and produce school History books that are historically balanced. In Greece and the Balkans, History books still promote nationalism but not expansionism as the country borders are considered final and narratives describe the events without great emphasis on good and bad guys. Even the most difficult issue, which was the name of the new state that was formed in the south of the old multi-national Yugoslavia after its dissolution, was solved. The previously named Republic of Macedonia, a state name that was in historical conflict

with the Greek province of Macedonia, is now officially named Republic of North Macedonia and it has been agreed that the school History books will be rewritten to reflect the current friendly relations of the two nations. Europe may have solved some of its old problems in the History school books but many new ones sprang in the early 21st century and it is in the hands of the political administrations of its countries and the History teachers to find solutions.

In 2018 the Council of Europe published a report with guidelines on the teaching of History in the member states of the European Union and whoever else would like to adopt them. The focal point of the report is the establishment of “democratic, diverse and inclusive history curricula and pedagogy and its success falls on the shoulders of the school teachers all around Europe.” Europe and the countries of the European Union are more diverse in many aspects compared to the diversity recognized in the United States. In the early 21st century this diversity has been multiplied and the most important aspect of it is the cultivation of democratic culture. Isn't Europe a democratic realm? Aren't the European states for democracy? The answer is yes to both questions but newcomers in the Union, countries in east Europe, are inhabited by peoples who do not have the same historical experiences as western friends and some may not have long standing and established democratic traditions. The 2018 European Union guidelines on quality History education are based on principles and certain results of historical study. “The study of history [...] offers insights into the complexities and diversity of past human behaviour; it fosters the ability to interrogate differing, even conflicting, narratives; it requires that arguments are supported by an understanding of wide-ranging evidence.” (p. 5). The precepts explain that History is a distinct subject to be taught “as it provides the answers to critically understand the present, by teaching that any feature of the past must be interpreted in its historical context and by raising awareness that historical interpretation is a matter of debate. *The thinking processes acquired through the study of history constitute a standard of judgment that is transferable to any subject.* Hence, historical critical knowledge and understanding of political, social, cultural, and economical systems intersects with the democratic culture necessary for active citizenship.” (p. 6). As the knowledge of History and the understanding of European democratic values leads to active citizenship, the role of the teacher in transmitting them to the pupils and students becomes crucial because “the critical understanding of historical phenomena facilitates the process of acquiring the competences for democratic culture (CDC).” (p. 6).

The CDC are central in the guidelines and they are divided into four areas of competences: values, attitudes, skills, knowledge and critical understanding (p. 4). The values include the importance of valuing human dignity and human rights, cultural diversity, democracy, justice, fairness, equality and the rule of law. In this context the history teacher plays the role of the person who will infuse the basic and crucial human values into the pupils through the teaching of History. The teaching of History is also employed for the teaching of CDC attitudes that include openness and respect to other cultures, beliefs, world views and tolerance to ambiguity. The study of History assists in the acquisition of important life and work skills and the CDC focuses on autonomous learning; analytical and critical thinking; skills of listening and observing; empathy; writing skills; cooperation; conflict-resolution skills. The history teacher will guide pupils in discovering History for themselves, the methods for historical analysis and critical thinking on historical topics, listening skills through collecting oral History evidence, learning through the experiences of others; understanding the role and the methods of diplomacy in History that result in the conclusion of local or international conflicts. The most important and more or less all inclusive competence of “knowledge and critical understanding of the world: politics, law, human rights,

culture, cultures, religions, history, media, economies, environment, sustainability” is central in the teaching of History. In this way, the classroom becomes a laboratory where young learners “can actively explore historical questions to experience and learn about, through and for democratic culture” and eventually become “active participants of democratic culture” through dialogue and cooperation. (p. 6). In the final analysis, the History of the world is a History of democratic values and of their absence.

The teacher who is called to fulfill the task proposed by the Council of Europe must be open about his/her understanding of the past: views, prejudices, stereotypes, biases, so that all pupils feel confident in expressing their thoughts and different opinions. The student audience might include minorities and migrant groups and the role of the teacher is to ensure that both the dominant and non-dominant groups in the society learn about each other through their History. The authors of the guidelines stress the fact that the CDC through the teaching of History is a lifelong process as human beings “continually experience new and different contexts” (p. 6) in everyday life but it is not a linear progress towards that goal because the competences are obtained by the interaction of all four of their dimensions (values, attitudes, skills and knowledge and critical understanding). This is very crucial as it is recognized in the guidelines that by studying the past and with the help of the History teacher who will use the relevant examples of individuals or groups of people, pupils can understand “-for good or ill- what human beings are capable of doing.” (p. 14). The teacher must be very careful not to portray particular groups of people only as victims –what it was done to them– but at the same time to stress what they did themselves as actors of History (slaves and abolition of slavery, women and their emancipation or their right to vote). The teacher should make sure that the references to traumatic events are not only general: slavery, the slaughter in World War I, the Holocaust and the extermination of Jews during World War II. Student learning will be more powerful if s/he traces what happened to an individual enslaved person, an identified soldier, a Jewish family. Moreover, teachers must be aware that the mono-cultural dominant model –one culture is superior to others– viewed differences is as “dangerous and divisive.” The history of mankind shows that cultures have always communicated when they met each other and the present world is characterized by interculturalism. Therefore, History teaching should be inclusive recognizing the interaction of cultures. The crucial role played by the teacher in History teaching is manifested in the student evaluation of historical sources used in the classroom. The development of critical thinking on historical sources will unpack for the pupil the “mechanisms of manipulation.” Using digital visual and written materials the History teacher will guide the students so that they “find, comprehend, select and use key historical information, to make well informed judgments.” The student will also be taught the temporariness of historical interpretations and that they are liable to change. This will be based on the use of diverse and contradictory sources so that pupils are able to understand the misuse of History in favor of “intolerant and ultra-nationalistic, xenophobic or racist ideas.” Students should be able to critically view visual sources (pictures, documentary films, broadcast videos) so that they “distinguish between the ‘witting’ and the ‘unwitting’ testimony” offered by the sources and especially the message that the creator wishes to convey (quotes from p. 20).

My comment is that the historian as a teacher plays a very important role in the education of youngsters. The school teacher does not only need to teach the historical facts and their interpretations but s/he can contribute a lot to the democratic culture of his/her pupils. Students need to be taught effectively the suffering of peoples because of wars, genocides, totalitarian regimes as well as the benefits of the freedom of speech, political plurality and the alteration of governments and leaders in power.

They also need to understand that in the 21st century individuals, peoples and cultures are and will continue to be required to interact as this has become automatic through immediate communication. They need to comprehend that personal, business, national success in the world we live in depends on tolerance; on deep knowledge of historical experiences of others including their political, social, religious traditions; on the fact that our world is just one community that shares the limited Earth resources for survival and success. The teaching of History can prove how many times the world has got very close to partial or total destruction: widespread famines, pandemics, world intense human activity, weapons of massive destruction, global wars. The History teacher and his/her work is vital in the education of modern citizens anywhere in the world.

The college/university History professor should continue the work of the school History teacher in teaching democratic culture but s/he must take the teaching and learning History a number of steps further and educate the future History teachers. Reforms in the school History curriculum and teaching must begin at the university, there where the future teacher is taught History and the methods of the teaching of History. Therefore, the History professor has a double role: to educate both the future historians and the school and university History teachers and professors. The future historians will be trained on the principles, methods, ethical values of researching and writing History completing their first substantial historical work at the doctoral level. Also, their training must include methods and ways of teaching History to college students and pupils. Learning the general pedagogy on teaching is not enough. Specific training in History teaching needs to be employed similar to certain graduate History teaching programs for school teaching (MAT) in USA and similar programs in Western Europe. The school or 2-year college History teacher is to be valued for his/her role in educating citizens in a democratic culture through the teaching of History.

The Historian as Researcher

You have finally decided to become a historian! Congratulations! You are about to graduate with your first History degree from a college/university and after you receive the bachelor's degree continue to the graduate school. In most of the cases you will have to complete the program requirements for a master's degree before you attend the doctoral courses (where required) and submit your doctoral thesis/dissertation. But you may have already completed requirements for a master's degree and the time has come to work on your doctoral courses/reading before you begin work on your thesis/dissertation. The question that most students ask at this point of their History studies is what History period should they work on. Some of those historians who completed their doctoral before the end of the 20th century might just laugh at the question above as all of them had decided on their History concentration area well in advance of the beginning of their graduate studies. But according to the American Historical Association report above, there have been a lot of recent doctoral students who at the defense of their thesis/dissertation are still puzzled with their topic and the results of their research: they “cannot explain the context and significance of their dissertation research.” This section of the book therefore will give those who have not decided yet on the historical period and the geographical area they are going to work on for their master's and doctoral studies some insight into the areas of the study of History and what they entail. Better safe than sorry!

A first degree History student in the US has been exposed to courses of a range of historical periods and geographical areas. A similar student in a European university has studied European or Asian or US/American or African History in ancient, medieval modern times. A student who studies History in any other university in the world has completed courses/modules in ancient and/or medieval and/or modern His-

tory periods related to at least the continent or geographical area s/he lives in. Any History student has been given the opportunity to choose his concentration field for further study beyond the first degree and therefore does have some basic knowledge of part of world History. However, confusion begins when s/he finds out that s/he likes a certain period in a certain geographical area but s/he is not sure of the practical and theoretical prerequisites that research requires in that area. A number of questions for which s/he may not be able to get satisfactory answers hit the student: how well do I need to know ancient or modern languages in order to study the topic I will choose? Do I need to travel to a foreign country for research? Who will help me with basic and extended bibliography for my topic? How will I narrow down and structure my thesis/dissertation topic? What suits my research and writing qualities better: a study on a US theme or of Latin American civilizations? A study of internal European affairs or a study of European colonialism? A comparative study of war refugees in Europe in the late 20th century or the Syrian conflict? The economic and social changes in Japan in the post-World War II period or the geopolitical position of that country in the late 20th century? A topic on literary or art History or a theme on the History of technology? A study on some aspect of ancient historiography or on modern trends in American History writing?

Not all historians like studying a specific historical period from a specific geographical area of the world. Those who are more theoretical in mind prefer reading about the development of human ideas. They like theorizing on the origins of History, its development as an intellectual concept, its practice, comparing and contrasting ideas of philosophers or History theorists on the meaning of History and its uses. There are some who try to understand what is a past event and a fact, why a historian needs evidence or whether History is an autonomous intellectual field or is part of philosophy or literature. This is the work of the History theorists, who may have also worked on a specific period or geographical area. Traditionally, though, a theorist will have studied philosophy and/or some theoretical aspect of the social sciences as well as History. You will begin by studying the classics in the philosophy of History such as Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831), Karl Marx (1818-1883), and Friedrich Meinecke (1862-1954), possibly in the original German, Lucien Febvre (1878-1956), Fernand Braudel (1902-1985), Georges Duby (1919-1996) possibly in French and of course Geoffrey Elton (1921-1994), E. H. Carr (1892-1982) and the post-modernists, just to mention a few well known names of History theorists and historians who wrote on History. Needless to say that important works have been written in Italian. After you do some research you will find out that a great number of the German, French, and Italian works on the philosophy and theory of History have been translated into English and you will ask: “do I really need to know German, French, Italian?” For a thesis/dissertation where you analyze and theorize on the general ideas of those theorists, translation might suffice although if I were your supervisor I would urge you to acquire at least a reading ability of German or French or Italian depending on your focal point. In case though you are serious on the subject and you want to work on what is generally called intellectual History you cannot find all the works of European thinkers in English translation. Moreover, there are terms in German, French or Italian that they conveyed different meanings in the 19th century and different ones in the 20th century and a serious scholar cannot theorize on concepts whose essence has not grasp in full (see chapter 3 below). History theory is only one aspect of intellectual History or the History of ideas, *Kulturgeschichte* and *Geistesgeschichte*, the critical study of ideas expressed by intellectuals. Intellectual History includes the History of philosophy, the History of economic thought, the History of political thought, the History of Literature.

Philosophers of History or History theorists are not interested in battles, political, social or economic change, biographies and similar themes of a typical historical investigation. They ask questions about the meaning of “cause” and the categorization of a number of causes in order of importance; what is a revolution and what are the factors that determine one or make one more significant than another; when and where can/will the next revolution occur; what is an “event” and what is a “fact.” Answers are sought to questions such as “Does history repeat itself?” “What can we be taught from the study of history?” “Is there progress in the course of history?” “Is there a pattern in the development of history?” “What is the purpose and meaning of history?” The student of these questions is not expected to find definite answers but to discuss possible answers and the method of trying to find an answer. (Stanford, pp. 230-231 and expanded in ch. 9).

Important ideas were written in non-European languages or by non-Europeans. Asian philosophers and thinkers of the Muslim world have produced a different corpus of works that are worth studying either all by themselves or in comparison with European ideas. For instance, the parallel and comparative study of ancient Greek and Chinese philosophy produces interesting results although in essence it involves two different and separate worlds. Another classical approach of comparative intellectual History is the contribution of Arab thinkers in the study and understanding of classical Greek works. Again, I believe that for best results the student of those parts of intellectual History needs to have a good grasp of the relevant ancient and modern languages. Some university professors and admission officers may disagree claiming that the knowledge of those languages as a prerequisite for the study of the related thought will become a barrier to those students who are interested in the subject but do not have the language requirement. In simple terms, a counter point to this approach is that the Greek word *eros* (ἔρως) is typically translated as love but which concept of love is discussed in the original classical Greek text under consideration? How are you going to discuss it if you have no idea of the ancient language. Will you rely on the different translations: love, ideal love, sexual passion, god of love, love of a thing, desire, object of love or desire by different translators? Unless you study the original text you have no conceptualization of the real meaning of the word in the specific textual context and more than that in the context of other works by the same author. This is what intellectual History is all about.

In any part of History studied, historians use periodization or a chronological organization of events in order to understand their succession. Greeks and Romans frequently used in their recorded chronology the names of *archons* (magistrates) and councils respectively in order to place an event in time. The Christian monks who first tried to organize History in calendar years divided historical events into two categories. Those that took place before the birth of Jesus (Christ) and those that happened after its birth. In a number of published studies you will come across year notations that are referred to as BC (Before Christ) and AD (Anno Domini, a.k.a. in the year of the Lord, after the birth of Christ) or BCE (Before the Common Era) and CE (Common Era). This chronological pattern has been used for centuries by historians and has created a standard reference system for all civilizations in the world. More and more authors use the BCE/CE system so that there is no direct reference to Christian Jesus Christ when they need to refer to the History of the years before or after year 1 CE. Note that wherever the AD/CE notation is missing, the reference is to the AD/CE years. Year recording in civilizations or even in modern cultures may follow a variety of patterns such as the use of the Hebrew or the Muslim calendar year in addition to the CE year.

History students are surprised when they learn that in the BC/BCE-AD/CE periodization there is no year zero and year 1 BC/BCE is followed by year 1 AD/CE. The Christian monks of the 6th and the 7th centuries never used year zero as they set the birth of Jesus at year 1 and historians followed this tradition. Needless to say that the people in Rome, Greece, Egypt and the Ancient Near East who lived in the year 1 era were never aware of this “historical anomaly” in their lives. However, there is an astronomical year zero that coincides with 1 BC/BCE and in History it is used when a calendar calculation needs to be made. For example, the historical event that took place in the year 357 BC/BCE can be accurately dated by the moon eclipse of the astronomical year -356 (minus 356), which is recorded in the ancient texts.

Chronologically, History begins with ancient History but the immediate question is what is ancient History and when does it begin. Ancient History is a chronological period invented by historians when they divided historical time into sections or historical periods. In the 18th and most of the 19th centuries, they had only European History in mind and their ancient History began with the Greeks in the 8th century BC and ended with the Fall of the Western Roman Empire (typically 5th century AD). Within this long human time, a major historical turning point was the death of Alexander III (the Great) of Macedon in Babylon in 323 BC, which helped chronologically in the separate study of the Greek and the Roman worlds and the respective civilizations. It was again in the late 19th century when the historical events and the corresponding civilization in Eastern Mediterranean and the Greek world were given a separate name, the Hellenistic Age, which is typically dated from the death of Alexander in 323 BC to the Roman victory in Actium (Greece) in 31 BC and the fall of the dynasty of the (Macedonian) Ptolemies in Egypt. In the 19th century, Greek History and civilization were studied intensely and almost all surviving texts in the Greek language were published by German and French editors in standardized editions. Major Greek and Roman works have been published by Harvard University in the Loeb series with facing pages of the original text and the English translation. The bulk of the Greek texts with no translations has been published on the web by the University of California, Irvine, under the title *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (TLG). The texts in Latin can be also found on the web in *The Latin Library* site. The immense number of the Greek inscriptions but with no translations can be found on the *PHI Greek Inscriptions* site. Inscriptions in Latin have been collected at *EDCS Epigraphik-Datenbank Claus/Slaby* (<http://www.manfredclaus.de/gb/index.html>). These publications have allowed historians in the 20th century and beyond to concentrate on the texts themselves rather than the differences between surviving manuscript copies and editorial puzzles.

In the late 18th, in the 19th and the early 20th centuries archaeological missions from various European countries discovered the ancient civilizations in Egypt and the Ancient Near East. Historical and literary texts in the hieroglyphic and cuneiform scripts were found and confirmed that there was History before the Greeks and its recording had actually began in Mesopotamia, in Sumer, during the early 3rd millennium BC. Ancient History, therefore, included now Ancient Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, Persia and the History of the Jews. Moreover, in the middle of the 20th century the Mycenaean Linear B script was finally deciphered and it was found to be the written form of early Greek and so Greek History was pushed back to the late 2nd millennium BC. There is still Linear A of the Minoans on Crete that has not been fully understood and deciphered yet. The script reflects a civilization of the early 2nd millennium BC.

There are other ancient civilizations in other parts of the globe but their chronologies may not coincide with those represented by Ancient Near East, Egyptian, Greek and Roman civilizations. There is no common ancient History chronology even among the civilizations above except in the periods when they share events. The

synchronized historical tables where all events are placed on the same time scale do help in recognizing those that have taken place at about the same time in different parts of the world but not in the understanding of the course of a civilization. Historians prefer establishing and referring to chronologies in BC/BCE and AD/CE terms for civilizations in other parts of the world even if they do not coincide with ancient times in the Mediterranean world. Therefore, the ancient History of a civilization may date well into the Christian era of the European civilization or the Muslim era of the Arabic civilization.

The beginning of the ancient Chinese civilization dates from the late 2nd millennium BC to 221 BC. China though has its own periodization and the centuries between 221 BC and 1912 AD are named Imperial China. The post 1912 years are Modern China. The prehistoric period of India lasted until about 330 BC, a Bronze and an Iron Age until 200 BC, a Classical period until 650 CE, a medieval period until the 16th century and a modern period as of the 16th century. The ancient period of Korean History ends in 108 BC and is followed by a succession of periods of kingdoms and a dynastic era. Japanese ancient History runs until 538 BC, the classical period until the 12th century, and the feudal period until the 16th century. The antiquity of Arabic History ends in the early 7th century and is followed by a medieval period that historically lasts until the early 20th century. The History of Mesoamerican civilizations and cultures is mainly known indirectly, through the eyes of their conquerors or from archaeological discoveries. The Olmec, Maya, Aztec and Inca Mesoamerican (Latin America) civilizations have their own chronology. The Olmecs flourished between 1500 BC to 400 BC. The Maya civilization has an Archaic period before 2000 BC, a Preclassical between 2000 BC and 250 AD, and a Classical and Postclassical that followed. The Aztecs flourished between 1300 and 1521 AD and the Inca empire lasted from 1438 to 1533. These are some examples of ancient History chronologies in various areas of the world.

The beginning of History in any civilization is generally defined by the existence of written records in the locally spoken language. The historical era is preceded by a Prehistoric period that is studied by archaeologists and is usually divided into chronological sections according to the different pottery unearthed. There may be other artifacts or utensils that the archaeologists discover and study together with pottery in order to define the time periods of a material civilization or culture. However, archaeologists may add to the History and civilization of a people by discovering inscriptions, buildings, burial offerings which confirm, correct or add to the information that exists in writing. Prehistory therefore needs to be totally separated from History in terms of methods and results achieved. However, it is not unusual for historians of ancient History to include a brief introduction or first chapter with the prehistory of the peoples/nations/place they have studied and which is usually based only on archaeological evidence.

Greek or Roman History will be used here as a model/example for the discussion of the study of ancient peoples and civilizations in a complete fashion: History, institutions, religion and customs in general, art, science. The Ancient History of Europe is based on sources that are literary and archaeological. Archaeological sources are the material findings related to a civilization and literary are those that can be found in written textual form. Archaeological sources include the material remains of the ancient world such as buildings, pottery, jewelry, weapons, implements, utensils, coins. The work of the archaeologists is to excavate, date, determine the location of the findings and interpret them, all of which will eventually give information to historians and combined with literary sources will allow them reconstruct the past, write History. From material findings we learn a lot about everyday life, religious practices

and burials, the society, economy, and military activity. Examples of archaeological excavations that have changed or are still changing our view of antiquity are Troy, Mycenae, Pylos, Tyrins, Knossos, Phaestos, Malia, Akroteri at Thera, Vergina, Ostia, Pompey, Herculaneum. Most of the times, archaeological findings by themselves cannot tell us a story as they are instant pictures of the past. Literary sources though can tell us stories that historians will use to write Histories. Not all of the literary sources are of the same value to the historian. In general, the literary material for Greek and Roman antiquity is in one sense “immense and illuminating and in another scanty and misleading.” (Creed in Perkin, p. 30). Therefore, the historian needs to evaluate their usefulness before use them in his/her History. The historian should not confine himself/herself to texts written by ancient historians and writers of orations or political treatises. There is a wealth of historically related information in philosophical works, in those about the geography of the ancient world and in works of literature written by authors who lived in antiquity or even later on in the Middle Ages (Byzantine and Western European authors). All these texts reflect a great number of different minds. There are works written or copied in antiquity and have been preserved on papyri in the sands of Egypt but most of the texts that have come down to us are the work of copyists. In the Middle Ages, copies of ancient works were made so that they can be studied by more than one scholars and these manuscripts are nowadays preserved in libraries. In most of the cases, more than one copies have been preserved but they are not identical. Copyists may have left words out from the original or the copy they copied from or they may have misspelled words. In the production of the standardized edition of each work published by Teubner publishers in Leipzig in the 19th century each surviving manuscript or codex has been taken into consideration and the differences or corrections have been recorded. This is also true for other standardized editions that were published in the 20th century. Standard editions of works written by authors until Late Antiquity in Greek and Latin have been mainly published by Teubner Press (original text only or sometimes with German translation), The Harvard University Press in the Loeb series (original text and English translation), The French Universities Press in the Belles Lettres series (original text and French translation). The Liverpool University Press has published in its Translated Texts for Historians series translations of a number of important texts and university presses in the USA and the UK have published collections of translated texts for educational purposes. However, not all authors or texts have been translated into a modern language and the student will be required to use his/her Greek and Latin in order to read for instance the wealth of inscriptions that have been discovered and published. Important works on ancient History have been published in German, French, Italian and Modern Greek (mainly archaeological reports of the Greek Archaeological Service) and the historian may not do without them. Therefore, the ideally prepared Ancient Historian of the Greco-Roman world must be able to read Classical Greek and Latin as well as the above mentioned modern languages apart from English. This is of course required of those who will be heavily involved in research and publication. The school teacher or the typical college/university professor can succeed in their teaching function with just the typical reading knowledge of Greek and Latin and a well based apprehension of Ancient History.

The main role of the Ancient Historian of Europe is to understand a world that has totally disappeared. The Ancient Greeks, the Romans, the Celts and peoples of various material cultures that once lived in Europe do not exist anymore and their civilizations and cultures must be reconstructed from textual and archaeological remains. It is not the same as our civilization(s) and culture(s) today and in principle one cannot compare Modern Greeks with Ancient Greeks, Romans with Modern Italians. There-

fore, the historian needs to have a good knowledge of all those expressions of a specific ancient culture in order to reconstruct the Greek, Roman, Ancient European past. Generally, any research topic in Ancient History and depending on its specifics requires a holistic approach or a combination of two or more fields of knowledge from History, History of art and architecture, law and religion, archaeology, literature, philosophy, historical geography, numismatics. Moreover, students of Ancient History should be diligent of generalizations regarding life in the ancient European world. As John Creed explains in his essay, the historian should not conclude from «Thucydides' history and the plays of Euripides that the great mass of the Athenian citizen-body was passionately interested in politics and its principles» or «that the cultivated scepticism of Cicero or Horace gave us an insight into the attitude of an Italian peasant or artisan» (Creed in Perkin, pp. 31-32) or even that the culture of the metal craftsmen of late bronze and early iron central Europe characterized all the Celtic populations. In other words, the historian should be very careful of generalizations regarding the Ancient World.

Ancient History of Europe but in fact any Ancient History requires by the historian the understanding of societies, cultures, and civilizations that are entirely different from his/her/our own. People and even leaders did not have a global perception of the world and news needed days or even weeks to travel long distances. For the Greeks, the Persian empire was powerful and vast but there were no maps for leaders to check its size while for the Persians Greeks and the Greek cities were minor enemies in the far west of their empire. Victories and defeats were relevant and leaders accepted them as true only if the enemy was completely destroyed. Our superficial historical perception of societies, wars, diplomacy, politics, religion in the Ancient World does not usually coincide with that of the peoples who actually lived in those days. The historian's main effort is to place himself/herself in the shoes of plain men, women, and children, politicians, soldiers, decision makers, men of literature, philosophers, and scientists and try to understand their way of thinking. Needless to say that this way of thinking differed in the Archaic, the Classical, the Hellenistic, the Roman period of the ancient Greco-Roman world and therefore the historian is asked to adapt his/her understanding to the specific point in time s/he studies. But this is why the Ancient World is fascinating and can fill its student with a lot of happy moments when s/he feels that s/he has finally found the key to its treasures.

The Middle Ages of European History is the second broad era of historical study and it is so named just because it is chronologically placed between ancient times and modern times. It begins roughly in the 4th or the 5th century and ends with the beginning of the Renaissance, sometime between the 14th and the 15th centuries, depending on local factors in the various areas of Europe. It is sometimes called the Medieval Period with the negative connotation of social, cultural, and scientific backwardness attached to it. However, since the middle of the 20th century if not earlier, historians have shown that it was a livery epoch and a period when a great number of works of ancient writers were copied and preserved for posterity. It was definitely times different from those of the Ancient World and from what post-Renaissance people and scholars have experienced. The Middle Ages were characterized by the spread and prevalence of Christianity initially in Europe and later in other parts of the world. The era can be seen through the eyes of a villager, a traveling artisan or merchant, a man of various ranks in the Christian Church, a soldier, a petite ruler, a member of the nobility or a King. The society in the Middle Ages was a highly stratified one with no mobility. Wealth could not buy a new social status and people's lives were determined by the social status of their birth. Greek and Roman political institutions disappeared

and the continent was filled with new comers, the modern Europeans of central, north, east and west Europe.

The study of the History of the Middle Ages since the beginning of the 20th century has been unfashionable despite its hidden beautiful secrets. Apart from specific studies in English, French, and Spanish History that revive life in the Middle Ages or link a modern theme with its medieval predecessor, the interest of undergraduates in both US and European universities is low. The notion that the History of the Middle Ages “is *not* worthwhile” (Tuck in Perkin, p. 42) has prevailed. “Why shall I study it then?” I hear the listener from the back of the room asking the fellow student sitting next to him/her. The list of reasons for studying the European History of the Middle Ages include the following: (a) the graduate will have received the same training in History research as any other student studying any other period and will be able to receive a doctorate in a topic/aspect of the Middle Ages; (b) The US college/university History graduate will be able to teach a number of History courses at both school and college (after receiving at least a master's degree) beyond topics on the Middle Ages (c) The UK graduate will be able to teach History at school/college, O-Level and A-Level; (d) will also be able to work in education administration (admissions, student affairs, academic advising, faculty administrative support, library related positions, curator, college/university officer); (e) will be able to work with the government (in positions requiring appreciation and awareness of cultural differences, project management and team work, interdisciplinary perspective, historical knowledge, research skills) or in the business world using the skills s/he has learned during his/her History education (human resources, project management and team work; business History and archiving); (f) depending on the graduate's success in his/her studies, emphasis within the area of the History of the Middle Ages and additional skills (knowledge of Latin, paleography, modern languages), s/he can work as an archivist, biographer, writer, editor, translator and similar occupations.

The decline or the lack of interest for the study of the Middle Ages in Europe has been attributed to a number of reasons related to changes in school education on both sides of the Atlantic, to prejudice, to historical ignorance. A basic knowledge of the Latin language studied/selected at school is a great asset for those college students who wish to pursue the study of the Middle Ages. Since the middle of the 20th century, the teaching of Latin has declined as fewer and fewer pupils have shown interest in its study. However, it may be difficult to begin Latin while at college/university and the knowledge of middle level Latin may be required for the study of primary sources related to the historical period. The Latin language requirement therefore may discourage students from the study of the Middle Ages. The Middle Ages is usually referred to in popular publications as the Medieval times associating the historical period with backwardness, obscurity, lack of civilization, social and cultural darkness, nothing important to be studied. On the contrary, the study of the Middle Ages may be highly rewarding for its student. In the area of culture and civilization, it is characterized by «the love for learning» related to the study in monasteries of the Christian tradition as well as the writings of certain ancient authors such as Aristotle. In the economic and societal domain the discovery of how people lived and especially life in a manor is an astonishing historical experience. The relations between the monarchs and the heads of the Church is a fascinating topic to be explored for those who would like to understand the development of clerical power in Europe. The coming of new peoples in Europe including the Alemanni, the Franks, the Lombards, the Goths, the Burgundians, the Angles, the Saxons, the Vandals, the Huns and the decline of the Roman Empire on the West will thrill those interested in studying the ancestors of modern Europeans and how they affected the fall of Rome. The variety of weapons, military campaigns,

battles, chivalry, the crusades are subjects that will impress with their historical uniqueness those interested in military History. Many modern European political institutions were shaped during the Middle Ages and the study of their origin links the past with the present. From many aspects, the Middle Ages is unique compared to the Ancient and the Modern World and its study offers unprecedented experience and happiness to its scholars. As Anthony Tuck put it “The student who approaches the middle ages has to come to understand a civilization based on social, political, and even perhaps religious assumptions which will be unfamiliar [new] to him.” (Tuck in Perkin, p.43)

Many people and some historians among them, believe that a historical event is unique in time and never repeats itself. The truth is that History never repeats itself but general events such as revolutions, wars, economic and social changes that may alter the world, customs and even religious beliefs are repeated. Of course, the times are different and the circumstances are different but a historian who is aware of how an abrupt development was solved by a military leader in the past or what were the methods that Lenin used in order to convince the agrarian society of Russia in the late 1910s that the time had come for a socialist revolution or the effect that the truthfulness and the speed that news travel had on different events at different historical times may arrive at interesting conclusions and solutions comparing the past with the present. Fake news or false news is not a modern phenomenon and in fact its effect today is very similar to its effect a hundred years ago and even earlier, in the Middle Ages. French Historian Marc Bloch using his own war experience during World War I compared in 1921 the effect that the oral spread of false news had in the trenches with that of oral false stories transmitted “by jugglers, pilgrims, merchants, itinerant monks»”(Bloch, 1921) in the isolated French villages in the Middle Ages. “False news is a mirror wherein the 'collective consciousness' contemplates its own features,” (Bloch, 1921) explained Bloch and which we are reminded by the effect of the fake news spread by US President Donald Trump through the social media (January 2021) that he had won his re-election but he was denied his second presidency.

Another interesting aspect of the History of the Middle Ages in Europe is the significance of the local communities in relation to authority of the kings and the Popes. The Histories of the rulers do not tell us the whole story for what was going on in the lands of the British, the French, the Germans, the Italians. The local aristocracy played a very important role and its History cannot be disregarded. Specifically, the interaction between the central authority and the feudal principalities must be studied together so that early medieval France is satisfactorily understood. Although historians do speak of countries and peoples in Europe in the Middle Ages, we should not think of modern states and their political institutions. «In continental Europe at least, different political authorities overlapped and interlocked with great complexity, and it was never easy to say where the frontier of any particular kingdom, county or duchy ran.» (Tuck in Perkin, p. 53). Moreover, the church did not just play a political, diplomatic, administrative role but it was to a very large extent the provider of education to medieval men. «Its members played an overwhelmingly important part in the intellectual and cultural life of the period, in monasteries, cathedral schools, and, from the mid-twelfth century onwards, in the universities.» (Tuck in Perkin, p. 53). The men of the church were allowed to move from one area to another and bring along with them their ideas as well as their preferences in art and architecture, all of which were of course subject to modification in the various parts of Europe. The common language of the men of church and literature was Latin, the unifying essence of authorities in western Europe. The student of the Middle Ages will be able to distinguish between local specifics and common patterns in western Europe.

The fall of Rome in west Europe did not end the Roman Empire as it is commonly thought by school graduates. The East Roman Empire survived for another thousand years transformed into what historians named Byzantium or Byzantine Empire. What had characterized the eastern part of the Roman Empire throughout its existence was the use of the Greek language by its inhabitants. This was of course a continuation from Hellenistic Times although until the times of Emperor Justinian I (482-565) the official language of administration throughout the Roman Empire (west and east) was Latin. The Latin language continued to be used in the East Roman Empire when Emperor Constantine (the Great, c. 272-337) moved the capital from Rome to Byzantium/Constantinople in the east but two centuries later it was clear that there was no linguistic communication between the high rank administration and the people who lived in the empire. Justinian was the first emperor to order the codification of imperial edicts in Latin into the *Codex Justinianus* and issued for the first time in the History of the empire the new laws (named in Latin, *Novellae*) in the Greek language. Thereafter, the official language of the Byzantine Empire was Greek.

Byzantium or the Byzantine Empire is studied separately from the Middle Ages of western Europe although chronologically coincides with them. A prerequisite of its study is of course the knowledge of medieval Greek, which is not so much different from Classical Greek but perhaps easier to learn. What impresses the student of Byzantium is its cultural richness. A great number of men of letters lived and produced throughout its existence: chroniclers, historians, men of secular, ecclesiastical, theological literature, men of popular poetry, Georgius Gemistus Pletho (c. 1355/1360-1452/1454), the neoplatonic philosopher. Painters of holy icons and frescoes, mosaic artisans, ivory artisans, church architects produced admirable artworks, unique to Byzantium. The Byzantine civilization is an entirely different and unique chapter in the History of medieval Europe. The Byzantines were the first who came into contact with the Slavs and especially the Russians, with the Avars, the Arabs, the Ottoman Turks and Islam and the study of their History provides a unique opportunity to those students who would like to pursue comparative studies: Christianity and Islam, East-West relations, European-West Asian civilizations and even Byzantine-West European political and ecclesiastical relations, Byzantine influences to the West.

The History and civilization of the Middle Ages in Europe is a very exciting epoch to be studied. The knowledge of basic Latin or Greek is a great asset for those who will pursue undergraduate studies and a must for graduate studies. You really feel a civilization when you understand what it wants to convey to you in its own language: *codex* or *πανδέκτης*. Latin and classical or medieval Greek may be “dead languages” today just because they are not used as they were a thousand or more than two thousand years ago but they are very live and alive when the student is able to read the text as it was originally written in the Latin or the Greek language. It is then when the vibrant text and the History and civilization it conveys become a true possession of its reader, you the scholar of Medieval Europe. Medieval European History is full of military, political and ecclesiastical struggles, a society of innocent peasants who try to survive in their secluded villages, a society of jugglers, pilgrims, merchants, itinerant monks, an aristocracy of kings, knights, and Popes, a guild of intellectuals initially at the monasteries and later at the universities, the History of the contact between the Christian and the Muslim Worlds.

There is no doubt among historians that a new historical era begins with the Renaissance or rebirth of letters, arts, sciences, politics after the crisis of the Late Middle Ages. Definitely, its first signs appear in some Italian cities but centered in Florence in the 14th century and lasted at least until the end of the 15th century. In cer-

tain fields though one can recognize sperms of the Renaissance in the second half of the 13th century and see developments until the 17th century. The Renaissance is a cultural movement that affected letters, arts, and sciences and revived the interest for the letters, arts, and sciences that had flourished by the Greeks and the Romans in the epoch of Ancient Europe. The central theme of the Renaissance was humanism, the human being became the center of study. This new thinking also affected politics. From a historical point of view, Renaissance may be studied together with the period of Reformation and Counter Reformation. The Protestant Reformation was the 16th century ecclesiastical movement lead by the monk Martin Luther against the authority of the Pope in Rome. In reality there had been some earlier Protestant reactions. The Counter Reformation or the Catholic Reformation was the reaction of the catholic Church to Protestantism and lasted from the middle of the 16th century until the middle of the 17th century. These ecclesiastical movements led to religious wars in Europe. The Renaissance, the Reformation and the Counter Reformation epoch from the 14th to the 17th centuries comprise together the so called History of Early Modern Europe. Moreover, it is in this epoch that the Europeans began the sea exploration of the globe, settled down in lands far away from their continent and European History became to a large extend world History. Most important for the History of the period was that “the long dominance of a basically European culture over most of the rest of the known world was [...] assured” (Woolrych in Perkin, p. 63) and the economy in some of the countries boomed. Economic History and History of science and technology of modern Europe begin in this era. After Roman times, standing armies were reused in this period as European countries began fighting one another for various causes. One very important political development in Early Modern Europe was the use by princes of representative bodies. In the 15th century, rulers in Europe, some occasionally and others very frequently, consulted some sort of «estates of the realm, meaning normally a constitutional body representing the nobles, clergy and commons» (Woolrych in Perkin, p. 66) and this way they governed with their consent. This is one of the stages in the long development of European government from feudalism of the Late Middle Ages to absolute monarchy in the 17th and the 18th centuries. One important example is the rise of English parliamentarism.

The 18th, the 19th, the 20th centuries and beyond comprise in historians' periodization Modern History. Students may focus on local European themes but European History has become global History. Europeans established their authority all over the world and influenced countries, peoples and their communities in other parts of it. In this period a student can study political, economic, social, cultural relations between a European country and locals in another part of the world: the British in Egypt and the Middle East, India, Ceylon, China, South Africa or the British and the French in North America or the Spaniards and the Portuguese in Central and South America or the Belgians, French, Germans, Italians in Africa are just some examples of the most well known imperialisms. In European continental affairs the American, the French and the Russian revolutions shaped two different governmental systems. The US and the French republics are still governed by a president and representative bodies that are elected by the people every so often. The Russian revolution overthrew the last typical European absolute monarchy and established a socialist/communist regime that lasted until 1990. The most important personality in this period was the head of the communist party who was dully re-elected every so often as its Secretary General and head of the state of the Soviet Union until he died. He was typically the only candidate for this position and he was supported by a party elite (Nomenclature) for the purpose of representing and governing the Soviet Union or officially the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR).

Frequent deadly wars among Europeans marked all three centuries and every time resulted in great technological leaps in war technologies. The simple big canons and rifles of one shot at the beginning of the period were eventually replaced by machine guns and atomic bombs that could and still can destroy the whole globe in a matter of minutes. War machines such as battleships, tanks and airplanes were added to the armaments of the belligerents. Countries were enlarged and shrank as a result of wars and genocides were executed during wars: Jews, Armenians, Christians of the Pontus (north part of Turkey). Military tactics changed drastically from units marching and firing in columns without any protection to sudden (blitz) war. Communication methods were developed so that the simple orders by mouth were replaced by complex maneuvers and attacks coordinated by signals transmitted by electronic devices. The two World Wars in the 20th century killed so many people in Europe and all over the world so that the peace we generally enjoy in Europe since 1945 has been the longest in the whole History of the peoples on the continent. The military historian of these three centuries can study a number of developments in weapons, techniques, army units, tactics, life of soldiers and their officers.

The economy and the society changed drastically. Economies based on slaves changed into industrialism; mercantilism changed into capitalism; the collapse of 19th century capitalism of the few was realized as it developed in the 20th century into capitalism of the many, shared capitalism. Some students may wish to return to the question of how and why the feudal economy was transformed into the 19th century capitalism or how and why 19th century capitalism of the few capitalists was transformed into the 20th century capitalism of the many. The changes from purely agrarian and trade economies into European economies of agriculture, manufacturing and services is one more topic whose aspects can be explored within the frame of Modern History. Did it really and why did European economic imperialism collapse or was it transformed into other forms of exploitation or advantage of certain countries over others? Economic historians who research topics in archives or those who create mathematical models in order to prove their arguments have at their disposal statistics that in some countries or areas of Europe are comprised of long series of figures that can be used for this purpose. Of course, researchers need to be very careful not to allow the figures lead them to partially supported conclusions.

The few cities in the 18th century became a lot more in the 20th century and some of them were extended with large suburbs. Aspects of the evolution of cities and their populations provide a series of possible research topics for the social and urban historian. Cities, towns and villages are inhabited by people who form local, suburban and national societies with different ways of living. Comparisons of living conditions form a historical point of view between rural, suburban, and metropolitan areas can provide interesting results. Changes in taste and fashion among different classes will show continuities and discontinuities among centuries or even decades. The exploration of various causes of the formation and the growth of modern social classes as well as the effects on the European societies in different periods allow for many of their aspects to be researched in depth from a historical point of view. Historical aspects of the changes that took place in educational methods and education of boys and girls in various European countries and by comparison open new themes in the study of formal training in reading and writing. In some countries the establishment of an increasing number of libraries and the rise in the utilization of local and large public libraries with printed or electronic sources by scholars and the general public will reveal facets of the level and the scope of the use of printed or electronic knowledge in modern societies. Social History has many more corners that a student can explore in various countries in Europe, discuss using theories, compare and contrast.

Political and diplomatic European History of the last three centuries has been well researched and studied to the point that only aspects that relate to the Balkans, East European countries and the Baltic States are still partially unexplored. Such an undertaking though requires very well knowledge of the language(s) involved and access to national archives, wherever possible and allowed. On the other hand, comparative political and diplomatic History may still have corners to be explored and studied but again good knowledge of at least one European language besides English is required. Since the 1970s, great emphasis has been given in the US and Canada to Public History, which mainly includes those who work on historical preservation (i.e. historic homes, sites, battlefields), archivists and their science, museum curators and their specialized work, oral History and fields related to History in the educational and entertainment industry (music, film, television, new media) or even in corporate History. This is a well established profession but new and possibly not yet fully defined. The audience of the public Historian is the general public as s/he is the link between History and the average educated person. However, the public historian must observe all requirements of historical research and study.

The globalization of History has allowed students to conduct research and studies in countries where Europeans operated in the last three centuries and in relation to their activities there. However, the study of national History of any country of the world is possible as long as the student possesses the relevant language(s) and access to the archives. Themes of World or General History, that is, comparative History or surveys of the History of continents, geographical areas or individual non-European countries, are becoming more and more popular. On the other hand, the History of the USA and the foreign relations of the country have been and are still studied in depth. However, there may be great differences in the viewpoints of American and European or non-American historians on US and American themes. Because it is understood on both sides of the Atlantic that a better understanding of both parts is needed, it is not unusual and sometimes required for European students of American History and culture to spend a semester in the US and very frequent for any American student to study for a semester in Europe so that they both acclimatize themselves into the entirely new to them cultural environment of the respective continent. This also helps in the exchange of professors so that they reply to the questions of the students of the other continent based on their own US/European/national traditions and History training. In my view, it would be very beneficial from a History training point of view if every European History student was exposed to at least a survey of US History and vice versa.

The traditional History divisions as possible research fields were discussed above but this has not exhausted all the aspects of modern study in History. It was the French thinkers and historians in the 20th century who began the study of aspects of human experience that had never before been thought of having a History such as the History of climate or the History of sexuality or the History of mentalities. Some of these new areas combine History and philosophy and may make use more of ideas rather than of archives. Some other topics though such as the History of diseases or pandemics, the History of women, the History of communication, the History of reading, the History of images, the History of business practices (management, marketing, advertising), or micro-History (for example, family History) can be based on primary sources. All these New Histories are not narratives but they are concerned with the analysis of structures. Burke has summarized very precisely the methodological problems and questions of “New History.”

However, the new paradigm also has its problems: problems of definition, problems of sources, problems of method, problems of explanation. [...] Problems of definition occur because the new historians are pushing into unfamiliar territory. They begin, as explorers of other cultures usually do, with a sort of negative image of what they are looking for. The history of the Orient has been perceived by occidental historians as the opposite of their own, eliminating differences between the Middle and Far East, China and Japan, and so on. [...] World history has often been viewed -by westerners- as the study of the relations between the west and the rest, ignoring interactions between Asia and Africa, Asia and America, and so on. (Burke in Burke, p. 9). The greatest problems for the new historians, however, are surely those of sources and methods, it has already been suggested that when historians began to ask new kinds of questions about the past, to choose new objects of research, they had to look for new kinds of sources to supplement official documents. Some turned to oral history [...] others to the evidence of images [...]; others to statistics. It has also proved possible to re-read certain kinds of official records in new ways [...], especially the interrogations of [judicial] suspects. (p. 12). Although the expansion of the historian's universe and the increasing dialogue with other disciplines, from geography to literary theory, are surely to be welcomed, these developments have their price. The discipline of history is now more fragmented than ever before. Economic historians are able to speak the language of economists, intellectual historians the language of philosophers, and social historians the dialects of sociologists and social anthropologists, but, these groups of historians are finding it harder and harder to talk to one another. (p. 18).

In any version of History, either the traditional narrative based on archival sources or the New History study of structures, the research Historian must rely on solid evidence and interpretations based on the evidence. The evidence can be drawn from typical archival sources or they can be of any tangible type but not just on one or more theories or constructed models. In other words, the student cannot use just a statistical, economic, social, philosophical or linguistic theory or model, adapt selected evidence to it and publish the results. Also, conclusions and interpretations must be supported by the evidence cited.

Intellectual History is not “New History” but it is a subject by itself and its study may take various routes. One of them is the philosophy of History or the History of History and can focus on various theories about the reasons for the study of History, the use of History, what History is after all or about how its conception by scholars has changed throughout the ages. Almost all important works have been translated into English and the need for very good knowledge of other European languages is limited to those students who would like to study specific theory of History ideas as they have developed in Germany or France. Another aspect of Intellectual History is the evolution of various ideas in the last three centuries that the student can discuss, compare and contrast, study their short or long-term impact. Intellectual and Social History can be combined if the student wishes to understand why and how certain ideas flourished within a specific social context or how and why a specific idea changed during a long period of time. In a number of cases the roots of ideas can be found in the intellectual production of the Greeks.

Regardless of the historical period s/he is going to study or the version of History s/he is going to use, narrative or structural, the researcher needs to follow the historical methodology. The historian must locate his/her sources that can be of any type

and in any form. They can be documents in an archive that can be accessed in their original handwritten or printed form or as digital copies. They can be buildings, artifacts, coins, images, films, machines, media, ideas in books, articles, essays. Other sources will be discussions and interpretations of documents, material sources, ideas. All sources relevant to the topics to be examined and researched must be arranged and studied carefully. All evidence supportive or non-supportive of the chosen topic must be judged, discussed, explained, and interpreted. The researcher must not try to prove or disprove a preconceived theory or idea and use only the sources that support it. No known to the researcher sources and relevant to his/her theme must be excluded. The final product of the History researcher must be a well constructed narrative or structural essay in which the conclusions are fully supported by the sources analyzed. The final result of the researcher's work will determine the success of his/her venture.

The Historian as Intellectual, Political Activist, Public Intellectual

Historians do their research and publish their studies, they teach at school and college/university, they are employed in a variety of professions and sometimes are asked or choose to become History makers. In any of their capacities above Historians are categorized among the intellectuals or they are public intellectuals when they are involved in a dialogue regarding the public affairs of a society or they are political activists. An intellectual is a thinker who employs critical thinking, s/he conducts research, and exposes himself/herself to reflection on his/her own results of research or that of others. S/he publishes the outcomes of his/her studies so that they are exposed to the scrutiny of other intellectuals or educate the public.

In 1938, Bernard Russel, the British philosopher and mathematician, addressed the American sociologists at the University of Chicago and he spoke on the role of the intellectual in the world. Among the several points he made, I have singled out a few I am going to comment on. His main argument was that intellectuals, writers in general, had no real influence in the early 20th century society and they had been replaced by “technicians,” scientists who generally promoted technology in the service of human beings, both peace and war technology. In previous centuries, he said, books could possibly influence the course of events and he stated the Carlyle story. At a dinner, a table companion insisted that books never had any influence on events and Thomas Carlyle, the British essayist and historian, replied: “There was a fellow called Rousseau, and they said that about his book, and their skins went to bind the second edition.” Few writers could dream for such a popularity. On the other hand, Russel doubted whether any writer had any influence in the course of the French or the Russian Revolutions or other world shaking events. But it also seems that anti-intellectualism sometimes governs the minds of the people who “want something inherently impossible.” At the end of World War I some British ladies could not understand why the Germans were not forced to pay the whole cost of the war although, Russel explains, it was known to the public that this was financially impossible for them. The ladies also said that because God was good “He must have created a world in which the Germans could be suitably punished.” With his two examples, Russel touched both human ignorance and bias, in various forms.

The study of the progress of technology is part of the History of science and technology and in some instances the historian is called to decide the magnitude of the influence of new scientific discoveries and technological inventions in the History of a period. Historians, scholars of humanities, social scientists, and scientists are all intellectuals. The fact that the 21st century is lead by scientists and technology experts does not lower or minimize the importance of other intellectuals but, on the contrary, it

does make their social role more important than before as they need to counterbalance the scientific and technological popular mania and unprecedented multiple leaps of our era affecting the world all over. It is the role of the historian to explain to his audience the positive and negative effects of scientific and technological changes throughout History. It is one of his/her responsibilities as a teacher and writer to show how progresses in science and technology saved or improved people's lives and how they resulted in wars that cost lives. Therefore, both the works of scientists and historians are important and complement each other as well as the works of other scholars in the humanities and the social sciences.

In the minds of the people in the street there are preconceptions about historical events that may derive from their religious, political, social, ethic code, national beliefs. It is the role of the research historian as well as the role of the popular historian to clear the clouds or minimize their effects over those events creating doubts and misconceptions. This does not mean though that all the people will be willing to accept those revised ideas face value. In any case, the civil war in Greece towards the end of World War II and in the five years after its end between the Greek national forces and the popular Greek socialist/communist political and military forces has caused a great number of Greek deaths and a great deal of fierce fighting in book and newspapers pages. In a few words the Left believe that the political and military intervention of Anglo-Americans deprived Greece from a Left government it deserved in the 20th century. Things would have been a lot different and much better, they claim, if some leaders of the Left did not decide to compromise, did not agree in the disarming of the armed forces of the Left on mainland Greece and eventually were not defeated by the militarily superior Greek national forces supported by the British. Until the last decade of the 20th century few of the supporters of the Left story knew or accepted or were aware that the communist leaders were informed of the fact that in May 1944 Churchill and Stalin agreed in a secret meeting in Moscow the spheres of influence in east Europe and Greece fell on the side of the British, the West. This explains why the Soviet Union (today's Russia was part of it) never really intervened in affairs in Greece after World War II. Sober Greek historians have proven that the military defeat of the Left as well as its inability to win elections during the 20th century was due to blind acceptance of the political line from Moscow, lack of real leadership, civil wars within the socialist/communist parties that emerged during the last century, prevalence of the hard liners in terms of left ideology. In some instances, ideas of those historians expressed in the 1950s and 1960s were not accepted as possible and probable explanations of the events until the end of the 20th century, after the fall of real communism in East Europe and Russia. In a number of cases, historians are understood by the public many years or even centuries after they state their opinion on events. The historian's role is exactly this, to state his/her opinion based on evidence not taking into account whether it will be immediately accepted by the readers. A precondition for this liberty is the historian's independence.

It was in 1965 when Jean-Paul Sartre, the French philosopher, literature writer and political activist, gave three lectures in Japan on the role of intellectuals in the middle of the 20th century. In his view an intellectual has to be an activist. Scientists who work with atomic energy and just do their scientific work are not intellectuals but just scientists. However, if those same scientists terrified by the destructive power of atomic bombs get together and sign a protest alerting the public to the dangers of war with atomic weapons, they become intellectuals. (p. 230). In order to give his own definition of the intellectual, Sartre discusses how intellectuals have emerged in France since the 11th century. Specialists in knowledge such as Montesquieu, Voltaire, Diderot, Rousseau, d'Alembert, and doctors of medicine called themselves *philo-*

sophes (philosophers=lovers of wisdom) and tried “to create a rational conception of the Universe which would embrace and justify the actions and demands of the bourgeoisie” using Reason. (p. 234). They applied this ideology of reasoning to the problems of History and society in order to crash the traditions, privileges and myths of the aristocracy and feudalism. So, those *philosophes* who asked for liberty (the right for free inquiry) and actually demanded the right to think with independence in order to conduct practical research were the “*organic*” intellectuals of the bourgeoisie. Sartre defines the modern intellectual as “someone who becomes aware of the opposition, both within himself and within society, between a search for practical truth (with all the norms it implies) and a ruling ideology (with its system of traditional values).” (p. 246).

No doubt Sartre uses his Marxist ideology to define the intellectual whom he views as “the product of a class-divided society” and “a product of History.” (p. 246). But I can use his concluding statements to make my own point about the coming to being of the Historian as intellectual. The intellectual is a product of his/her times. Not all of the intellectuals in History are alike, in the sense that they might not have the same education, experiences, ideologies while they are writing their studies. Therefore, historians are not alike and each historian's work must be understood and appreciated within the framework of the times s/he lived in and wrote. We cannot judge Thucydides in modern historiographical standards; we cannot evaluate the Byzantine History writer George Sphrantzes, or Phrantzes, who was an eyewitness of the Fall of Constantinople in 1453 and wrote about it, in terms of how we define History writing in the 21st century; we cannot criticize George Grote (1794-1871) for faults in his multi-volume *History of Greece* as historiography in the middle of the 19th century had not reached the modern level of research and not all of the sources were available. On the other hand, we can praise all of the above for the clarity in their writing style. It is crucial, therefore, for a historian to be able to pass judgment on the work of other historians, even his/her contemporaries, based on a number of parameters (availability of sources, consideration of other studies on the same topic, writing clarity, bias, ideology).

In the question what is the function of the intellectual, Sartre replies that “no one has given him a mandate to exercise a function” in the society. (p. 246). There are specific behaviors though that may characterize him. For example, the intellectual can not fight racism by just demonstrating its “aberrant character” but s/he has to return to himself and destroy the racism within himself/herself that have existed since childhood. (p. 249). My comment is that in the same way whenever the historian encounters questions of racism, cultural inferiority or superiority compared to his/her own, higher or lower civilizations compared to his experiences, ethical dilemmas, s/he must first look into him/her, shake off his/her long standing personal beliefs and examine the facts without any bias. This is very difficult when a black historian arrives at the conclusion that a white man's policy against the blacks can be justified or when a historian with Marxist beliefs must admit that certain political actions of communist parties in Europe were toward the wrong direction and harmed their cause. The ancient historian needs to be able to approach the Sumerian civilization in the Ancient Near East not comparing it to the classical Greek one but as a civilized entity on its own. The historian of Modern Europe must be able to understand why the Quran justifies tolerance or intolerance against people of other religions. The historian cannot claim that an action of a historical figure or a group of people was just or unjust, ethical or unethical according to his/her personal or social attitudes of the times s/he lives in except in the cases of human extermination such as the Holocaust or the Armenian or the Black Sea (Pontus, in north Turkey) people genocide, African slavery and similar

facts. The German policy of “*Lebensraum*” (“space to breath”) that justified the attempts for German territorial expansion can not be discussed by a historian as right or wrong from an ethical point of view but it will be discussed as justifiable or unjustifiable from a policy point of view, successful or unsuccessful, right or wrong based on the political, economic, social circumstances in Europe at the time. In the same manner the US bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki need to be examined under the same spectrum. When I am sometimes asked, I reply that as a human being I condemn the American action because it killed thousands of innocent people but as a historian I can justify the action because without it the war in the Pacific would have been prolonged with the loss of many more lives. I admire Thucydides as a historian but in the discussion of the Peloponnesian War and from the Athenian point of view I cannot disregard his military failure as a general and his consequent exile by the Athenians. I recognize the successes and failures of the Byzantine emperors in battles, the progress in administration, legal system, literature but I cannot just close my eyes in front of the horrible deeds of some emperors, empresses, and the people in the name of Christianity. Above all, I am a historian and think as one.

Sartre makes a distinction between the intellectual and the “*false intellectual*,” (p. 252) whom he defines as “a type created by the dominant class to defend its particularist ideology by arguments which claim to be rigorous products of exact reasoning.” The example he gives is of an intellectual in the 1960s who tries to defend the French involvement in Indochina or Algeria in the 19th and the 20th centuries by initially complaining about the inequality that existed in the French colonies, then stating that he is against violence, and finally admitting that he is against the revolt of the natives against the settlers. (p. 253). If this example is considered by a historian and from today's point of view then we arrive at the following conclusion. The historian does not use his/her own ethical values in order to make judgment on historical facts. S/he basis interpretations on the evidence examined and their analysis. S/he does not justify or condemn the above mentioned revolt because of his political, social, ethical convictions but s/he may interpret it on the basis of other historical facts, its side-effects, causes, results, a combination of parameters. In case the above example is discussed from the point of view of current events, then additional observations need to be made. The historian must be careful to make the distinction among History, journalism, political science or politics regarding current events. There is of course the US Journal of international affairs *Current History* that devotes its issues to current events that will eventually become History or projects current events to the past. Most articles though touch topics of political science, the environment, research journalism rather than History. The historian can not just theorize on current or recent events, s/he needs to have historical sources to work on and with. Although History is actually the moment that has just passed, its study needs some distance from it. Usually, the History of a recent political event begins with the journalists who report, for example, a leaders' meeting, write about it, possibly place it in its historical and geopolitical context, analyze it. Then, the minutes or decisions of the meeting are officially issued. Later, notes of individual participants are published and non-historians may discuss the event further from a political, geopolitical, social, scientific point of view. Finally, after some years and sometimes after the effects of the results of that meeting have been felt, the historian comes to study it, analyze it, find possible causes and effects of it, place it in context from a historical point of view.

Sartre discusses the role of the intellectual and its traps from a Marxist point of view referring to the oppressed and the bourgeois class. However, I will use some of his points freehand and explain certain mental states that the historian should use or avoid. During the practice of the profession, the historian should never believe that

s/he knows all the truth. S/he should never be fully confident that s/he has discovered the one and only truth. S/he should never be satisfied with what s/he has discovered and stated on the electronic paper. History is a dynamic phenomenon. A historian is first thrilled with the initial discovery but digging further into the fact this feeling passes quickly. Then his/her emotions rise again with the second discovery but now new questions arise that complicate the explanation and once more s/he relapses into doubts. At the end, the historian has so many questions and doubts about his/her new historical discovery that s/he is not sure on how to state the fact(s) and the interpretations on the electronic paper. In my research for a book about agriculture in Greece in the 1920s I was first very excited when I understood that great changes took place after the influx of war refugees into Greece and their agrarian establishment on state land. The explanation of the reasons for the refugee settlement seemed simple but it raised new questions to me when it was revealed that an international committee under the auspices of the League of Nations had undertaken the venture. Also, Greece had requested and received international monetary loans in order to facilitate the refugees and this new discovery immediately led me think about the economy of the country. Further research showed that there had been a variety of problems during the decade long settlement of about 1,5 million refugees and the new question was whether the explanation was mainly political, social, economic or financial. It was then when I understood that the agrarian situation in Greece in the 1920s had to be seen from various angles and just one explanation was not enough to describe and explain the state policies, the international view, the refugee opinion on their establishment. Even this discussion from various points of view did not let me fully satisfied with the results achieved because there are still half answered questions or aspects not fully explored or understood. Moreover, it was not enough just to write a monograph on the refugee settlement in Greece from the international point of view because in this way I excluded all the other aspects of it. Therefore, the historian should investigate into the maximum depth of a fact, examine it from all aspects, and even express his/her doubts about his/her results. There is more research and discussion in the historian's work rather than certainty in his/her outcome. You will spend most of the time of your research on the questions rather than on the answers. History, like medicine, is not an exact science. History and the historian proceed using trial and error and testing hypotheses. It is not important to find who is the murderer but how the murder was committed: causes, processes, milieu, results, effects.

The historian's ideologies should not interfere in his/her work, that is, personal political, religious and social ideologies. Regarding political ideologies, I can recognize three main streams: conservative, liberal, radical. The historian should be freed from his/her political ideology in order to write a non biased History but he may not be able to avoid interference of the ideology in his/her interpretations. In the discussion of the reign of Frederick II (the Great), the historian will not overlook those evidence that show his “enlightened” policies so that he appears as an authoritarian ruler only. However, in his final conclusion, apart from his progressive ideas for his times s/he will also include those aspects of the regime that prove Frederick's autocratic reign. Of course, the historian will be judged by other historians for his/her research, analysis, and conclusions. In the same way, Hitler's biography cannot intentionally disregard his social policies before the beginning of World war II, those that made him so popular a politician and chancellor in both Germany and abroad. It goes without saying that the discussion of those policies by the historian must not justify his prewar and war crimes against mainly the Jews (Holocaust) and minorities. Again the historian's work will be judged by his/her fellow historians. Similarly, a discussion of the economic policies of the Stalinist era in the Soviet Union or Maoist China must

not just focus on certain successes. Some Marxist historians will probably emphasize those successes in their conclusions but again the analysis must discuss all the problems of the same period in the above regimes. In other words, the historian with the conservative ideology cannot see anything liberal as a drawback to a nation's success or the historian with the liberal ideology in mind cannot blame authoritarian rulers or politicians for a nation's unsteady course or the radical historian cannot view anything Leftist as done well and the only way for a nation's progress. The historian must not use his/her conservative ideology in order to prove that the alleged communists in 1950s USA (period of McCarthyism) were a real threat to the nation; s/he must not use his/her liberal ideology in order to prove that kingship in 18th century France was the only responsible institution for liberal or radical reaction in the country and Europe; s/he must not use his/her Marxist ideology in order to prove that there was a AD 19th century class struggle in the societies of the Ancient World. Some historians and History theorists believe that the historian cannot separate himself/herself from his/her ideology and therefore his/her ideology is by definition embedded in his/her work. Not necessarily, I reply. The historian can be trained to be unbiased as long as s/he is willing to be so and do so. On the other hand, in a final interpretation the historian will focus on what s/he thinks was the main result of his/her research and it is there where s/he may express his/her ideology and of course will be criticized for this in a positive or negative manner. From an entirely different perspective, Sartre writes that his intellectual “should attack externally and internally every ideological representation” of the “‘positive hero’ the ‘personality cult,’ the ‘glorification of the proletariat.’” (p. 262). In any case, the historian should keep the unbiased principle in mind throughout the process of research and writing. History theorists do recognize that this is generally a difficult task although not impossible to be accomplished.

Religious ideologies may also interfere in the work of historians. A devoted Catholic historian must be very careful when discussing Protestant geographical areas, peoples and matters. S/he must be willing to understand Protestantism or a particular version of Protestantism under investigation very well in its own terms and not from a Catholic perspective. Vice versa is also true. Moreover, it is very important that the student of ancient religions approaches the one(s) s/he wishes to discuss without any Christian or other religious bias. Once more, religious beliefs need to be examined in relation to the era, the people, and the information available. What we know about the rituals of the Celts/Gauls appears to be very cruel to a modern scholar who was born a Christian, a Muslim or a Hinduist, and it was also “barbaric” to Herodotus. However, it was absolutely normal to the Celts. Therefore, the historian will not judge their beliefs in comparison to his/her beliefs but in terms of their ancient society. This does not mean that ritual human sacrifice should be accepted and justified by the historian as a religious practice but it needs to be explained as related to the Celtic/Gallic beliefs and practices.

Social ideologies may sometimes lead a historian to bias either intentionally or unintentionally. The historian who comes from a well to do family, took no loans in order to study at university, did not have to work during his/her studies, could spend any amount of money to get what s/he needed for his/her studies and life may not be able to understand the hardships of life at any age. Similarly, the historian who was born in a middle class family may also find it impossible to grasp the palatial spending during the Roman Empire. Moreover, one needs to investigate well and think very hard in order to give some meaning to the orgies of Caligula instead of dismissing the idea altogether and bypass them. The Caucasian may have in him/her the idea that s/he belongs to a superior race; the Black may believe that historically all the sufferings of his/her race are due to the behavior of the White; the Japanese may consider

the Chinese as sub-humans because of cultural bias; the Muslims may view the Christians or the believer of other religions as inferior peoples or vice versa; women or minority historians may sometimes over-emphasize or over-justify the role of the groups they study and come up with conclusions that are partially supported or even not supported by evidence or are based on doubtful evidence or sources. In other words, there are many social ideologies that may disorient the historian.

Usually historians are warned during their university training about political, religious or social ideologies that may interfere in their work. However, some of those ideologies nest in one's mind from childhood and it is very difficult to be controlled. Therefore, during his/her investigations and writing process, the historian should always have in mind how those ideologies may influence him/her and especially in the forming of hypotheses and arguments. S/he should be questioning his/her selection of sources, evidence used, statements, conclusions and ensure that they are not affected by ideologies to the point that are biased.

“Zola was a product of the society he described and observed it with the eyes it had given him,” writes Sartre (p. 274). Exactly the same statement applies to Sartre (pp. 275-276 & 294-295) and to any writer of any era and historians are not excluded. The historian is the product of his/her times and this cannot change. However, s/he must try to shake off his/her memories and experiences of his/her life and emerge himself/herself in the period s/he studies and become part of it so that s/he understands it as much as possible. Some History theorists claim that the historian should try to put himself/herself in the shoes of the people or the personalities s/he studies in order to re-create in his/her mind their minds and what they thought when they acted in a certain way. But this may only be partially possible or not possible at all depending on the information available. The historian should not view the past with the eyes of the present but try to understand it in its own terms. Moreover, s/he must not try to predict the future using past and current information as the result might be misleading. On the other hand, historians are employed by government and non-government agencies in order to offer their suggestions regarding policy making on matters of foreign policy and political or social activity abroad. It is true that the European historian knows about the History and peoples of that part of the world and may make suggestions based on past experience and present situations but this does not guarantee success. The failure of four different peace plans regarding the nationalities of Bosnia in the Balkans between 1992 and 1994 proves my argument above. In short, the historian is a product of his/her times but s/he must make a great effort to adapt himself/herself to the period s/he studies. In some instances, the historian may use some of his experience in order to understand the past better. If one has lived through a war knows first hand what war means. If one has lived through a pandemic understands much better the fear of those who experienced the plague during the Middle Ages. In contrast to Sartre, who in 1970 was not quite sure what an intellectual was and what his/her role in society was, the historian must be a sober and balanced thinker. S/he needs to be able to find, select, judge, theorize, write in a specific historical way.

Four years after the May 1968 events in France, Michel Foucault (French philosopher, historian of ideas, political activist, literary critic) offered his own definition of the role of intellectuals. It seems that the May events determined among the Leftist intellectuals in France the role of the intellectual. Until then, a number of intellectuals in the 19th and the first half of the 20th century in France, Russia, Germany, Italy and elsewhere had become leaders of radical political movements. In 1968 though, the workers' and students' movement in France was not led by intellectuals. This shook the world of the intellectuals and both Sartre and Foucault made up their minds about the role of the intellectual in the 20th century society. They both admitted

that after 1968 “the intellectual discovered that the masses no longer need him to gain knowledge” (Sartre, 1970; similar idea in Foucault, p. 207) and, therefore, his/her role is no longer to place himself ahead but “rather, it is to struggle against the forms of power that transform him into its object and instrument in the sphere of 'knowledge,' 'truth,' 'discourse.'” (Foucault, pp. 207-208). This is of course a political definition of the function of an intellectual in the society but can we admit that the masses do not need the historians anymore? Can the people decide by themselves what is History, what are the facts and their meaning, what is true and what is fake, what is imaginary and what is based on evidence? Can they just invent the History they like, believe in it and convince others that this is the only History that it is to be accepted as valid?

The historian does write his/her History so that s/he guides the masses towards a specific goal, political, military, economic or social, although nationalist Histories in the 19th and the early 20th centuries in various places of the world have actually tried to do exactly this. Historians should fight against those powers that want to force them lead the masses for or against an objective set by others for a specific end to be achieved. The historian falls into the trap when s/he is led to work on certain topics and, for example, try to prove that Alexander of Macedon was just a homosexual or a blood thirsty warrior, Martin Luther was a Catholic traitor, The Holocaust never happened, the Russians had every historical and national right to annex Crimea in 2014 and invade Ukraine in February 2022. The Historian is an independent intellectual, s/he must not be financed in order to prove predetermined outcomes. S/he is to explain to the masses in the most simple way the results of his/her research without being one-sided or biased for or against a cause. His only cause is the truth that emerges from ALL the evidence s/he has studied and the doubts that the evidence give rise to his/her discussion and interpretation.

Fundamental, therefore, in the existence and function of intellectuals in society is their autonomy. Pierre Bourdieu, the French sociologist, philosopher and public intellectual, analyzed this central idea in a lecture he gave in Athens, Greece, in 1996 and its published lengthy summary in English in 2002. The intellectual world, he writes, is an autonomous microcosm that has managed to constitute itself progressively since the 12th century after fighting battle after battle against political power in Europe. However, political powers do interfere in this microcosm and, for instance in France, try to include in published lists of intellectuals non-intellectuals such as editors of influential newspapers and exclude others that seem to be indispensable in a list of thinkers. There has been a continuous struggle of artists, writers, scientists for independence from religious, political, and even established academic powers (“academies”) which in Europe are “the Trojan Horse of the state in the intellectual field.” On the other hand, this strict independence has created universes of intellectuals that are very harsh and ruthless when one finds itself against the other. The role of the intellectual, Bourdieu writes, is to “intervene in the political arena” using “the competence and the authority” s/he has acquired in his/her field within his/her universe. My comment is that political participation of thinkers in France is commonplace. At least in the last two centuries intellectuals have intervened in the French political scene and when necessary have even fought in wars. But this is not unique as there have been examples of politically active intellectuals in the US and in other European countries throughout the 20th century.

Bourdieu defines the intellectual as “an 'autonomous' individual, a 'purist' who commits himself” and rejects the difference between a pure intellectual, not engaged in political activity, and the engaged intellectual. Historically, the benefits of one being an intellectual are universal and this is how perhaps History progresses, he writes in this difficult to understand part of his essay. Intellectuals must sortie from their

“Ivory Tower” where they have withdrawn after confrontations with the power of the media –which Bourdieu considers a great threat for the independence of the intellectual– and “give back to all that which they have accumulated in their Ivory Tower.” They should not deprive “ordinary mortals of their knowledge, their competence, and their values.” Intellectuals should react when a government takes measures that are for example racist or when nationalist movements appear in societies or even in the microcosms of other intellectuals (artists, writers, scientists). Intellectuals must “come out of their universe to affirm the values of universality which constitute their profession.”

He recognizes though the fact that towards the end of the 20th century it had become very difficult for young intellectuals to publish their ideas as journalists, editors and publishers of journals controlled the means of communication with the public and other intellectuals. The situation had become so difficult that his example that in the 1990s Zola would have to pay a well known newspaper in order to have his “J'accuse” article published is not improbable. Therefore, he urges intellectuals to “re-appropriate their own instruments of dissemination.” Bourdieu formulated this idea in the mid-1990s when the Internet was at its early beginning and nothing showed even in 2002 when he died that electronic publishing would eventually become the tribune through which any writer and actually any person will be able to express his/her ideas to the public freely –some countries in the world are still exceptions to this statement– and at a very low cost. Moreover, a great number of electronic journals are currently open access and my belief is that more and more will become so in the near future.

According to Bourdieu the intellectual must be an activist and lead demonstrations in the street against policies of the government. Moreover, s/he should explain his/her views and ideas to the public and not keep them to himself/herself or to the subscribers of his/her Ivory Tower. In my view, when an intellectual is exposed to the media, printed or electronic, runs into the danger of being misquoted or some of his ideas are isolated and misrepresented or even that s/he influences the public in a way that s/he does not want to. I believe that an intellectual should avoid great personal publicity through the media, state his ideas addressed to the public in writing and in a very clear way and allow the people to read them and decide. Internet publications, for those who do not aim at high rated journals and book publishers, allow easy communication with the public. The intellectual is required to make the results of his specialized research available to the society and specialized research results must go hand in hand with popularized articles. In the 21st century, an intellectual does not have to demonstrate in the street along with others who hold the same ideas with him/her. The Internet has allowed political and intellectual activism to flourish in most countries of the world and the demonstrator's weapons are words and images coming out of the computer keyboard. The historian is an intellectual who can influence the public in many ways and when his/her readers are at various ages. The school teacher narrates and explains History facts to the pupils, the college/university professor educates future historians and citizens showing the course of human experience through History, the historian who writes popular Histories explains to the public complex historical facts and interpretations and makes recent History findings known to a wider audience. In short, the historian may function as an active intellectual, that is, shape the historical consciousness of the people, all the way from school to advanced age through his/her teaching and writing publishing his/her ideas on the Internet.

Can a historian be a public intellectual? A public or engaged intellectual is a thinker who is generally involved in public affairs that are usually related to politics. The term “public intellectual” was coined in the English language and in the US in the 20th century but this specific role of a scholar or scientist has been prominent in Eu-

rope since the 19th century. The example that stands out is Emil Zola and his “J'accuse” (1898) article on the Dreyfus affair but we cannot disregard the English pamphleteers of the same century or even Demosthenes the Orator and Apostle Paul in ancient and early Christian times respectively.

In the 20th century in France, Britain, Germany, Italy and in other countries of the European continent, the public intellectual was in most of the cases a Leftist who tried to explain to the masses why capitalism and parliamentary democracy had come to an end and the future was in socialism/communism and the socialist republics. After World War II and the Stalinist era in the Soviet Union (today's Russia was a part of it), some of those intellectuals had doubts about the correct road to socialism and this gave birth to very fruitful debates and ideas on politics, society, economy, culture. However, the whole intellectual structure of the Leftist intellectuals collapsed on that night of 9 November 1989 when the Berlin Wall fell unexpectedly and East Berliners visited freely West Berlin and experienced capitalist everyday life. The Mikhail Gorbachev reforms in the Soviet Union and the transformation of China into a type of capitalist country under a communist regime put an end to the discussion of how socialism/communism can change the world. Therefore, towards the end of the 20th century, there was no more fuel in the minds of socialist European intellectuals and it is generally accepted that there has been a decline in the fruitful, original, and inspiring ideas that public intellectuals had generated until then. In other words, suddenly, in Europe the collapse of the Leftist ideas and discussion on the future of European civilization created a gap that could not be fulfilled by other Center or Right ideas as there had not been intellectuals who could express counter ideas to socialism/communism. (see in general Etzioni & Bowditch, ch 4). In the 20th century, the European liberals had been identified with conservatism and extreme conservatism and had been accused of supporting capitalism and parliamentary democracy, dying intellectual concepts. Until the end of the second decade of the 21st century, the non-Center and non-Right political parties have still been strong in most of the European countries and the Right-Center-Left intellectual debate has not ended. However, the European civilization idea in Europe and the western civilization idea in the US definitely need a new future to be thought of them for the 21st century.

I propose, then, that the intellectuals of the 21st century strive for Western European parliamentary democracy, society and economy governed by in general by the *metron* (moderation). For the political system, I insist on the institutions of Western European parliamentary democracy as they operate in France, Britain, Germany, Italy, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Spain, Portugal, Greece, Cyprus and in other countries of the European continent and islands. I do not include the young post-communist republics of East Europe, certain authoritarian regimes outside the European periphery or elsewhere in the world and the banana type republics. The economic system of the 21st century cannot be other than that of regulated capitalism found again among European countries and not in the US. It seems that the best system is the idea of mixed economy in which capitalism operates but the government intervenes where and when necessary in order to safeguard minimum wages, public health, education, and support for culture. The third ingredient of the 21st century ideal system should be the *metron*. The *metron* is the Greek word for moderation or simply no exaggeration whose meaning though incorporates justice, equality, human ideals. The *metron* is to be applied to any expression of public and private life: in politics, the economy, in social affairs, in personal matters. An ideal government would also use “imagination” and team work when in power for best results. I understand that some of the above are ideals but they are ideals of democracy that are worth fighting for and even dying for. The historian

does not have to be an active politician but he may apply all of the above with the use of his/her electronic pen.

Chapter 3

What is History in the 21st Century

[Works referred to in this chapter can be located in the Bibliography]

Hmmm... Why should the History of historians be different in the 21st century? I hear the puzzled student asking. Was History writing different before? Although History writing has followed certain rules since ancient times, since Herodotus, Thucydides, Plutarch, Livy and Tacitus, historians and History theorists have developed a variety of ideas on the use, the meaning, the usefulness of History and the methodology for achieving its possible ends. Some historians just do not bother about the theory of History and write History following the basic rules. Others just have it in mind while working on their topic. Still, others, though, either emerge into the theories of History and even adjust their History writing to one or more of them or allow one to guide them completely to their writing. The historian should be aware of the theory(ies) of History even if s/he does not use them or rejects one or more of them as during his/her professional life s/he may be asked the typical question “what is History.” S/he should be aware that the possible answers are plenty.

A personal note you may just skip

It was in the Graduate School at Kent State University, Ohio, USA, in the 1980s, when as a student I completed the last taught course named “Historiography” with the Harvard educated Prof. Dr. Harold Schwartz. I excelled, a very rare grade for Harold, and my classmates could not believe their eyes when I showed them my exam blue booklet with the grade 'A' on the cover. Until then, Harold was rather disappointed with me as a graduate student. He insisted that in his course/module I am assigned Thucydides and I work on him and his historiography method. At the time, I was interested in Modern History only and I hardly completed a satisfactory paper on Thucydides to be read by Harold. After the oral presentation to the small class at Harold's place, where we met once a week for discussion and cake tasting he made or just bought himself, Harold said that the paper was satisfactory but he expected something more from me as a Greek. When it came to the final exam, he asked that his nine Historiography students of that semester presented themselves in a classroom at Bowman Hall, the History building, at a certain time and be prepared for a three-hour long written examination. When one of my classmates dared ask about the essence of the topics, Dr. Schwartz replied laconically: “I hope you have read the material assigned.” On the set date and time, we were all in the specified classroom and waited for Harold to appear and distribute the polygraphed sheets with the exam questions. He showed up on time and distributed an almost empty exam topic page with the university logo, the course number, course title, his name, and the exam question: “What is history.” There was sensation in the class. All of my classmates would write something on this topic and pass the course. But what made Dr. Schwartz decide that only I and very few of his students in the more than thirty years of his teaching that had passed deserved the highest of all grades?

Without knowing that in the Graduate School I would have to answer this question, I had already worked on the what-is-history riddle in my last undergraduate year. Prof. Dr. Theodore Tatsios at the university college Deree College-The American College of Greece had taught the undergraduate History senior class with three important books: Carr's *What is History*, Stern's *Varieties of History* and Fischer's

Historians' Fallacies. Of course, the individualized senior thesis in his class was to be focused on one historian and his work. So, the whole story of Herodotus, Thucydides, Livy, Vico, Voltaire, von Ranke, Elton, Carr etc came immediately to my mind. I made a great effort to conclude the essay in three hours although no other student had left the room. Harold was surprised with the width and the depth of my analysis. “Excellent,” and “a complete discussion of the topic,” he wrote on the separate evaluation sheet that accompanied the examination blue booklet. The essays were handed back to us from the History Faculty secretary office and I did not have the chance to talk to him then. But a few days later, I met him by accident in Bowman Hall. “Dimitrios,” he said, “you surprised me. What is the topic of your Thesis?” “A modern Greek History theme,” I replied timidly and we separated. I did not know at the time that he had written the final biography of *Samuel Gridley Howe. Social Reformer, 1801-1876* (Harvard Univ. Press, 1956), a major US social reformer in the 19th century and a Philhellene who had spent some years in Greece during the Greek War of Independence in the early years of 1820s. I never met him again since but his impact on my later writings was immense. I understood what both Tatsios and Schwartz had taught us: History is not only a compilation of primary and secondary sources on a specific topic. It is also theory and method of historical practice. It is what the historian must have at the back of his/her mind when s/he examines the sources and writes his/her History. It is an immensely difficult task undertaken by the historian-to-be.

Ancient Lucian, more contemporary than ever

It has been almost two thirds of a century since E. H. Carr first published (1961) his *What is History* and the theory of History landscape has changed a lot. Historians have entered the digital era but at the same time some of them have leaned and relied heavily on the social sciences and literary studies and their methods. Hence, it is absolutely necessary to discuss and reexamine the what-is-history riddle in the light of the scholarship of the last decades. I will work backwards. I will begin with late 20th century post-modernism and Hayden White and will travel back in time to Elton, Carr, Hughes, von Ranke, Vico, Thucydides and finally Lucian of the 2nd century, just to mention some great stations of thought in the theory of History. Surprisingly enough, today, Lucian is more modern than any other theory of History and practice theorist. In summarizing the ideas of thinkers, I have retained the complexity of their thoughts in their writings even when they were not clear enough and I have followed their arguments very closely in order to truly reflect their line of thought. All works mentioned are cited in the Bibliography.

White's post-modernism

Two historians and a movement represented by a literary studies scholar and his followers have dominated the theory of History scene of the second half of the 20th century. Geoffrey Elton, E. H. Carr, Hayden White and Keith Jenkins, the historian who publicized the ideas of White, begin my discussion of What is History as these are the scholars that the novice in the study and understanding of the theory of History may encounter first.

Keith Jenkins, a post-modernism advocate, was the one who first compiled a set of criticism on the works of all three, White, Elton and Carr, after he summarized their ideas. In the theory of History subject, Jenkins basically rejected Elton and Carr and sided with White and postmodernism as it is evident in his later works. Hayden White (1928-2018), a literary criticism historian, received degrees from Wayne State University and University of Michigan (PhD in medieval history) and presented his ideas about History in three books. Hayden White believes that History is a narrative

discourse and its content is imagined or invented as found. In writing History a historian combines the sources found (the known part) with unknown wholes that need to be imagined or invented, the sublime past. As historical facts cannot tell a story by themselves, the connecting essence needs to be imagined or invented so that a historical truth is created and a History is told. That History may have no real relation to what had actually happened. The past can never be grasped in historical narration. The past can either make no sense to its student or can make perfect sense and one will base his/her political thought on the first or the second belief and will proceed accordingly. To White, the past makes no sense and therefore it justifies his “visionary politics.” (*Content of the Form*, pp. 71-73 & passim). The second part of his theory is about the historical narrative, which White believes it is in the form of metahistory.

The study of history, White believes, can be used by people so that a transition from the present to the future is based on ethical terms and choices of the past and they can be changed by historians in such a way so that they determine a new future. Humanity will become better if it is accepted that History does not have a single meaning but many and thus people will be released from the “burden of History” (*Tropics of Discourse*, pp. 27-50) that determines one and only future path for the human being. The past is chaotic and uncontrollable and can only lead to a similar future, a utopian society determined by its history and politics. In White's reading of historiographical writing, before the end of the 18th century, history was chaotic and not in any order. During the 19th and into the 20th centuries, Marxist, liberal, and conservative ideologies disciplined History, gave her a specific form, in the way that suited the theorists and historians. Those forms were nothing more than anesthetizations and in the post-modern era of the end of the 20th century their open criticism allowed for their dislocation. Towards the end of the 18th century, historical writing was about to become just another form of fiction but the historians applied the rules of evidence, the search for the facts based on evidence, and avoided the imagined narrative. Actually, the historical narrative they produced, they claimed that it reflected the order, the coherence, the structures and the developments that the past possessed. This is, of course, a direct reference to Leopold von Ranke (1795-1886) and those historians who followed his methods (see below), either conservative, liberal or radical. White writes that “insofar as historical events and processes become understandable, as conservatives maintain, or explainable, as radicals believe them to be, they can never serve as a basis for a visionary politics more concerned to endow social life with meaning than with beauty.” (*Content of the Form*, p. 72). Everything depends, then, on how one studies the past and for what purpose. Politically Left, Center, or Right historiography is disciplined according to the ideology of the historian, who rules out the possibility of the History being meaningless. White concludes that “we require a history that will educate us to discontinuity more than ever before; for discontinuity, disruption and chaos is our lot.” (*Tropics of Discourse*, p. 50). However, this theory of discontinuity is not explained further by White.

White believes that history reconstruction is based on the “primitive” and non-primitive elements. (*Metahistory*, passim & *Tropics of Discourse*, passim). The primitive elements are the ways by which the “unprocessed historical record” (*Metahistory*, p. 5 & *Tropics of Discourse*, p. 125) is prepared for the narrative form of history. That is, White's unprocessed historical record needs to be converted by a historian into a chronicle and then into a story to be told. These elements will become the basis for an interpreted narrative. In the formulation of that narrative, historians use three types of explanation: by argument, by emplotment, by ideology. For the explanation by argument historians will use the modes of organicism, mechanism, contextualism. For the explanation by emplotment these are the modes of romance, comedy, tragedy. For the

explanation by ideology these are the modes of anarchism, conservatism, radicalism, liberalism. The historiographical style of each historian is determined by the mixture of the above modes used for the narrative and, White believes, the form used for the narrative falls into four tropes of poetic language: metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, irony. (*Tropics of Discourse*, passim & *Metahistory*, passim). This whole process is what White calls metahistory and according to his theory the sequence to be followed by historians is the following: use of primitive elements for the construction of the non-primitive narrative elements, which are analyzed in a number of modes and are summed up in the historical narrative. The historical truth that historians are eager to find and express in their narratives is just the “truth of fiction.” (Jenkins' term in *On What is History*, p. 154). White writes that “If we recognize that there is a fictive element in all historical narrative, we would find in the theory of language and narrative itself the basis for a more subtle presentation of what historiography consists of than that which simply tells the student to go and ‘find out the facts’ and write them up in such a way as to tell ‘what really happened’.” (*Tropics of Discourse*, p. 99). The what-exactly-happened criticism leads White to conclude that History has followed a path away from her natural course, the literary tradition. “In my view, history as a discipline is in a bad shape today because it has lost sight of its origins in the literary imagination. In the interests of *appearing* scientific and objective, it has repressed and denied to itself its own greatest source of strength and renewal. By drawing historiography back once more to an intimate connection with its literary basis, we should not only be putting ourselves on guard against *merely* ideological distortions; we should be by way of arriving at that ‘theory’ of history without which it cannot pass for a ‘discipline’ at all.” (Ibid).

A summary and simplification of White's main ideas can help me conclude on what I can retain for our future conclusion of what history is. For White, therefore, the narrative of History cannot be based on the discovery of the facts as there may be no facts to be based on. Therefore, a historian should write his/he History using possible traces of the past that s/he puts together in a narrative, which is an interpretation based on his/her own ideology and is composed with the use of literary principles and methods. History writing should actually be a product of literary imagination. However, even if one disagrees with White's concepts, a practicing historian will recognize that not all of his/her questions can be answered by his/her sources. There may be empty spaces for which s/he does not have anything and therefore s/he can only hypothesize in order to fill in the gap. Hence, a narrative can be based on sources selected by the historian and on hypotheses. Also, in a number of cases, the final narration will be driven by the ideology and the theory chosen by the historian. In other words, the same selected sources and the same hypotheses can lead to different interpretations and different Histories. If you add the ingredients of ideology and theory, then by definition different Histories will be produced. I suspect that what White really wants to explain is that the historical narrative can by definition only be a nice literary (fictional) product. As there is nothing solid and stable to be based on, History is a nice, imaginary, story telling about the past, if there is any. A well written long essay based on nice well constructed sentences that they tell a story. The truth is that following the trends of each era, history writing can be conservative, radical, liberal. In Europe, the historical interpretation in the 19th century was rather conservative, in the 20th century it was basically radical (various grays of red, blue or black), and in the 21st century, so far, liberal. White's theories and the other ones that we will discuss below point more and more to the uncertainty in History sources, in their interpretation, and in the final historiographical produce. I will retain, therefore, for future reference from the discussion of White's theories, our conclusion: uncertainty.

Elton's truth

Geoffrey Elton (born Gottfried Rudolf Otto Ehrenberg, 1921-1994) was a German-born British political and constitutional historian and was educated at the University of London and University College London (PhD in History). His most influential work on the theory of History was published in the *Practice of History* and *Return to Essentials*. I will summarize and discuss ideas from both books before I mention Jenkins' summary and my consideration of it. In his *Practice of History*, Elton begins by writing that he, a practicing historian, is going to discuss how historians practice History having theory in mind, which is not known to philosophers, sociologists, and historiographers who are not historians and theorize on the subject. The basis of his study is his “experience in the study, writing and teaching of history,” (p. 2) an explanation of his own “faith and practice” as a working historian. He admits that apart from his own there are other roads to success. Among the many world civilizations of the past, History was a main concern of only the Jews and eventually the Christians in the Bible and the Ancient Greeks. In those civilizations, History was “a teacher for the future, a basis of religion, an aid in explaining the existence and purpose of man.” (p. 2). Apart from the writings of ancient authors, the systematic study and research of History began in the 19th century. History is both an art and a science. It has always been an art. Her science nature was added at the beginning of the 19th century and had made her “appropriate to the highest abilities of the human reason.” (p. 5, n. 2). Although the study of History includes all that human beings “have said, thought, done or suffered,” it is limited to the part that is revealed or can be reconstructed in the mind through evidence, that is, to the “surviving past,” to the “present traces of the past.” If in the present nothing exists or can be reconstructed from a certain part of the past, then that part had never been. Political or diplomatic History may be called dull and not enough for the understanding of a society but If there is no evidence for the lives of the “ordinary people” or the whole of society then they do not exist for the historian. Archaeology, anthropology, economics, social psychology, sociology have their own “methods, questions, and results” that are not the same as in History. History is different from these disciplines because it has to do with events, with change, and with the particular. Cause and effect are not the main “content” of History, they are just a particular case of movement from state a to state b. A may have caused b but their relationship may just be coincidental, or there might just be a case of coexistence, or it is just a temporal sequence. Also, historians do not treat facts as unique but as particular because there must be a reference to common experience before there is any meaning in them. A unique event cannot be measured or assessed. He believes that E. H. Carr (see below), who has dealt with modern History does not possess the right judgment for ancient or medieval History because he is actually ignorant of the evidence and the historians' work on these historical eras. An amateur historian does not understand History and s/he generally finds the unusual as perfectly ordinary while the professional is able to understand an era from the “inside” and judge it. An amateur is characterized by his unwillingness to judge or judge by the wrong standards. Lord Acton (see below) was one of them as he was “censorious and uncomprehending,” saw conspiracies and plots everywhere, he was a stranger in History. Although amateur History can be very good and professional History can be very bad, amateur History is written from the outside, it can only achieve “sympathy and romantic love,” an “insult to the intelligence” with no “fundamental explanation.” (p. 18). This has been achieved by G. M. Trevelyan (see below).

“Good historians may be born but true historians are made.” (p. 18). A good historian knows his evidence and knows the “right” questions to be asked, some of

which will be answered and others that will lead to new questions. Elton is very harsh on his colleagues, the work of which will be discussed further down. Next, he is skeptical of the use of computers in historical research. Views of historians may be confirmed by machinery, he writes, only if the needed evidence exists. The historian must always remember that his knowledge of the past is determined by the evidence of the past, which must be “criticized and interpreted” according to the rules of historical scholarship and new methods must follow this canon. Historians must be very careful when they use theories of other sciences as they may be trapped in their “preconceived notions” and this may be a danger to historical truth. In this scheme, examples may be selected or distorted in order to fulfill it. Toynbee's *The Study of History* (see below) is used as an example in which some eras of war are classified as periods of peace so that they fit his system of civilizations. Elton's main argument in this context is against Marxist historiography. A historian must not adopt Marxist methods unless he subordinates them to his own and he must use them to do only what the evidence allow him to do. He must not allow Marxist theory to dictate him specific models and his conclusions in his History writing. On the other hand, historians can “repay the debt [to the social sciences for the use of their theories and methods] by giving instruction in the rigorous analysis of evidence, skeptical thinking, and the avoidance of ill-based generalizations.” (p. 39).

Originally, it was thought that God reveals himself in History and this was the purpose of History. Other historians claimed that there is no purpose in History. History must not be subordinated to prophesy through the theory of rise and fall of societies (cyclical theory of Toynbee) or the theory that History is a straight line of progress (suggested by E. H. Carr). He rejects Carr's belief that things will get better in the future and that the lesson of History may be to teach human beings “to better themselves and their world.” But History is not “philosophy teaching by example” such as Plutarch's works or the late medieval (1559) *Mirror for Magistrates* because History is an autonomous discipline. “The task of history is to understand the past, and if the past is to be understood it must be given full respect in its own right.” (p. 47). Also, History teaches about the behavior of humans, their relations, about circumstances and conditions that may influence individual or social life. History can make reasonable predictions, it contributes to the understanding of the present and may suggest guidelines for the future. But the “study of history is an intellectual pursuit, an activity of the reasoning mind, [... and] the search for truth.” (p. 49) This is the main purpose of History and depends on the historian's manner of study, precision of mind, intellectual honesty and penetration. “Omnia veritas,” (p. 50), always the truth.

The difference between a historian and a natural scientist is that s/he “cannot invent his experiment: the subject of his investigation (the events of the past) is outside his control” (p. 53) because the event did happen and cannot be altered or arranged to be repeated. The historian cannot verify the past, s/he can only discover it and try to explain it as it is “irrevocable” and “indestructible.” This means that there is a truth to be found but this may not be the only truth. He accuses Carr that he confuses the actuality of an event with the surviving evidence (facts and facts of History). An event that can be known, he writes, is just enough for an event to be a fact of History. Although Carr criticized Lord Acton for his idea of “ultimate history,” ultimate History is what happened but historians may “never be able to rediscover it in full or with total assurance.” Lord Acton supported the idea that there should be absolute attention to the facts and their meaning so that historians avoid bias. Elton claims that “history written by men not afraid to allow themselves to appear in their discourse is both livelier history and probably better history.” (p. 57).

Historians are to be warned that by choosing some facts and ignoring others are not making History. They must not invent or construct facts. The discovery of evidence for a theme depends on the question asked and “the arbitrarily determined choice.” The historian begins with a choice of a topic or “line of approach” and from then on s/he becomes the “servant” of his sources/evidence. Initially s/he asks broad, varied, flexible questions. S/he asks and listens to the evidence at the same time and there may be a limited extend of different questions to be asked. The historian's method results in the extraction from the remnants of the past the “true facts and events of the past,” their true meaning and interrelation as “the past must be studied in its own right, for its own sake, and on its own terms.” (p. 65). The historian needs to know at least all his sources and be competent in criticizing them before s/he begins writing his/her History. It would be ideal if the historian is aware of all the sources on a topic but in most cases this is impossible and therefore it is desirable that the historian knows “the range and types of sources available to him” as well as what other historians have written about the topic. His/her goal is not to investigate for specific documents that will answer specific questions but to compile an exhaustive list of sources pertaining to a topic. Although it might be impossible for a historian to see every single piece of evidence or scholarship on a topic, it is required that s/he must “be able to produce sound and trustworthy history” based on the material in his/her disposal. This may be possible if rules of scholarship based on other historians' work are applied. The historian must be trained and educated to “be sceptical and critical” of the sources and dispose the manufactured ones. First, it must be verified that the source is genuine and then its relevance to the historian's topic must be verified. Well known forgeries are Constantine's donation, the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, and Hitler's diaries, I add. It is very difficult for a historian to make sure what the evidence mean or does not mean, what it says, and s/he is not allowed to be biased following the first or the second approach to the sources. S/he must be able to ask the sources the correct questions, those that exhaust the possible answer(s) from the evidence, answers that must be possible in human terms. If there are gaps in the evidence then the historian may use possible or probable answers in order to complete the series of events. The historian's “imagination, controlled by learning and scholarship,” (p. 87) may be used to fulfill the uncertainty that exists in the surviving evidence.

The historian reveals himself/herself in his writing as there is no “impersonal history.” Each historian with his own personality looks “afresh at the facts of the past,” (p. 104) but his character must not be involved further so that he uses them in order to prove a thesis he likes. “The historian need not try either to eliminate or to intrude himself.” (p. 105). The scientific methods of History used for the research need the art of writing (exposition, explanation, persuasion) for the historical narrative to be conveyed to the readers. The difficulty is to express obscure or technically problematic themes in a readable language as the technical historical terms per era need to appear in their meaning and in context in the written outcome of the historian. Historians should never change technical terms into jargon in a context different from the one they are to be used. The historian should always have his/her audience in mind while writing his/her History. School children, the general reader, the fellow historians are different reading groups and they need different writing style on the part of the historian. The dream of all historians is to satisfy the needs of the “general readers” but matters should not be omitted or simplified just for the general reader. On the other hand, if the historical message is explained in a clear way there is no need for a historian to have a specific audience in mind while writing or talking. “No problem of historical

study that I have come across, in my own work or that of others, has seemed to me incapable of being explained with full clarity to any person of reasonable intelligence [...]” (p. 116). The historian first explains things to himself and then to others. History writing can be a description, an analysis or a narrative of a topic although the first two and possibly the third one are found together in the same work. Description is just the external appearance of the function of a government department or a medieval village. Analysis is still static but it explains a situation in a wider aspect, it studies inter-relations, may establish causal relations and motives. Narrative tells the story in a short or a long historical time span. In this context of writing History Elton attacks the university textbook which is “to offer an aid to teaching rather than deal with a complex of historical questions.” (p. 122). It is a History book full of “undifferentiated facts,” arranged in short subsections that include everything. One of the good examples he uses is the *Oxford History of England*. My comment is that he is totally mistaken for the very simple reason that the student and the general reader or even the trained historian himself may need this book before they read anything specific. It is indispensable when one needs to have a quick look at a period before he proceeds with the specifics, the facts, the basic interpretations, the historically unanswered questions, the basic sources. All these present problems of selection, arrangement and presentation and make it extremely difficult for a historian to write a General History or a “textbook,” in Elton's terminology.

The questions “what” and “when” and “who” and “how” and “why” form the basis of all historical research and study and writing. With analysis a historian will try to understand “what was it like” and with narrative s/he will explain “how did it happen.” It is only in the narrative that a historian can describe and discuss the events and the problems s/he will encounter in his/her investigation and understanding of the past. “Nobody can write universal history –everything that happened or has been thought– in one piece; the processes of writing will not permit it.” (p. 128). My comment here is again that he is wrong in the sense that General History can be satisfactorily written by selection, looking at the big picture and the important details. Elton insists that analysis in a book cannot be like individual articles in isolation put under the covers of a book but there must be a common topic that links them together. However, I comment that this has been a common practice with essays compiled and edited by one or more scholars in one book, which is perfectly acceptable and very useful nowadays in historical scholarship. But he is still obsessed with analytical books such as Christopher Hill's *The Economic Problems of the Church from Archbishop Whitgift to the Long Parliament* (1956) which is analytical by topic (state of clergy, financial problems, on the work of Archbishop Laud) and draws facts from a long period ignoring other changes. The narrative is generally missing, Elton writes. My comment is that he is one more time wrong because this is a dissection of a period by problem to be discussed with the focus on the economic matters and by definition it leaves other themes untouched. It is not a synthetic work of every aspect of that era to be composed in a nice, chronologically arranged narrative. On another instance he believes that a one volume History of Europe from 962 to 1154 “lacks a main thread” because it is mainly analytical. Needless to say that he is wrong again and this has become standard approach in multi volume Histories of large geographical areas over a long time period. He also attacks Fernand Braudel's *La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen à l'époque de Philippe II* (1949) as well as the *Annales* school³ method in general because even in the skilled hands of Fernand Braudel (1902-1985) and Marc Bloch (1886-1944) “it can no more answer all the important questions of history than

³ See in brief “*Annales* school,” *Wikipedia* at <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Annales_school>.

can any other method.” (p. 133). My comment is that too much analysis may promote historical knowledge but without a respective narrative it remains in the historical silos of specialized research and does not enter General Histories. The praise for story telling, Elton continues, is found in the lay periodicals but even the most serious and best of popular historians lack depth in investigation, solid truths, and illuminating explanations. The biography is a special form of narrative but it is a poor way of writing History. When his *The Practice of History* was published in 1967 Elton had already made up his mind on what the theory and practice of History was and attacked historians he disagreed with, especially Carr. The Carr-Elton dichotomy on History has survived until nowadays and there is no way to be bridged. It seems to me that a great number of historians follow a mixture of the two.

More than twenty years later, Elton gave three lectures at the University of Michigan on the same topic, which along with his inaugural lectures were put together in a book. The first lecture in *Return to Essentials* begins with an attack on the school of *Annales* who adopted theoretical models used by economics, sociology, social anthropology in order to revolutionize the History of France. The long-term approach was “a neat concept because it left so much uncontrolled speculation in the hands of the historian.” (p. 10). This is the wrong method, he writes, and it “threatens the virtue of history” as it demands that History is accommodated by this ideological theory. Of course, the way Elton states this argument is totally wrong. He does not understand the then new methods proposed by the French School. Ideological theories of History, he continues, include Toynbee's theory of civilizations which “rested on inspirational faith rather than serious study” based on religion. The 17th century was not an era of peace as characterized by Toynbee because wars were fought throughout the period all over the globe. Also, He does not agree with Benedetto Croce (see below) and R. G. Collingwood's (see below) statement that there is historical re-enactment in the historian's mind and attacks “the faith” of Marxist History (R. H. Tawney, L. Stone, Chr. Hill, see below) as the one which rests “upon the empirical study of historical problems” and can predict the future. There were no classes in 17th century England and no revolution, Elton writes and firmly believes, and explains that the evidence is only from pamphlets, sermons and such-like comments and not from the event itself. Apart from certain mistakes and inadequacies as well as adoption of the basic Marxist historical beliefs in the works of the British Marxist historians, Elton fails to see or even consider the new movement on the study of History and he approves only the old techniques and historical theories being himself anti-communist and anti-religion. In my view, the words “class” and “revolution” cannot be used historically before the 19th century as it is then when they assumed the meaning they have in the commoners' mind and the historians' terminology and understanding. Moreover, Elton is right to say that he rejects ideological theories that subject the historian to predetermined explanatory schemes.

In his second lecture Elton discusses philosophical theories which support the idea that historical past cannot be “reconstituted.” At the beginning he attacks structuralism and post-structuralism (Heidegger, Adorno, Saussure, Barthes, Derrida, Foucault) in vitriolic phrases against German and French philosophy. Further down in his lecture he criticizes for various reasons the works of Francis Fukuyama, R. H. Tawney, David Irving. Well, History has proven that Elton was the philosophical odd one out in the 20th century regardless of the fact that I do not personally agree with literary criticism, structuralism and prophecies used in the theory of History. Hermeneutics, the explanation of scriptures (*The Bible*), Elton continues, as a method of analyzing and understanding historical documents is totally irrelevant to History as the first (Hermeneutics) invents meaning while the second (History) discovers meaning with-

out inventing it. History cannot obey to one law (Hermeneutics) but “accepts the probability of unpredictable variety,” (p. 30) writes Elton. In his opinion, Hayden White named *metahistory* a theory that it has come to mean that it is a form of study beyond History and superior to it. In his books White goes back to the old dispute whether History is an art or a science. White, continues Elton, accepts as one thing the theory of History and the practice of History and confuses the work of the historian with the historian himself. All reconstructions of History are of the same value, independent of writer and reader. This whole thing, writes Elton, is meaningless and reveals a “general lack of experience in trying actually to write serious history,” beyond a version of History of ideas (White's studies). At the end of this lecture Elton concludes that “it is only by providing as truthful an understanding of the past as we can obtain that we can offer to the present a past which can be useful to the present, a past from which it can learn.” (p. 48). The deficiencies and the problems a historian encounters in the understanding of the evidence is what creates uncertainty for historical truth, not the transformation of events in the mind of the historian. Historians rely on the sources and do not use fiction to complete the missing parts. These gaps raise controversies among historians that assist them get closer and closer to truth.

In his third lecture Elton explains that studying the past for its own sake means that the past must “exist within the terms of its own experience.” The historian must use his knowledge of what happened after the event in order to understand it but avoid prophesy. On the other hand, studying the past for its own sake means that it must be treated as independent of the future. Historical evidence, which constitute the relics “of past events and experiences,” need to be “correctly understood” before they are used. This reading depends on the historian's training, the acquisition and application of professional skills and his/her ability to put fundamental questions to the evidence that are “focused entirely on the concerns of the original creators” (p. 55) and not of the historian himself/herself. History is interested in and studies the “experiences, actions, thought and sufferings” of the human beings of the past. Psychology, anthropology, sociology, folklore, criticism of art and literature interest the historian as long as their “processes and products [are] subjected to the historical treatment.” (p. 63). Elton states his principles of historical inquiry: (a) separate question from answer, which means that the question a historian puts to the evidence must not result in a biased answer that is already in his/her mind; (b) the historian knows what happened after the events s/he studies, the advantage and burden of hindsight, but s/he must work on it “on its own terms”; (c) “keep an open mind” by acquiring a fuller knowledge of the topic under study in order to reconsider (if necessary) your thoughts. Regarding the question why we study History, Elton writes that it does provide some pleasure and satisfaction but mainly because by historical writing the historian becomes the “keeper of humanities memory.” History cannot teach anybody directly and instruct him/her to do specific actions but it can “teach you to think more deeply, more completely, and on the basis of an enormously enlarged experience about what it may be possible or desirable to do now” so that s/he avoids the stories of myth-makers. (p. 72). My comment is that Elton has been extremely arrogant and nationalistic in his two books but if one follows his practicing theory religiously s/he understands that according to him everything is based on the evidence and nothing else. He rejected any other theory or ideology on the theory of History, even in his second round in 1990. However, he was throughout the 20th century and he still is today (2023) one of the two theoretical and practical legs –the other is E. H. Carr– on which most historians base their written Histories. This is because he describes the basic elements which most working historians adopt in their work in order to produce their History.

Elton has been criticized heavily by the post-modern movement of History and Jenkins has used some of the ideas presented in his two works above to exercise his post-modern criticism. Here's Jenkins's summary and interpretation of Elton's ideas with his criticism embodied in them. Elton, Jenkins writes, explains that there are people who should not practice history and should not be called historians. He dislikes the amateur historians because they are not interested in the sources but they just read secondary works and come up with conclusions. Also, they make anachronistic judgments, are interested in sentimental historical events, make love stories the main theme of their writing, focus on the insignificant because they are not trained historians. Elton believes that Historians' interest in Anthropology and Psychology (of his days) and other social sciences contaminates historical writing. Also, their theories, for example the theories of Malinowski and Freud or Marxist sociologists, are for one praised by their fellow scientists and the next day they are heavily criticized and abandoned. Elton implies that History is not a Science as it is not governed by laws, mainly those proposed by Marxist historians or those found in religious doctrines. He opposes the use of any theory in the writing of History especially the “[...] widespread conviction that certain extravagances current among students of literature render all forms of objective study impossible [...]. Ideological theories create preconditioned convictions about the historical past; philosophical theories deny that the historical past can ever be reconstituted. The first undermine the historian’s honesty, the second his claims to existence.” (Elton, *Return to Essentials*, p. 26). On the contrary, the professional historian is concerned with the people of the past, their experiences, their thoughts and their actions. Elton believes that he belongs to the tradition of the 19th century historians like von Ranke (see below), who began the systematic research about History and based their History writings on it. Also, historians should study History for its own sake although the knowledge of History can make people understand the possibilities open to human thought and demonstrate the variety of human thought and action in the past or the “unpredictability of the past.” (Elton, *Return to Essentials*, p. 125).

According to Elton, Jenkins continues, History itself is governed by three principles which are based on three preliminary observations. Historians ask different questions for different periods of the past, a method which needs different techniques to be used but the method of doing so is one and universal. The basis of historical research is the sources of History. The sources guide the Historian in historical writing and the gaps should not be filled by fiction because historical truth is found solely in the sources, the “testimony” of the past. “Historical evidence is not created by the historian” (Elton, *Return to Essentials*, p. 52) but needs to be found. The study and use of historical sources must be conducted by trained historians. The above observations lead to the three principles which are discussed below. A historian should not ask questions to his sources trying to get replies to answers s/he has already in mind. S/he has the privilege and the burden of trying to understand the nature of an event, which its protagonists did not have. Third, a historian should keep an open mind so that further study may lead him/her to modify what he had originally thought about an event. The study of the past will “teach you to think more deeply, more completely, and on the basis of an enormously enlarged experience about what it may be possible or desirable to do now [in the present].” (Elton, *Return to Essentials*, p. 72). Further, Jenkins writes, Elton explains how a historian should fulfill his professional function: “The historian fulfills his function properly if [...] he concentrates on honesty and integrity.” (Elton, *The Practice of History*, p. 144). Generally, the historian is not able to arrive at the one and only truth of what was the past but he will always be able to say that those are the events that happened in the past and there is a truth to be discovered if it can be

found. Although Historian's own “position” and “psyche” will influence his historical interpretation, they can become a virtue if they lead him/her look afresh at the facts and generate new debates and controversies. However, a historian should try to minimize this bias of his/her. In historical writing, three dignities must be observed: that of the historian, that of the audience, and the dignity of the mater under study. At the end, though, “no work is free of the tentative, the doubtful, the correctable.” (Elton, *The Practice of History*, p. 140). These are the main points stated in Jenkins' summary of Elton's ideas and his criticism.

In short, I comment, Elton gives great emphasis on the use of the sources for the writing of History. The sources must be studied and analyzed by trained Historians, who have the integrity to use them in the proper way. No imagination or fabrication of events should intrude the Historian's work. A historian must not approach its sources with ideas he already has in his mind and try to prove them by selecting the right sources and asking them only those questions that prove his/her arguments. The practicing historian must try to minimize his sentimentalism towards certain events and be as impartial as possible. A historian's work will by definition be tentative as new sources may surface post its publication. It will always include doubts about certain events or their interpretation as the historical record is not continuous and crystal clear. These will definitely lead to correction so that the work is as close as possible to the original truth of the past. From Elton's theory I will keep for future reference his denial for the literary approach to History writing and the required approach of the sources without preconceived ideas or theories.

Carr's optimism for the future

Edward Hallett Carr or widely known as E. H. Carr (1892-1982) was an English historian, diplomat, journalist and international relations theorist who was educated at Trinity College, The University of Cambridge (Master's degree in Classics), and is mostly know for his fourteen-volume *History of Soviet Russia* (1917-1929) and his *What is History?* I am going to give a full summary of Carr's written ideas before I present Jenkins's summary and criticism, which I am going to criticize as well.

The first edition of *What is History?* was published in 1961 but after the number of discussions it raised among historians Carr had began work on a second edition in the early 1980s that he was unable to complete before his death. A new introduction and a wealth of notes for that second edition did survive though. In that new introduction that was going to start the new edition, Carr explains that the lectures that composed the first edition were given in the late 1950s (in an international climate of great hope for humanity in the period of recovery after World War II) and expressed a great deal of optimism and belief in the future. However, in 1981 the world picture had changed completely: new highs in the Cold War; intensification of the possibility of a nuclear war; the economic crisis with high unemployment rates; terrorism; the increased political and financial influence of the oil-producing countries of the Middle East; the rise of the 'third world' in the international scene have brought about great pessimism. On the other hand, the vast majority of people do not believe in a hopeless future as they continue to “make love, conceive, bear and raise children with great devotion.” (p. 4). Great attention is still given to education and health, new sources of energy are explored, new inventions that may change the economic situation are announced, small investors still trust state bonds and there is great interest in national heritage, architecture and the arts. All of them of course are done for the future generations. The present gloomy picture of the future of the world is only painted by a few “disgruntled intellectuals” of Western Europe and especially in Britain. This great skepticism for the future of humanity which has no belief in progress is a form of

elitism of certain social groups whose security and privileges have been threatened by the crisis and of those countries whose “once undisputed domination over the rest of the world has been shattered.” (p. 5). Those responsible for this situation are the intellectuals who serve their ruling class regardless of which class they belong to by origin. The new introduction ended here and the text of the previous edition was inserted in the 2nd edition of the lectures. The editors of *Cambridge Modern History* claimed that in the future we could have “ultimate history” as historians expect History to be rewritten generation after generation. In the second edition it was stated that some scholars thought that this meant that every new version is just a new collection of personal points of view and therefore there could not have been “objective” truth in History. Carr explains that this should not mean that for example History written in the end of the 19th century is not valid and History written in the 1950s (when he was writing the first edition of this book) makes sense. My comment and answer to the What-is-history question in relation to time period is that this is relevant to the times a historian lives and by definition to the society he lives in.

Carr explains that the 19th century was the century of establishing facts in History and this was achieved by German, British, and English historians. The positivist and the empiricist point was clear: first collect the facts and then draw your conclusions from them. Lord Acton wrote to the contributors of the *Cambridge Modern History* that their narration and interpretation of the battle of Waterloo should satisfy French, English, German, Dutch equally. A historian must be accurate in his/her dates and places and on this s/he will be served by the so called 'auxiliary sciences' of History that are archaeology, epigraphy, numismatics, chronology and many more. The basic facts that are the same for all historians compose the “raw materials” of the historian and their selection and use depends on the historian before even the beginning of writing his/her History. An influential story written by a journalist in a newspaper depends of course on his selection of facts. Facts do not speak for themselves but only when the historian asks them to speak, uses them in a specific order and context. “The historian is necessarily selective.” (p. 12). Historical facts cannot exist “objectively and independently” of the interpretation of the historian based on them. Facts are not by definition historical facts. Instead of Carr's example let me describe my own experience. Many years ago, in the summer, at about 5:50 in the morning I was awakened up by a gun shot and a shout heard from the street in front of the block of flats I live. It eventually became known that a thief had fortunately shot unsuccessfully a gas station owner who was returning home carrying with him the returns of the previous day and night. The thief missed the man but he managed to grab the case with the money and go away. Is this a historical fact? No, according to Carr. Some of the neighbors were interviewed by the local newspaper and the story was published on the first page. Does this make it a historical fact now? No, according to Carr. Years later a local historian who was investigating criminality rates in the region referenced the publication of the story in a footnote of his work. Has the incident now become a historical fact? No, writes Carr, unless the story is used by more historians in their works and eventually becomes a historical fact of criminality in the region, the town, the country and enters their Histories.

In the same way, Carr continues, we know very little about the History of the fifth century BC in Ancient Greece because we only know what few people in Athens wrote and their view of the rest of Greek city-states and kingdoms. We do not know in the same detail the views of Spartans, Corinthians, Thebans, Persians, slaves and other non citizens in Athens. In this case, the historical facts were pre-selected for us by those who wrote the accounts that have been preserved until today. For at least both ancient and medieval times one can conclude that the facts we have are no more than

widely accepted judgments. For historians' writing on modern times, the 19th century “heresy” that one must collect all historical facts pertaining to his study has resulted in “dry-as-dust factual histories.” Documents tell us only what their author wants us to know or s/he thinks s/he knows. The facts on sources will speak via the historian who will work on them and decipher them. The historian's work is to use the “processing process” on the facts recorded on sources so that s/he can use them in his/her History. The Gustav Stresemann (1920s) example Carr gives at this point proves that the diplomat recorded only what he thought deserved recording for the future but at the same time stresses the importance of checking the original (documents in this case) instead of a published selection or even the published version of them. Carr stresses his point that “facts and documents are essential to the historian. But do not make a fetish of them. They do not by themselves constitute history; they provide in themselves no ready-made answer to this tiresome question ‘What is history?’” (p. 19). The historical facts never come to the present “pure” because “they do not and cannot exist in a pure form. They are always refracted through the mind of the recorder.” A study of a work of History should begin with his/her writer, the historian and “history means interpretation.” (p. 23). The historian must be able to come to contact with the mind of those about whom s/he is writing so that s/he writes their History. We can view and understand the past only through the eyes of the present. “The historian belongs not to the past but to the present.” (p. 25). A historian must master and understand the past so that s/he is able to understand the present.

“History is what the historian makes” as s/he views History from his/her point of view depending on the times s/he lives and his/her ideology: St. Augustine from the early Christianity point of view, Tillemont from that of a seventeenth century French priest, Gibbon from that of an eighteenth century Englishman, Mommsen from that of a nineteenth century German. There was/is no right point of view but the only one possible for each one of them. This does not mean that one interpretation is better than the other and that interpretations can ride over facts. The historian must bring to light all “known or knowable facts” relevant to his/her topic and his/her proposed interpretation. The assumption that the historian divides his/her work into two phases: in the first s/he reads the sources and fills his/her notebooks with facts and in the second he uses the notebooks in order to write his/her History seems to Carr “an unconvincing and implausible picture.” After he reads the basic sources, he claims, the historian begins writing immediately and reading and writing goes on at the same time and the written text is constantly revised. So, “input” and “output” is done at the same time. The historian communicates with his/her facts, s/he is in a give-and-take relation with them, s/he is engaged in “a continuous process of moulding his facts to his interpretation and his interpretation to his facts.” (p. 29). S/he begins with a provisional selection of facts and interpretation(s) based on the selected facts and as s/he goes on this selection and interpretation may change as there is reciprocity between present (the historian) and past (the facts). The historian cannot work without the facts and the facts without the historian are “dead and meaningless.” The first answer to the what-is-history question, according to Carr, is that History is “a continuous process of interaction between the historian and his facts, an unending dialogue between the present and the past,” (p. 30) not a dialogue between individuals but “between the society of today and the society of yesterday.” (p. 55).

Carr is emphatic that Grote's *History of Greece* (1846-1856) and Mommsen's *History of Rome* (1854-1856) cannot be understood outside the fact that the former represented through his History the progressive British middle class of the 1840s and glorified Pericles and the Athenian democracy and the latter as a liberal who writing in the 1850s and after the failure of the 1848 revolutions in Europe he was looking for

the strong man in Germany, the counter part of Caesar. “Great history is written precisely when the historian’s vision of the past is illuminated by insights into the problems of the present.” (p. 37). So, it is important that when we read a history book apart from the author’s name and the title we also look at the date of publication or writing and beyond that we consider the historical and social environment. Historians of a certain era may be following a common pattern. In the 19th century, British historians regarded History from the prism of progress. They expressed the ideology of progress of the society they lived in. After the First World War the English historian Arnold Toynbee saw History in a process of decline. Since, British historians have decided that there is no general pattern in History. Until the beginning of the 20th century, History was mainly the biography of “great men.” But the individual cannot be separated from the society/ies (group, class, tribe, nation etc) he lived/lives in and a biography of a human being without his/her social milieu is not History. The facts of History are not about individuals who acted in isolation but “about the relations of individuals to one another in society and about the social forces which produce from the actions of individuals results often at variance with, and sometimes opposite to, the results which they themselves intended.” (p. 52). Collingwood’s (see below) mistake was that he considered that the thought behind an individual’s action was the thought itself of the individual actor. The historian needs to investigate what is hidden behind the act and the “thought or the motive of the individual may be quite irrelevant.” Rebels in History owe their historical role to the “mass of their followers” and therefore they cannot be discussed as individuals outside their social context. A “great man” in History, which is a social process, represents either existing forces in his era or the forces he helps to create by challenging the status quo. In the final analysis, he is “an outstanding individual who is at once a product and an agent of the historical process.” (p. 55). The past can be conceived only in the light of the present and the present can be understood only in the light of the past, which is the dual function of History.

Periodization in History is not a fact but “a hypothesis or tool of thought.” The beginning of the Middle Ages for example depends on the interpretation of certain facts. The geographical divisions of History is also a hypothesis and not one accepted by all historians as, for example, whether Russia is part of Europe. Historians need to use generalizations in order to test information in his/her sources or compare events such as the French Revolution with the Russian Revolution. On the other hand, a historian cannot separate the unique from the general as History is concerned with their relation. The past may teach the present and the example is the almost obsession of the makers of the Russian Revolution with the lessons of the French Revolution, the 1848 revolutions, and the 1871 Paris Commune. The Bolsheviks feared that Trotsky would become Napoleon. However as this is a two-way communication, History’s role is “to promote” an understanding of both the past and the present through their interrelation. The historian is not concerned with the private morality (positive or negative) of figures of History as long as it does not affect historical events. For example, the personal behavior of Henry VIII to his wives is not of historical interest as long as it did not interfere with his handling of the affairs of the state although it may not be acceptable from a social point of view. Moreover, the historian is not expected to pass moral judgments on the behavior of figures under his scrutiny and decide how bad were Charlemagne, Napoleon, Genghis Khan, Hitler or Stalin based on the people who were killed as a result of their wars. The historian is not a “hanging judge” and as Benedetto Croce (see below) wrote the figures of the past cannot be tried twice. They are “subjects of history” and that is enough. The historian though will need to pass important judgments on “events, institutions, or policies of the past” and on collective misdeeds of the Russian, English, and American societies that produced Stalin, Cham-

berlain, McCarthy instead of the personalities themselves. (p. 78). He will not pass a judgment on individual slave-owners but on the institution of slavery and the society that accepted it and used it. My comment is that in these cases, the historian should let the facts and the descriptions of the events speak for themselves and focus on their analysis and interpretation. Carr concludes that History is a science and historians must improve their standards of History in order to make it “more scientific” by increasing rigor in History writing as History is a difficult and serious subject.

Historians and scientists both try to explain phenomena by asking the “Why?” question and search for answers. “The study of history is a study of causes,” (p. 87) states Carr clearly, as the historian seeks answers to his 'Why' questions. Herodotus was the first one who has explained in his *Histories* (5th century BC) that by writing his book he wanted to preserve the memory of the deeds of the Greeks and the barbarians and to explain the reasons why they fought one another. On the contrary, Thucydides does not offer clear explanations of the causes of the war(s) he discusses (5th century BC). But in the 18th century Montesquieu accepted that there are causes, moral or physical, as opposed to “blind fate” which operate in every monarchy and influence it positively or negatively and events are subject to these causes. Since then, historians have been trying to find the causes of historical events. Nowadays, the term “cause” is out of fashion and historians use the term “explanation” or “interpretation” or try to find how an event happened, which leads back to the “Why?” question. In practice, after they have done in depth research for the complex event(s) they study, historians assign a number of causes to the same event, categorize them in order of importance to them, establish their relations and possibly try to find the main cause. “Nothing in history is inevitable” or “unavoidable” or “inescapable” or even “ineluctable” (p. 96) but when historians speak of an inevitable event, they mean that the circumstances were so strong that the resulted event was expected. Some historians also write about the accidental in History or what is commonly known as the Cleopatra's nose theory. Had Cleopatra's nose being shorter, Antonius may have not fallen in love with her and the course of world History could have been different! Polybius (2nd century BC) was the first historian who thought about the chance in History followed by Tacitus (c. AD 56-120). The Cleopatra's nose statement was mentioned by Pascal (*Pensée*, paragraph 413/162, ed. Seuil, 1962) in the 17th century and in modern historiography the theory was given new life by British historian John Bury in an essay he published in 1916 under the title “Cleopatra's Nose,” in which he claims that there are endless cases in History in which chance has modified or determined its course. Carr says that the role of accident in History has been exaggerated and although it does exist “serious historians” can usually rationally explain an accidental event and fit it into the pattern of events of a certain time or era. But an accidental event is not one that a historian fails to understand. An accidental event may have an effect but it will not become one of historian's significant causes because “History [...] is a process of selection in terms of historical significance.” (p. 105).

Carr continues by claiming that Herodotus and Thucydides saw no goal in History. The Jewish and the Christian tradition did see an ultimate objective in the progress of History which resulted in her end. This was also the idea about History in the Middle Ages. It was in the Renaissance when the “anthropocentric world and the primacy of reason” were restored and an optimistic view was adopted. The high point of History as a “progressive science” was reached at least in Britain by the late 19th century along with a general optimistic feeling in the whole of society. In the late 1950s, when Carr was working on this book, “the decline of the west [had] become so familiar a phrase that quotation marks [were] no longer required.” (p. 112). Clearly, there are ups and downs in History, characteristics of regression and progress, but

Hegel's or Marx's four or three civilizations and Arnold Toynbee's twenty-one or more civilizations or the cycle of rise, decline, and fall for a civilization, make no sense. However, it can be observed that a force(s) to “drive a civilization forward dies away in one place and is later resumed in another,” (p. 116) which means that progress in History is not continuous in time and place. Also, what seems a decline for one group may be new opportunities for another. “Progress is an abstract term; [... and] perfection is not realizable in history.” (p. 119). But Carr would agree with the notion of unlimited progress towards defined goals whose validity can be verified during the attaining process.

Regarding objectivity in History, Carr claims that the facts of History cannot be objective since they are selective by the historian due to their significance. However, we can accept, he writes, that there can be an objectivity of relation, “of the relation between fact and interpretation, between past, present, and future.” (p. 120). It is only the future that can provide us with the tool to the interpenetration of the past and this can be the “ultimate objectivity in History.” The explanation of History provides the light for us to see the future and, vice versa, the future illuminates the past. A historian is objective when he chooses the right facts, he applies the “right standard of significance.” S/he can do that only by rising above “the limited vision of his own situation in society and in history” and project his/her vision into the future so that s/he gets a more deep and lasting sight into the past. (p. 123). An understanding of the future brings a historian closer to objectivity. I believe that what he means here is that a historian should not limit himself/herself to the situation and conditions s/he lives in during writing his/her History but free himself/herself from the present environment and possibly try to understand and project his/her theme into the future so that s/he sees the past in the eyes of the future not of the present. In recent History, Carr continues, a historian may delay a judgment as there might be a “delayed achievement,” for example a failure of today may be a tomorrow's success. My example is that we cannot judge fully the current (2018-2021) policies of Chancellor Merkel's administration in Germany or those of Prime Minister Johnson's in the UK until we see their effects in the future. The historian today has many questions to ask before s/he comes up with a verdict, an interpretation of the decisions made and actions taken. This judgment will most probably be better in the future because of the more favorable relation of the future with the past rather than the present with the very near past events (a few days, months, years ago).

When a historian seeks to know the facts, Carr continues, the questions s/he asks and the answers s/he receives “are prompted by our system of values.” (p. 131). Values determine the way we approach the facts, values are in the facts, they are important parts of our existence as human beings. The objective historian is the one who manages to go deeper into the reciprocal interaction of facts and values, a totally independent process. S/he tries to balance between fact and interpretation, fact and value, otherwise History is meaningless. History is change, movement, progress. We have come from somewhere and we are going somewhere. There is future in society and there is future in History. “The historian has no excuse to think of himself as a detached individual standing outside society and outside history. This is the age [the 20th century] of self-consciousness: the historian can and should know what he is doing.” (p. 139).

In his notes for the second but never realized edition of the *What is History?* Carr was going to add certain thoughts on the themes of his study, some of which I copy here as they were written. On the matter of objectivity in History he added that “History requires the selection and ordering of facts about the past in the light of some principle or norm of objectivity accepted by the historian, which necessarily includes

elements of interpretation.” (p. 162). On progress he wrote that “The theory that the universe began in some random way with a big bang and is destined to dissolve into black holes is a 'reflexion' [sic] of the cultural pessimism of the age. Randomness is an enthronement of ignorance.” (p. 163). My comment is that now we know that this might be true and might signify the end of human History on Earth but not the end of the History of the Universe or the History of other civilizations in the Universe. Therefore, not the end of History. By 2020 it has been confirmed that there are “inexact” sciences (my terminology) such as cosmos physics and medicine in which hypotheses and experiments do not always result in exact outcomes but they are similar to the generalizations in History (last point by R. W. Davies, Carr's editor). Carr's notes for the second edition reveal that he was still puzzled by the accidental in History and the “What if” questions. It is tempting to hypothesize what would have been done in the Soviet Union had Lenin not died so early and Stalin had never taken over (pp. 169-170) but this remains in the realm of fantasy and, in my opinion, it is of no interest to the historian at all as it is plain fiction. It seems that he had understood that there is a need for a more universal history with “economic, demographic, military etc, etc specialists” working along with historians and vice versa as these specialists will need “a broader historical pattern which only the 'general' historian can provide.” (p. 172). In my opinion, it is the historian who will study the work of other social scientists and decide how useful and convincing are their conclusions in order to be considered for his/her own study. In his *What is History?* E. H. Carr tried to criticize and summarize theories of History and philosophy of History that had remained prominent immediately after the Second World War and offered answers to most of the questions that were to be asked by History students and researchers and practicing historians.

There is no doubt that Carr's ideas and conclusions influenced generations of historians throughout the 20th century and beyond but at the same time were heavily criticized by other historians and especially the post-modernism movement of the late 20th century. Keith Jenkins went over a number of Carr's ideas and theses that he summarized, interpreted and criticized as stated hereafter. Carr argued, Jenkins writes, that historians until his era used three ideas in their history writing: (a) the 19th century (von Ranke's) idea that they should present the past as it really was, (b) that they should study the facts and draw conclusions from them, (c) and especially in England that they used empiricism. But there is no simple common-sense History. He makes a distinction between facts and historical facts. For example, the date a battle was fought is a fact but not a historical fact by itself. Facts do not speak for themselves. They speak only when the historian chooses them and uses them in his his/her work. In the 19th century there was harmony in historical writing as the historians transformed all their facts into historical facts and they all spoke liberal, which was in accordance with the prevailing liberal ideology of the era. However, all historians will transform the facts into historical facts according to their ideological preference. However, the facts are presented to us as they were perceived and understood by the recorder. While we are reading a History therefore we need to have in mind that we do not read about the facts but the historian's reflection of the events. Also, the historian needs to imagine the minds of the people s/he is dealing with as we can only understand the past through the present. Therefore, “the function of the historian is [...] to master and understand it [the past] as the key to the understanding of the present.” (Carr, p. 26). The historian must ensure that all the facts are accurate, must include all relevant facts, and must be balanced. When a historian begins work on a topics, s/he makes a provisional selection of facts and a provisional interpretation, which is changed as new sources are added. Therefore, History “is a continuous process of interaction between the historian and his facts, an unending dialogue between the

present and the past” (Carr, p. 30) and the future, he adds at a later point. In the 18th and the 19th centuries, Carr claims, History has been viewed as progress but in the 20th century and because of the two World Wars, pessimism has prevailed. Pessimist thinkers such as disappointed liberals, existentialists, and those who believed in the accidental in History and its non-existent meaning, have led to skepticism about the discipline. However, Carr, is optimistic. Objectivity in History is when the future provides “the key to the interpretation of the past” (Carr, p. 123) but historians need to understand that total objectivity is impossible. This was the summary of Carr's points that Jenkins presented in his study before he puts them under his lens of criticism.

In Jenkins's criticism of the ideas put forward by Carr, the focal point of the historiography discussion is the narrative: how can a historian reconstruct the past using its remnants. In White's view, the facts can be significant only if they can be placed in context, in a “whole” or a “totality,” that is in my terminology, the General History and its historian. According to White, as this totality is impossible to be found, it needs to be imagined or invented by the historian. The totality to fact and fact to totality relationship according to his literary terminology are meaningful only if they involve metonymic or synecdochal “tropes.” Therefore, interpretations of the past are imagined or invented, no absolute truth can be found in History, and because of the “tropes” that need to be used, the outcome of a historian can only be *metahistory* (White, *Metahistory*, passim).

Are Carr's ideas still useful in the 21st century?

In my view, Carr has tried to understand the what-is-history riddle from a theoretical point of view and in the light of the historical events of the first half of the 20th century. The facts are important only when the historian uses them in his/her History and there is a continuous interaction between the future, the present, and the facts of the past. From Carr's work, I will put in our theoretical quiver for future reference his idea of the dialog of the historians with his facts and his discussion on objectivity in History. Historians and philosophers do know that the what-is-History question belongs to the theory of History and, in turn, the theory of sciences belongs to philosophy. It is a question that historians need to consider and have in mind but it is not History, it is philosophy. This explains why a number of philosophers have worked on it and nowadays it also interests the social scientists. Its topics include the meaning of the past, the facts of the past, how the facts are transformed into historiography and above all how historians theorize or should theorize about the past and its autobiographical recording. In the philosophy of History the post-modern movement has introduced new concepts taken from 20th century philosophical inquiries as well as from literary criticism.

I believe though that we need to set some definitions so that we proceed with our understanding of the past or pasts. In terms of time, past is just the previous fraction of a moment in human life/experience. Here's my example. I witnessed an explosion in a factory and this is a fact to which other facts are added as time goes by from the moment of my first experience. Other facts that I perceive are the results of the explosion (smoke, fire, destruction) as well as other effects that I see happen (people are dead or seems to be dead or injured, the police arrives, the fire brigade vehicles arrive, ambulances arrive to carry the dead/injured away). At this point in time, I have no idea what caused the explosion but as time goes by I will collect more information from the factory workers, employees, and owner. I may eventually check the police and the fire brigade reports and the medical records of the injured in order to find out what the outcome of their investigation or examination was. At the end, I will write the History of this event based on the data I collected and my own experience. During

the data collection process, I may notice that the oral stories I collected as well as the information in the written reports do not always match when compared themselves or with my own perception of the explosion and its aftermath. The sequence of outcomes may be slightly different, the numbers of dead and injured reported may differ, the various descriptions of the explosion itself including times may vary. In other words, different witnesses of the same event may perceive it and report it with minor or significant differences. In other words, the past is composed by (a) the event (συμβάν) that did happen and (b) the human perception of it (the facts or γεγονότα). They are two independent parts that do not coincide. The historian, who may also be an eye witness, can only investigate and report on the facts (perceptions) but it will be impossible to know the event and its aftermath as s/he was not part of its mechanism and effects (the exploded matter, the natural forces, the walls that were pushed by the wave that hit them, the employees that experienced it, the policemen, the firemen, the doctors). Moreover, a couple of centuries later, the historian will need to rely only on what was recorded (the facts or γεγονότα) of this explosion (event or συμβάν). Hence, a historian cannot reproduce an event but s/he can only find the facts of the event by reading what was recorded by individuals who witnessed or were involved in the event or even just heard about it. A historian can never find the truth of an event but in an attempt to get to know it or write about it s/he will rely on the facts that were recorded. In philosophical terms, there is no truth to be found about an event because this truth was not and will never be revealed by its mechanism (objects and natural forces) or its subjects (living beings). A historian, therefore, needs to find the facts and base his/her History on them.

Continuing my thoughts, I need to state that the facts are most of the times confusing or ambiguous. Unless there is only one source to be investigated as it often happens in the study of Ancient History, the facts are generally a different recording(s) of the event(s). In Ancient History, a historian may encounter that his only source is the story of one person or fragmented information from one or more sources that may not make much sense. In this case, the historian may question aspects of his/her only source or in the fragmented story try to read between the gaps and reconstruct the fact(s) as much as possible. It is in these cases that the arguments of the historian will convince his/her fellow historians and his/her reader that s/he might be towards the right direction or s/he has just used pure imagination. Pure imagination is not acceptable in History writing because it leads to fictional history. The arguments must be based on and connected to the fact by other recorded facts not by imaginary facts that are not recorded anywhere. I/we do not know which one is the better argument when it is connected to an imaginary sequence of facts. Using our example above, let's assume that one source records 300 dead and injured and another 100. The easy way out for a historian is to write "either 300 or 100" but this is only satisfactory if there is no other way of reconciling the number. There might be cases though that a combination of facts considered by the historian may lead to a more concrete number. Still, facts can be confusing and even changing in the future. Studying the general picture of the European theater (the Mediterranean and Continental) of the Second World War and its outcome a historian may arrive at the conclusion that the war against the Germans was won by the British with American help but another historian may come to the conclusion that it was won by the Americans with the British help. Finally, still another one comparing the terms and the consequences of the German armistice and peace treaties of the First World War and the Second World War may conclude that the victor of the Second World War was Germany. If one projects this to the end of the 20th century and into the 21st century Germany, then a historian may very well conclude that Germany was the victor in Europe from a political and

economic perspective. Carr, who had seen this happen, was the one who spoke about the effect of the future in the facts of the past. Moreover, the outcome of the Battle of Marathon was perceived in one way by the combatants, in a different way by Herodotus and still in a different way by John Stuart Mill who commented on it. The Achaemenid (Persian) records show that the Persian Kings believed that they had subjugated the Greeks. Herodotus spoke of the great victory of mainly the Athenians over the Persians and J. S. Mill of the great impact that this victory had on the later development of the Western Civilization. Thus, a fact may have two or more facets at the same time, those that a historian needs to find. Those facets may change or multiply or even become fewer as time goes by when a facet that was live during some time it is finally eliminated. When the “percentage agreement” note exchanged between Churchill and Stalin in Moscow in the secret meeting of 1944 was acknowledged by the Soviet Union in the 1950s it eliminated the earlier fact-facet (suspicion) that was possibly a Churchill/British hoax. Most of the times, a fact is not or may not be a solid cornerstone that a historian can use and build his/her History on it.

After the historian collects his/her facts, s/he is ready to proceed with their examination and interpretation. The facts cannot speak by themselves, they need to be examined, discussed, and interpreted by the historian. There is no historical narrative without interpretation. An inscription or a battle report is a fact that it contains information about the past. This is just an isolated piece of information. It first needs to be read and understood, to be placed in context, to be related to other facts, and to be interpreted. Is it a new piece of evidence, how does it relate to other facts, does it alter our view of what it refers to and toward what direction? This interpretation of the specific fact in combination with interpretations of other facts will eventually lead to a narrative that cannot be anything else but an interpretation of a History. Historians who examine the same event and study the same facts may produce narratives with different interpretations. Historical interpretation must be based on the interpretations of the facts. It cannot just be a set of textual imaginary outcomes of fictional facts. As Lawrence Stone put it in his 1992 note in *Past and Present* journal, reality cannot be defined *purely* [sic] as language. “This is because if there is nothing outside the text, then history as we have known it collapses altogether, and fact and fiction become indistinguishable from one another.” And in the same note in *Past and Present* Gabrielle M. Spiegel insists that “If texts –documents, literary works, whatever– do not transparently reflect reality, but only other texts, then historical study can scarcely be distinguished from literary study, and the 'past' dissolves into literature.” The interpretative narrative, therefore, needs to be based on facts that represent some historical reality, not fiction.

An interesting history topic is the role(s), status, life of women in the distant past. Two examples will illustrate my point that it is very easy for historians to follow the methods and views of social scientists and loose track in the study of History. In the 1960s and 1970s, at the peak of the feminist movement, became very prominent a theory (“the kurgan hypopthesis”) proposed by Marija Gimbutas who claimed that before the Bronze Age invasion of the Indo-Europeans in Eastern Europe, the local neolithic populations and their cultures were women centered and mother centered. According to her excavations until then and their interpretation, those societies were very peaceful, honored women, and favored equality between genders. This situation was changed when the “Kurgan people” invaded Europe from the east and established their male dominated societies. This theory was just butter and marmalade on the bread of the feminist writers, those who wanted to elevate the role of women in the 20th century and prove that the normal gynocentric human condition was overturned by the brutal males. In the light of new excavations and further studies, this interpreta-

tion was heavily criticized from a scholarly point of view and after years of discussion it was shown that some times and at given points in time scholars see what they want to see rather than accept and express their doubts about what they discover. This is the case of an archaeological interpretation that may influence History, it is based on facts but on those facts that are chosen to prove one side of the facts at the time of presentation to the scholars and the public. Based on this specific interpretation of the facts, a historian may construct his/her view as a tower of playing cards: totally unstable to historical criticism.

One more example is what can historians deduce from letters of women from Ptolemaic Egypt dated from the 3rd century BC to the 7th century AD. I selected one letter of 257 BC sent by Simale to Zinon about her son Herophantos (P.Col.Zen. 1.6), which is included in the translated collection by Bagnall and Cribiore. This is a petition of the mother to her son's employer after she visited the work place and witnessed that her son was bitten badly by his immediate supervisor. She complains that apart from an initial payment she has not received any other money from the employer for her son's work. She complains about her son's maltreatment and insists that any payment needs to be made to her directly. Without any additional information about it, this is a letter that shows that a Greek Egyptian mother agreed to a paid apprenticeship for her son. When she learned that her son suffered in his job, she was brave enough to go and try to talk to his employer but she was prevented by the supervisor who eventually showed her that her son was indeed bitten but he was alive. It was then that she showed her courage and wrote the petition that has survived for centuries. When those letter were first presented at the beginning of the 20th century and re-read by feminist academics in the 1970s or by women studies theorists in the 1990s it was enthusiastically said that they revealed the real voice of ordinary ancient women as opposed to queens' words. In their letters, those ordinary women finally reveal their interests and their concerns, sometimes in their uncertain and unpracticed handwriting, signs of a somehow emancipation. These statements were Siren's song in the ears of those who wanted to show how old the feminist movement was and how brave and possibly emancipated some ordinary women could be. The scholarly study of the letters and that one specifically in combination with other historical factors eventually revealed a different picture explained in the introduction and the commentary by Bagnall and Cribiore. It seems that the letters were most of the times written by professional scribes and it is suggested that in most of the cases the scribes kept notes and wrote the letters by themselves but one may assume that the final text was read to the woman who commissioned it. As Bagnall and Cribiore point out we cannot ascribe certain universal characteristics to groups such as women, men, people of the same class or ethnicity. Most probably the gender distinction was not perceived in the same way that we do in modern societies. "Class" is such a controversial term in Ancient History. In ancient times, the society was organized in families and then there were patronage patterns of various complexity in the ancient stratified society. It is definitely clear that in the letters women express themselves without the interference of a male. However, based on this letter or on similar ones of the same epoch one cannot construct generalizations and imaginary conclusion about the status and role of women in ancient times, not even in Ptolemaic Egypt.

Catrina Kelly wrote in her 1991 note published in *Past and Present*: "A major task of women's history at the moment is to explain the different significances [sic] and operations which may be adopted by patriarchal, that is gender-based, systems of power relations." This is fine for women's studies but in History writing, one cannot begin with a conception and then try to find those facts that will prove his/her idea. Discussions about context and process of construction might serve very well art, liter-

ature, film studies etc but not History. Kelly asks this question about women in the Medieval period: “It would be interesting to know, for example, how the emphasis on genealogy and patrimony might have affected women: did they or did they not sense that their property rights and family status might be under threat?” But this may be impossible to find as the facts are totally missing. However, Kelly says that the link between text and context “does not only mean asking questions which texts themselves do not ask” but, I comment, also a reference to a considerable range of material is required. A historian cannot force a text reply in his/her own interest even with the use of other sources. Kelly continues writing: “An aggressive attitude may have to be adopted to the sources themselves, concentrating not on the most obvious interpretation, but on secondary layers of meaning.” Well, I believe that a reading between the lines without any additional evidence is never safe from a historian's point of view. Also, reality can be invented in literature and language studies but not in History. The text in History, what historians call document or evidence, can not be treated in the same way as a linguist or literary scholar treats a literary text. In this sense it is not a literary text that a historian can modify at will and make it speak the way s/he wants it to speak or carry imaginary meanings as per his/her scholar's wish. It seems to me that those who study gender, linguistic, literary and critical theory wanted to give to their theories a historical perspective, to legitimize and institutionalize their theories by using the philosophy of History as a stepping stone into “liberalizing” historiography from its traditional methods and practices and taking her along with literary theory on the “text”, its “reality” and its “extra-text” concepts into the “metahistory” era. Spiegel concludes her 1992 note in *Past and Present* by saying in my own understanding that the past is a now silenced material existence in fragmented inner narratives chained by conflicting interpretations that compete for significance in the eyes of the historian.

Jenkins finally speaks by himself

Jenkins, the foremost advocate for post-modernism in History and he who believes that finally “the end of history” (*At the Limits of History*, pp. 230-244) has come, initially studied history but he quickly moved to political philosophy at Nottingham University (PhD). His theories or the summaries of post-modern theories on History he promulgates have been strongly criticized, especially some disdainful declarations about the discipline and the profession. In the post-modern world, he claims, History is not necessary any more, it has “no object” of inquiry, it is merely a sort of rhetoric, inescapably aesthetic, as stated in Macfie's summary of Jenkins' views in his review. Macfie began his review of Jenkins' writings by summarizing the practicing historians' criticism against post-modern theory and the suggested practice of History and ended his review with conclusions about post-modernism, which though I do not accept. So, according to the collected criticism against Jenkins' ideas, most, if not all, of the post-modern theorists of History are not qualified to comment on the discipline as they are not practicing historians. A historian has the ability to discover at least part of the past. The goal of the historian through historical investigation is to attain truth in the past although s/he knows that the one found may not be the absolute truth. Post-modern theories are mainly associated with French post-modern philosophy and are ancient (Aristotle), cyclical, and repetitive. Nothing is entirely new. Post-modern theories are associated with disappointment and decline of the West after World War II and especially after the collapse of existing socialism in the early 1990s and the failure of Marxist ideas and beliefs at the end of the 20th century. So, if orthodox Marxism cannot be proven correct, science cannot offer solutions, and there is no belief in progress anymore, then History is totally useless. Most important of all, History is not

quite based on philosophy and “based on the everyday language of collective experience.”

Jenkins, Macfie continues, has preoccupied himself with theory only. He explains in his professorial inaugural address (essay “12. 'Once upon a time' On history”) published in his *At the Limits of History* how philosophy and political theory attracted his attention during his pre-undergraduate and undergraduate years when he studied History and shifted his interest to political philosophy during his years of his doctoral research. He theorizes very successfully on issues that belong to the philosophy of History but he has never practiced History. In his *Rethinking History*, he describes the way he sees how monotonous and oppressive the historian's “job” [sic] is: a historian brings with him personal values, positions, ideology, epistemology. S/he uses “routines” [sic] in working with sources, is trying to formulate an “original thesis” and write down his/her history. S/he faces pressures of the everyday life: spouse/family/friends complains on his/he working overload, “pressures from the work-place” [sic] (universities officials, teaching), pressure from publishers (bondage, format, market, deadlines, literary style, referees, re-writing). This explains how many “factors outside 'the past' operate on you and influence what you write in essays and studies,” (p. 28) he concludes. Jenkins never wanted to do this boring “job,” he never wanted to be involved in academic History, for his own reasons of liberating himself, he was bored with teaching traditional History to PGCE and undergraduate students, he discovered Eden in White's *Metahistory* and Derrida's works, which are philosophy and possibly philosophy of History but not History practicing. My comment is that us, who chose to study History are not doing a “job.” We are doing a function (λειτουργημα) in the classical Greek meaning of the word. We do it because we love doing it, not for money, not for glory, and yes we suffer and as Chekhov told a young man who insisted that he reads his literary work, if you sleep well at night and suffer not, your writings worth nothing. Yes, we do it so that we teach our students something different/new from what they can read in books; fresh knowledge/interpretation that is always based on evidence not on imagination, otherwise we would write historical fiction.

A practicing historian could easily dismiss Jenkins et al. and their post-modernism on History and many historians have just not bothered to involve in the 1991-2007 discussion on the matter. Now that post-modernism on History has clarified itself and many historians keep accepting their burden of History by doing their function and accepting what they have to sacrifice in life, we need to understand that it was good that Jenkins et al. stirred the waters of philosophy of History in the late 20th century. A practicing historian is not very much interested in the theory of History from a philosophical point of view but in questions that relate to the writing of History and especially to the Universal History or General History, when historical facts need to be seen from a wider geographical or chronological perspective. So, Jenkins et al. generated side effect questions and discussions on, for example, how much can a historian squeeze his History writing in order to produce a General History. Should a General History be founded just on evidence or a somehow hypothetical/imaginary connecting essence that will make her more attractive reading to the general public? Is this necessary and how much of it? Who is the target reading group of a General History or “Who is History for”?

Post-modernists believe that in the post-modern world History should be just a series of studies of the history of post-modernity itself. However, in the 21st century, students, historians, the public still want to know more about the Sumerians, Alexander of Macedon, the Carthaginians, Athenian democracy, the Romans, the Celts, Christianity, Byzantium, Charlemagne, the Crusades, the love of learning in the Me-

dieval period, about women and children throughout History, the Renaissance, Michelangelo and Leonardo, the Holy Roman Empire, the economy in the era of the Italian Independent Cities, Napoleon and Hitler, USA and the Americas, China, Korea, and Japan, the working class in England, socialism in France, World Wars, the European Union, the European Civilization, and Universal/General History. Historians then out of their love of learning will lean over the sources in order to write those Histories in demand and beyond them.

Evan's reconsideration of History

Studying about History and writing History is explained by Richard Evans (University of Oxford, DPhil in History) in his *In Defense of History*. Evans has to answer the crucial post-modern question whether it is possible to do History at all in the 21st century. The post-modernism label that “covers a variety of sometimes contradictory and conflicting ideas invites critical investigation rather than silent acceptance of such ideas. Postmodernism is a convenient label and it is not an organized movement nor does it amount to a coherent ideology [...]” (p. 318). Evans sees that there are very few historians who are able to discuss History theory at an acceptable philosophical level as it has already become an independent discipline with its own level of abstraction which has become highly theoretical. Philosophy of History has departed from the level of working historians. No History theory, including post-modernism, is excluded from scrutiny and assessment. The support of the majority at a given point in time does not make a theory be accepted universally and uncritically. It becomes ridiculous when some believe that the “end of history” has come and there is no reason for further discussion. History has shown that all theories of whatever shade come and go or rest among other theories in time. Although historians cannot have exclusivity expressing opinions on History theory, their History practicing experience is most valuable. History writing was intensified after the Enlightenment and reached its first peak in the 19th century with nation oriented Histories (Germany, England, France) and the faith that historians working on the principles of von Ranke's search for the primary sources of History would eventually find historical truth. This very optimistic view of History remained so until the outbreak of World War I. The defeat of Germany, the many wars in the inter-war period (1918-1939), the idea of relativity established in Physics, created a very gloomy environment for History writers, who could barely write History in that epoch. It was only after the Second World War with the great emphasis that was given mainly in the United States on the causes and the consequences of that war that History writing was revived and more and more university students wanted to study it.

Especially in the United States, the great technological advancements, mathematical models, statistics, and computers were used to produce “scientific history.” The methods used, though, were as scientific as the ones used in the 19th century and the applications of Cliometrics were very limited. Alas, quantitative methods could not solve the big questions in History. Cliometrics was disgraced in the mid-1970s when its forerunners published their work on American slavery: Robert W. Fogel and Stanley L. Engerman, *Time on the Cross* (Boston, 1974). Based on mathematical and statistical analysis of the sources, they concluded against previously prevailing thought that slavery was profitable, efficiently run from an economic point of view and the standard of living of slaves was as high as free workers of the era. However, a closer look of other historians proved that the authors had used flawed mathematical and statistical procedures, did not cite the full sources or were selective with evidence that proved their arguments only and relied on economic, sexual behavior, fertility models that were not explained. Therefore, basic principles of History research

and analysis were miss-followed or not followed at all. It seemed, therefore, that scientific History had failed but the debate whether History is a science or an art continued among History theorists.

Other topics that historians have discussed for a long time is moral statements and judgments within their work as well as general laws that govern History. It is generally easy to avoid these statements expressed explicitly in Ancient or Medieval History but very difficult when it comes to figures such as Mussolini, Stalin, Hitler. Evans suggests that an opinion can be expressed through sarcasm, irony and other rhetorical and stylistic language weapons. Also, a historian does not have to say that the Celts, the Huns, the Germans were blood thirsty people but that because of their tactics a lot of people were killed during a specific period in time. Some historians have tried to find general laws that have governed human history. The most notorious case is that of Arnold Toynbee who in his multi-volume *A Study of History* tried to prove that his twenty-one or more civilizations he recognized in the 6000 years of human history rose, developed, and collapsed. He was accused that he selected the evidence that would prove his argument and one example was his explanation why and how the American civilization was born in North America. A critic pointed out that the major problem with the work was “the vision itself in which every age and every civilization is judged by a standard foreign to it and its importance restricted to what it contributed to the progress of an arbitrarily chosen principle.” (pp. 55-56). By now (end of 20th century), Evans continues, it has become clear to historians that History never repeats itself and facts are not reproduced in time. Historians cannot use the past and predict the future as, for example, they failed to tell us before hand about the collapse of existing socialism in East Europe.

If History is not a science, is it an art? The historian's writing must be plain and clear although some employ a literary approach, which if it turns into “a literary mode” the consequences might be unpredictable. History is not a branch of literature. On the other hand, the ideal History work should be readable from cover to cover. It is noted that those historians who wrote in a literary way such as Gibbon, Michelet, and Carlyle (see below) lived in the 18th and the 19th centuries. The 20th century historian, Evans continues, is generally writing in a stiff manner so that s/he appears to be more scientific as s/he be judged on the content of the work and not on the style of writing. History can be viewed as a science “in the weak sense of the German *Wissenschaft*” or, I add, the Greek same word “επιστήμη,” as a body of knowledge which is the result of research carried according to specific methods, presented in a written form and subject to peer review. It is not surprising that “επιστήμη” appears in Thucydides (I.121) as a set of technical knowledge (“seamanship”) that needed to be acquired for supremacy in war. Of course, History is not a science in the sense that it formulates general laws and predicts the future. It is also an art if a historian manages to present his/her research in a language and form readable as a piece of literature without betraying its scientific essence. It is also a craft as the apprentice needs to learn the method on handling the sources and use the tools of the trade effectively.

Evans now turns his attention to facts, sources and causation. He first clarifies the Elton-Carr dichotomy on facts. For Elton a historical fact was an event that happened in the past and was recorded. The historian found what was recorded and used it to recreate the fact in the present. However, s/he had to approach the source with an open mind, without any prejudice or preconception, and read it in the context of the time that happened. Any present theory or ideology in the historian's mind should not be used. On the other hand, Carr saw as historical facts only those that were selected and used by the historian for his History and which were therefore subject to a historian's theory and interpretation in the present. But Evans claims that a historical fact ex-

ists anyway and appears only when the historian uses it as evidence in order to support an argument. It is at this time that the Historian uses theory and interpretation. “Facts thus precede interpretation conceptually, while interpretation precedes evidence.” (p. 77), states Evans. Typically, a historian begins with an idea, which s/he tries to support by using evidence that s/he must discover in facts (sources). Facts and evidence are different. Although facts are usually associated with events recorded in texts, they can also be buildings, government bonds, personal relations, technological advancements in arms etc. Evans concludes that “an event is a fact, but a fact is not necessarily an event.” (p. 79). History is about a number of aspects of the past rather than only events. Theory, continues Evans, enters the picture when a historian approaches the sources and tries to read them from a different perspective. Anthropological theory for the study of African rural societies in the 20th century, a fresh look at the history of European witchcraft in the 17th century, and Marxist theory, for example, on the urban and rural societies offered us an understanding of industrialization in England. So, a historian may read a source from an entirely new perspective using ideas and theories of the time s/he lives. Le Roy Ladurie (French historian, 1929-2023) instead of reading the inquisitional reports in order to study the inquisition itself and the Cathar heresy, he read the details that the heretics revealed about their everyday life in order to write a History of relationships and the living conditions in a medieval village. There is no single way of reading a document and it is actually desirable that historians examine sources from different perspectives. However, there are some documents, such as the Dead Sea Scrolls that may be possibly read in one way only. Evans, also points out that sometimes archivists decide what is important to be retained from a History set of records and what to be destroyed. He offers his own personal experience but I have also witnessed at least two such cases. The first one was the official burning in 1989 of hundreds of thousands of citizens' police folders that were kept by the Greek police between roughly 1950-1974. The unanimous political agreement was that they had to be destroyed because they contained the police informers, that is, the names of those who had provided detailed information about the lives of citizens accused of being communists. It was also decided that a few hundred similar files of well known persons who had been involved in the political or public life of the country during the same period should be preserved and deposited at the Greek State Archives. It was claimed that the burning of the plain citizen folders would prevent possible personal conflicts as the police informers could have been close friends or relatives who had been forced or had voluntarily become police informers. Although this action may have solved a social problem it did destroy for ever valuable documents regarding the political involvement of a large number of Greeks in the politically turbulent post-World War II years of Greek political life as well as the informers' mechanism of the Greek Junta (1967-1974) for plain citizens. What was retained were the folders of well known political or public figures (the elite Evans explains in his own example) that may not contain the same sort of information that the other ones of the plain citizens did. The other example is the cadastral record of the inter-war distribution of lands in Greece that was preserved at least until the 1980s when I last saw it in an underground room in the Greek Ministry of Agriculture. Thousands of official documents were on the floor of the room waiting for their cataloging and I was forced to step on them as there was no free space for one's shoes. I do not know today if this archive has survived to provide the economic and social historian with valuable information about the rural economy and society of inter-war Greece. The non-trained ministry employee who was in charge of that archive told me that nobody had shown any interest in those documents until my appearance. The historiographical time had come though in the 1980s for historians to be interested in studying those forgotten docu-

ments. The conclusion is that by definition the History record is fragmentary, the historian knows that and s/he tries to examine the surviving fragments in a broader historical context so that s/he gains some sense of the whole even where significant parts of it are not available. A historian then will use his imagination but within the boundaries of the surviving historical record in order to fill in the historical picture.

In another part of his *In Defense of History* Evans touches the problem of the meaning of words in historical time. In the 17th century the word family, for example, included the house servants but this is not anymore the case. I will use the example of translating ancient inscriptions written in classical Greek. Although the language used and the content is generally similar in the same period of time, there are words that puzzle the historian. For example, the words “πολιτεία” and “πολίται” typically mean the political system and the citizens of an ancient Greek city state. However, on inscriptions of the 4th century BC that involve confederacies of cities it may not be clear whether the reference is to the political system and the citizens of the confederacy or to those of a single city referred to in the same inscription. Moreover, when one translates classical Greek texts into another language or even into modern Greek will notice that s/he must decipher how certain words or phrases function within the original text and try to recreate the same function in the translated text without changing the meaning or effect they have within the original context. This is very difficult when the historian needs to extract historical meaning from such a text. Sometimes the historian will have to think on the meaning of a source and interpret it in his/her own way without excluding other interpretation. Triangular drawings in European caves inhabited by prehistoric people have been interpreted from fertility symbols all the way to “pornographic” drawings. A series of newsreels recording live events in the 20th century may show to one historian only the action in the foreground, the main event filmed, but to another the unintended action(s) filmed in the background with families and vehicles passing by. In both cases, a historian will try to unveil what s/he thinks is important to be used in his/her study from that source and not necessarily what was the intention of the original filmmaker. The same may happen when two historians read a politician's speech and try to decipher its meaning. They may come to different conclusions among themselves and their interpretation may be entirely different from the intention of the author. How many different interpretations, I wonder, may a historian offer to Clint Eastwood's “empty chair speech” in the 2012 Republican National Convention? A few years after the performance, the speaker himself said that it was a “silly” speech. In other instances, even the author himself/herself may later give a different meaning or explain that his/her intention was different from what s/he herself/himself intended it to be originally. In any case, Evans says, a historian should know the boundaries of his/her interpretation and avoid giving meaning(s) to sources in a way that they only serve his/her argument. A study in the archives has shown that the argument “the British bombarded Dresden in 1944 at night because Americans bombarded it during the day” (my example) is not quite true. This will lead us to the discussion on how we use historical sources to derive historical facts. Typical historians will differentiate between primary and secondary sources and use them accordingly in constructing their History. But in the typical post-modern view History and fiction is one and the same thing, researching and writing about them is exactly the same, they both use elements of human experience, both use language as means of presenting reality to the reader. According to this view, there are many correct views of a historical fact and there is no objective knowledge about the past. This line of theoretical thinking makes historical facts disappear from view, the distinction between primary and secondary sources on which historians base their research is non-existent, and the historian becomes an author of fiction. (pp. 110-114).

Then Evans turns to how readers must view history books and how historians use secondary sources and he writes: “no reader comes to a history book naively willing to believe everything it says.” Also, historians “do not write as if *everything* they say is absolutely true.” but they write in a language that reveals various levels of certainty including words such as “probably” or “perhaps.” (pp. 107-108). It is true that undergraduate university students learn History by reading secondary historical work, the validity of which they must learn to judge in the same way that they put under scrutiny primary sources. It is certainly true that to a large extent we use the same procedures in reading secondary sources as we do in reading primary materials: we ask who has written the document, and why, and to whom the document is addressed, and why, we check it out for internal consistency and for consistency with other documents relating to the same subject, and if it contains information derived from other sources, we ask where this information comes from and do our best to check it out too. But this does not mean the *objects* of these identical procedures (primary and secondary sources) must be identical too. Even with secondary sources, the past is not just a text as political, social, economic, cultural events “are not the same as literary texts.” (p. 110). Greek and Roman inscriptions, diplomatic documents, records of births, marriages, and deaths, land systems, filmed historical events, radio and television speeches, electronic databases do not tell a story by themselves. The future historian's sources will not be only texts. In any case, historians do not take their sources as past reality. They are all made by humans with specific purposes and need to be considered by historians with skepticism.

Evans uses the example of the David Abraham affair, a PhD holder in History, who wrote in the 1980s a book on the Weimar Republic which appeared to be so much theoretically abstract that reviewers wondered about the sources that his arguments were based on. When his footnotes were checked, it was found that there was a number of immaculate paraphrases that appeared to be as direct quotations from the sources, wrongly attributed sources, mistranslations, “inventions and falsifications of the sources.” For example, a “not” that was left out in a quotation from a letter, reversed the author's whole argument. It is wrong to believe that because a scholar has been awarded a doctoral degree, his/her academic integrity must be trusted. The reaction against the author was so fierce that he directed his career towards law and after receiving a second doctoral degree in law he eventually became a university professor of law. My comment is that my experience in checking footnotes has surprised me with inconsistencies ranging from obvious printing mistakes to references that are rather irrelevant or cryptic in relation to the point made in the text. In the case of Abraham, it is interesting to note that even after the second edition of the book with the corrected references, the analysis of the experts in the field showed that the whole theoretical argument of the rival between agrarian and industrial blocks of the era in Germany was taken from the work of the Greek Marxist political theorist/philosopher Nicos Poulatzas. Abraham had tried to find the evidence that would prove his argument, much of which eventually was found to discredit his arguments. In the final analysis, it seems that Abraham did not deliberately falsified his sources but as he admitted he was very careless in the notes he kept and he quoted and paraphrased in the same sentence. This way he missed the direct quotations from his interpolations of the sources. Evans concludes that “the past does speak through the sources, and it is recoverable through them” (p. 126) because “historical method is based on the rules of verification,” (p. 127) and footnotes is the means.

Then Evans discusses causation in History and the views of various historians. My comment is that causation in History writing has been a major issue of consideration and discussion although the consequences of a historical fact compared to its

causes may be more important. Historians have preoccupied themselves mainly with causes of wars, upheavals, political changes and less often with those of social or economic nature. In two of my studies I focused on the changing face of Greek agriculture and rural life in the first half of the interwar period (1920-1930). Summarizing the issue in one sentence, agriculture in Greece and life in the villages changed profoundly when great land estates were broken up into small lots and were distributed to landless farmers along with the application of a number of other state policies. The main cause of this development was the coming of about 1,5 million refugees to Greece from Asia Minor (West Turkey) after the defeat of the Greek army in the 1920-1922 campaign against the Turks and in the aftermath of World War I and its peripheral settlements. However, the coming of the refugees did not only cause the distribution of land. It did also cause: the establishment of refugees in new villages mainly in northern Greece changing the population distribution; the introduction of new agricultural methods of cultivation; economic and financial demands on the shoulders of the Greek state with consequent changes in the economic landscape of the country; a new social mixture of indigenous and new population in the country; the intensification in the construction of public works in the countryside; new plans for agricultural education. In my studies, the argument for the new face of rural Greece in this period was built up little by little when each one of the causes above were discussed in separate narratives with supporting archival and other contemporary evidence. Also, their contribution to the changing appearance of Greece was examined at the end of each book chapter. Finally, an additional essay summarizing the conclusions of the individual essays emphasized the argument that was deployed gradually in the study as a whole. In the final analysis, though, the work does not spin around a central point of causation but around the changes in Greek agriculture that did occur or were launched during the period under consideration. In general, causation does not seem to be the focal point of study in economic and social History.

Evans remarks that in the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th century, historians studied political history and the History of the nations in order to understand the causes and consequences of wars, the actions of “great” political figures, the fall of empires and the rise of nations. But this changed radically after World War II when in the framework of economic and social History, historians wrote the History of almost any social group, of feelings, of the natural world, of those whose in previous centuries it was thought that there was no History to be written: the isolated, the condemned, the odd ones, the marginal ones. The rise of social History in almost every country resulted in the study of human groups and notions that they were not thought before that were going to be a subject of study. Social History began in England in the late 19th century but in the 20th century the term “Social History” meant the organizational and ideological History of the labor movement, specifically of the socialist and Marxist labor movement. But in the 1970s and the 1980s “Social History” changed to the “History of Society” according to which apart from the proletariat social historians should also study the landowning aristocracy, those who owned property, the professional bourgeoisie, the peasantry, and the criminal underclass as well as social institutions: the family, clubs, societies. So, the 19th century definition of History as just been political and diplomatic became very pluralistic in the 20th century: economic, social, intellectual History. Within those broad categories historians began to specialize in their work and study in detail subjects such as transport History, the Holocaust, or specific aspects of World war II. Eventually, it was revealed that it is very difficult for historians to agree on what is important about the past as, for example, the History of the Holocaust, its background and its consequences led them to areas of the discipline that are far away from the typical general political-diplomatic-e-

conomic-social complex. Their studies of World War II themes are now (in the end of the 20th century) about ordinary people, their families, specific ideologies and practices. Their historical working hypotheses are different from those who study the same period or about the same protagonists. This fragmentation though asks for more synthetic works summarizing political and diplomatic History along with the History of countries, continents, movements, social groups, diseases, and many others.

During the 20th century, Evans observes very rightly, that groups of History theory revisionists have entered the scene of the study of History and have very arrogantly announced that it is their theory that is the correct one. This happened with quantifiers who used mathematics and statistics, the psycho-historians who believed that all the answers can be found in the theories of Freud and the psychologists, the Marxists who wrote about the proletariat only, the feminists who focused on women only. From their point of view, all previous theories and ways of writing History were “redundant, biased, useless, or false” (p. 201) because their methods were unsophisticated, they were unscientific or neglected certain concepts. Usually, after some time of intensive debate, these theories come to a rest and their supporters form a subgroup in the big family of historians and History theories.

Objectivity in History has been interpreted in various ways. Evans discusses the opposing views of Carr and Elton. Carr identified History with progress and showed that expressing his admiration for the ideas developed for and during the Bolshevik Revolution. History was all about how it contributed to the future, not about the past, not about the present. From this point of view, his definition of objectivity in History collapsed in 1990 with the end of existing socialism. In plain English, historians cannot predict the future. Elton opposed Carr's idea of History as serving the future stating that the purpose of History is to understand the past. Events that happened in the past are to be discovered and historians must study and analyze their traces, the historical facts. Historians should not be biased and select facts according to their preconceived ideas. Objectivity according to Elton meant that historians should read the sources without prejudice. But, Evans, says that historians should engage in a dialog with sources and be aware of theories and ideas that they have formulated in the present so that prejudices and preconceptions do not slip in unnoticed and interfere in their reading of them. Both Carr's and Elton's aspects of objectivity are not fully satisfactory but post-modern theories cannot fulfill the hiatus.

One major question of objectivity is the denial of the Holocaust. Supporters of this conception in the Academia claim that Jew deportation and the Nazi plan for the “final solution” never existed and extermination camps are post-war pro-Jewish political lobby. They insist that their opinion must be listened to as the other side of the coin and they publish scholarly articles with references to sources to prove their points. However, the articles are a mixture of prejudice, propaganda, rational arguments and “scholarship.” Post-modernist theories according to which “meaning is supplied by the reader” (p. 241) have encouraged such interpretations. It is not very difficult to select among the stories of the survivals and the other denial evidence those that they claim that never saw deaths by gases, had a poor but happy life in the camps and Jews were isolated but never exterminated. After all, my comment is, the role of the Warsaw Jew Council in their attempt to save Jewish lives and property has by now become well known. I can add one more denial case that is not based on scholarly evidence but it is discussed among ordinary people and extreme right-wing political figures. The supporters of the Greek Junta period (1967-1974) shut their eyes before the political and physical extermination of non-supporters of the Greek military regime and dictatorship's inhuman methods against them and promote as its main success the economic prosperity of the average Greek. But it is not difficult to find support for

their arguments in Junta official publications and those of Junta theorists who insist how much safer, political stable, and financially autonomous Greece was disregarding any other consequence of its administration. So far, the extreme right wing political supporters of the Junta denial have been isolated and their appearance in the Greek parliament was short lived (2012-2019) and only during the recent world financial crisis.

Evans believes that the new trend in General History to focus on the less important as well as the important is a side effect of post modernism (especially pp. 291-291). He uses the examples of Simon Schama's *Citizens: A Chronicle of the French Revolution* (Knopf, 1989) and Orlando Figes' *A People's Tragedy: The Russian Revolution 1891-1921* (Cape, 1996) to explain the mixture of important with small incidents, personal histories, less important everyday Histories. They are not typical political-social-economic Histories but the focal point is the violence during the revolution. But I believe that this is a method of keeping the interest of the general reader, who is more interested in reading a breath taking narrative of a revolution rather than a typical facts and interpretation account. On the other hand, Evans continues, there are Histories that “build on the obscure and the unknown.” They take very small incidents of everyday life and use them to create a bigger story but in a metaphorical and symbolic way. They intentionally allow for “perhapses,” “may-have-beens” as one of the authors admits, and “speculation”. History is reduced to just mytho-story. The source(s) are just used as an excuse for a nice literary story to be built that is not History. Regarding objectivity, Evans concludes that “[...] the historian has to develop a detached mode of cognition, a faculty of self-criticism and an ability to understand another person's point of view.” The past did happen and historians must find how it happened and “reach some tenable though always less than final conclusions about what it all meant” (pp. 252-253).

Evans' *In Defense of History* is a very useful synopsis of 19th to 21st century History theory as it summarizes and criticizes a variety of ideas about History. It also explains the more that two centuries long conservative-progressive/radical (conservative vs Marxist) ideological conflict of historians as well as the attempt of well known History scholars to misread or read the sources in a different way so that they support their own radically knew History argument and make a sensation in the world of historians and beyond. It also analyses and criticizes the Elton-Carr controversy. The book was attacked by both conservative and progressive in the political spectrum historians, which shows to me that its arguments are well balanced. So, it appears to me that after the completion of the first two decades in the 21st century, there is still belief in progress and the post-modernism in History practice has come to an end. Let it continue in philosophical and literary circles, in Sociology, Anthropology, Ethnology, Art, Music etc. After all, in History there is no post- but only past, I say.

Cannadine's question on History's death

David Cannadine (University of Oxford, DPhil in History) addressed the What-is-History question in a lecture in 2002 the main point of which spun around the then question of whether History was in so deep a crisis that could proven to be “terminal.” In the 20th century, History had sustained two major attacks: the Marxists and post-modernists but political History has managed to remain alive. Also, Francis Fukuyama's claim that the end of History (*The End of History and the Last Man*, 1992) has come with the triumph of liberalism and democracy in 1990 is a very old-fashioned approach. My comment is that Fukuyama just repeated in the late 20th century what Cannadine confirms had been stated a number of times before. In almost every decade of the previous century, he writes, a group of thinkers repeated one way or

another the same argument about the end of History. History was institutionalized in Britain in the first decades of the 20th century with the British History writings of 19th century Historians as well as the establishment of degree programs in a number of British universities. Also, the publication of History textbooks intensified the spread of British History beyond the Academia.

The early 20th c. debate, Cannadine writes, was whether History is an art or a science. In an attempt to place History next to the sciences, J. B. Bury, proclaimed in his 1902 (published 1903) inaugural Cambridge address that History is “not a branch of literature” (p. 19) but “a science, no less and no more.” (p. 22). Eventually, as Evans has also explained, it was agreed that History could be both an art and a science. Another dispute arose between those who favored analytical History and those who preferred the narrative. Lewis Namier (British, 1888-1960) was excellent in dissecting English politics of the mid-18th century and the 1848 revolutions but he could not put together a story. On the other hand, A. J. P. Taylor (British, 1906-1990) wrote History in a manner that anybody could read and understand but he had no interest in analyzing the inner forces of historical change. Historians soon understood that there is no analysis without narrative and narrative without analysis. Working both ways, the narrative will place the analysis in the historical sequence of events. The History of a nation as almost any historical fact can be seen from more than one angles and it is not uncommon for some historians to view for example the 18th century “as a time of progress, modernity, self-made entrepreneurs and secular enlightenment, [while] others insist that it was an old regime, sustained by monarchy, aristocracy and established religion.” (p. 41). My comment is that they are both valid interpretations depending on which geographical part of Europe historians examine, which country, which part of the century. One more difference in History writing, which Cannadine characterizes as “polarised positions,” (p. 42) is between those who follow the French *Annales* school methods (emphasis on climate, geography, social and economic conditions, feelings) and those who adhere to English traditional empiricism (focus on the political-diplomatic sources). Also, he makes the distinction between those who write “micro-history” and discuss very small events or ordinary people and which can contribute to History only if they can fit in a general historical picture and those who write “global history” such as William McNeil (American, 1917-2016). Global history, Cannadine continues, “loses its edge without concrete detail and local specificity [sic].” (p. 42). The next interesting topic that Cannadine mentions is the effect of technology on the teaching and writing of History in the last two decades of the 20th century, which have actually affected me as a historian profoundly. Cannadine focuses on digitization of sources but there is a lot more in History and its marriage with technology and more to follow during the course of the 21st century.

Eventually, he gives a one sentence explanation of why we study History: “the justification for the study of history remains what it has always been: to teach the virtues of perspective and proportion, tolerance and humanity, breadth of vision and generosity of view – in short, to provide what is so often derided as a genuinely liberal education.” (p. 49). First, he believes that History can teach positively and it can broaden one's perspective of the present world, which is nothing else but what is meant by liberal education. One may think that politicians and diplomats were taught their lesson when at the end of World War II the victors did not humiliate Germany as they did in the peace treaties of World War I but again the conditions were not the same and this may be identified as a rather isolated incident in the 20th century. But, my comment is, that massacres in local wars in the 20th and the 21st century were just a repetition of the same events since prehistoric times. In the late 2010s, the world has seen that ISIS' (Islamic State of Iraq and Syria) top leaders and its European warriors

learned nothing from their European/US education and they did not stop the destruction of artifacts in the cities they occupied or of the ancient city of Palmyra (“Which European countries have produced the most ISIS fighters?” *CBS News*, 25 January 2016). Instead, they and their comrades unsuccessfully tortured and eventually beheaded the Syrian antiquities scholar Khaled al-Asaad, and “hung his mutilated body on a column in a main square” (*The Guardian*, 19 August 2015) of the ancient city because he refused to reveal the place where the Palmyra treasures were hidden. They were all blinded by religious fanaticism. Cannadine uses the example of liberal education in the philosophical and political sense and implies that History teaches liberalism. In my view, the study of History does not teach anything and if one wants to apply examples of the past to the present, then s/he can be taught various examples of liberalism, socialism, communism, authoritarianism.

Gaddis' experience with the two faces of History

John Lewis Gaddis (University of Texas at Austin, PhD in History) describes his experience when he interviewed political protagonists of the Cold War for his History and their disappointment when they read what he had written about the historical facts they had lived. Although he explained to them that what they had told him was only their version of the story and he had to combine the stories of other protagonists as well, his interviewees insisted that when those events happened he was just a child and he had no experience or knowledge. So, Gaddis explains that “history is [...] a representation of reality. It's not reality itself.” (p. 136). What happened, what I call event, he writes, is one thing and the constructed memories, the facts, is another. As individuals, he continues, “there's much that we suppress, whether consciously or unconsciously, just as there's much else that we choose, quite deliberately, to emphasize.” (p. 137). Winston Churchill was a History protagonist, on the one hand, and the writer of his own History on the other. However, historians used a lot more beyond what he wrote in order to write his History. He would definitely not like a lot of what has been written about him and his doings. Historians must first judge the past in its own terms and then apply their own present judgment on it.

At this point, it is worth noting the case of the German historian Heinz A. Richter and his book on the Battle of Crete during the Second World War. In 2011 Richter published his *Operation Merkur: Die Eroberung der Insel Kreta im Mai 1941* in which he discusses the German “conquest” of the island of Crete from the German military point of view. The historian discusses in detail the operation which was conducted by parachutists, the allied and civilian resistance on the island, and why the German army arrested and executed civilians, Cretans, but only those who did not fight in regular military units. He explains that according to the prewar Geneva Conventions on humanitarian treatment of soldiers in war those who fought the Germans in organized army units and used fire weapons were considered soldiers and when captured were treated as prisoners of war. But those civilians who attacked the German parachutists individually or in ambushes using agricultural weapons or rocks or their hands were considered as guerrillas and when arrested they were executed according to the German military orders of the war. In addition, the German forces executed family members of the guerrillas including women and children for retaliation of the unorthodox war fought by their relatives. Although both actions (guerrilla war and execution of innocent civilians) was illegal, the retaliation on civilians was back then considered by the German commanders legally justified because the Cretan civilians fought an unorthodox war. It had been for the first time during World War II that the German army had fought against a regular allied army as well as against guerrillas, who according to the German notion of war fought a dirty war that had to be replied

appropriately. The Cretans and the allied perspective of the Battle of Crete, claims Richter, has created the idea that against the law of the war the local civilians fought bravely the invaders and in any possible way without firearms. It is this notion that Richter tries to overturn explaining that the retaliation was in line with the German understanding of war regulations. The book was immediately translated into Greek and it could be read by both scholars and non-scholars as it had been done with other books of the same author. In 2014 Richter was going to be publicly commended in Greece for his work on Greek historical themes and be awarded an honorary doctoral degree by the University of Crete. During the ceremony though there was reaction. Cretans provoked by at least one high rank military retired officer of the Greek army interrupted the award ceremony and protested against the author and his book on the Battle of Crete. The honorary degree was awarded but a few years later under the pressure of the islanders and various Greek authors and journalists it was eventually revoked. The author was also sued for his book on the History of the Battle of Crete as it being insulting to the Cretan people. However, the Greek court of law dismissed the suit as being against the freedom of speech. Some Cretans believe that in his work Richter justifies the German atrocities against civilians and undermines the great efforts of the locals to fight the invaders in any possible way and with any means. They also claim that he presents the parachutists as noble soldiers and not as cruel conquerors. In a few words, Richter has presented for the first time in Greek History writing the German military view of the invasion based on sources from the German archives along with those of the other side of the hill. In strict military terms, this is a view based on German military war regulations and what was then accepted as war practice from that point of view. Cretans and especially Cretan army officers who have been proud for centuries for the use of guerrilla war against invaders of their island felt insulted when the invasion and its effects on the local population was undermined. In any case, the same historical fact can be viewed from two different angles: the invader's view and the local resistance view point. Richter explains in detail the former but he does not deny the latter. In this case, the History of the Battle of Crete should be at least a balanced combination of both views as they are actually just two of the many faces of the same coin: The Battle of Crete fought by Germans, Greeks, British, Australians, New Zealanders.

Gaddis believes that the past may constrain or may liberate the present. His example of what may constrain the present is presented above with his reference to the interviewees who saw in the present only their view of the past. Regarding liberation, he refers to the example of a child who at an early age believes that is different from all the other children but later on learns that his/her past was similar to other children's past. By reading Foucault, youngsters may believe that he invented homosexuality but later will understand that it was already referenced in ancient times. The historian, Gaddis continues, “performs both acts upon the past itself.” (p. 145) and he insists that this is the purpose of studying History, the balance between the polarities of oppression and liberation and as a result this has an impact on the society.

My comment is that this may sound as a post-modern metaphor. I find this idea too abstract, too philosophical, and it might be understood in terms of the philosophy of History but it does not really add anything important to the practicing of History. He is also using the same idea to the teaching of History. Students and teachers are both oppressed and liberated by the teaching and learning of History but, in my view, this is a very abstract idea with many different interpretations.

Hughes' macro-History, social sciences, and psychoanalysis

Henry Stuart Hughes (1916–1999), a Harvard educated historian (PhD) was very much interested in psycho-history or the combination of History and psychoanalysis. He begins his published lectures by explaining micro-history versus macro-history. At the micro-history level a historian is precise in what s/he is investigating but at the macro-history level s/he needs to establish long-range “trends.” It is at this level that History must be written if we would like to understand “man's wider relationship to his environment.” (p. 7). German historians of the 19th century who followed von Ranke's belief that they were going to explain the facts as they did happen, they actually wanted to investigate a fact or a personality and get to its “central idea” that would help them understand it. This idea was deeply religious (protestant) and was trying to find and understand the will of God in the past. So, there was no need for any analysis but just for the evidence that would prove what happened. Based on the ideas of German idealism, romanticism, positivism of the 19th century, they created the discipline of History, which was separated from literature and philosophy. Positivism influenced those who believed that History was a science like the natural sciences and the historian should find “causes” and “laws.” The scientific discoveries of the early 20th century changed the landscape of natural sciences and History could not fit anymore to this new framework. Dilthey (see below) in Germany and Croce (see below) in Italy tried to re-establish History as a discipline with its own methods and procedures. But it was not enough anymore for a historian to find the “idea” or the “spirit” in a fact and they tried to describe the process by which a historian put a coherent narrative of the past. Still, though, they thought that the historian needs to arrive at the “*verstehen*,” the “inner understanding” of facts and capture the past. Hence, a sense of mysticism was introduced to the study of the past. Feelings and emotions possibly inherited in a fact cannot be reproduced by the historian, they are not verifiable. So, idealism did not lead anywhere: von Ranke's faith was not enough and the search for “*verstehen*” was now not enough again to help a historian understand the past. No historian of the early 20th century wanted to accept the idea of historical judgment, that a historian needed to interpret the past. This was the first step towards a new approach of History in a new century. The second or a parallel step was that of economic and social History in France. Marc Bloch (*Apologie pour l'histoire ou Métier d'historien*, 1949) also accepted that historical judgment is subjective but he pointed to tangible evidence like archaeological remains, linguistic differences, folklore and the like. Bloch thought of a historian as a craftsman who would try to re-enact the past in his mind and in his History and at the same time would try to discover as a good craftsman process of the past such as methods of tilling the soil in Medieval Age. There was nothing to be re-thought as these processes were described or could be found as archaeological evidence, for example building of towns and walls. The historian became now the re-constructor rather than the narrator of the past and this way s/he could find more truth in the past. Hughes states that Bloch made the historical knowledge more manageable.

Truth in History, Hughes, explains has remained a matter of historical argument for a long time. Some have argued that a historical narrative is true only if it corresponds with the facts. If the criterion of judgment is only internal: “—if an account is to be accepted or rejected primarily for its artistic and philosophical elegance—then it is difficult to see where the writing of history differs from the strictly imaginative exercises of the human spirit.” (p. 18). This is a 1960s rejection of one of the post-mod-

ernist arguments for literary imagination in History. Hughes argues that the historian needs to get out of the “philosophical fog” by trying to find what is false. The historian writes nothing that is not supported by the facts and this way s/he tames imagination. On the other hand, this gives the historian the liberty to go beyond the scrutiny of the documents and use historical judgment (interpretation) in order to view the facts from various angles.

Afterwards, Hughes turns to the relation between History and social sciences. He uses Hippolyte Taine's (1828-1893) phrase about ancient man: “A language, a legislation, a catechism, is never more than an abstract thing: the complete thing is the man who acts, the man corporeal and visible, who eats, walks, fights, labours,” (Taine, *History of English Literature*, 1871, p. 3)⁴ to show how important is the historical figure itself as a human being living in the natural entronement. But the thinker who began this discussion was Giambattista Vico (see below, Italian 1668-1744). He was interested in ethnology, archaeology, language, and anthropology and influenced historians of the 19th century. He helped them pay attention to other living manifestations of the past, especially archaeological remains, apart from the “documents.” This is exactly the idea of the human History that was put forward by Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre (1878-1956) in early 20th century France, who tried to investigate social, economic, geographical, psychological manifestations of the past. Febvre wrote that this goal could be achieved though a combination of scholarship and imagination, imagination constrained by the sources. A very difficult but not impossible task. What is very difficult is for a historian to understand the mind of those historical figures, a task that Vico proclaimed to be beyond a thinker's power. How did they see, heard, felt, smelled their present? Hughes proposes three ways: technological change, psycho-physiology (for example, diseases and senses), language (the link between body and mind). (p. 29 and following pages). Vico was the first one to have stated that human beings are the only ones who can understand human culture because they used their minds to make it. Technological improvements (for example, mechanical innovations) are usually anonymous but in historical terms they are as important as a new religious dogma or a constitutional enactment simply because they are creations of human mind and this is of paramount importance. My comment is that when it comes to the writing of General History, History is usually written collectively and rarely solely by individuals.

Hughes continues that peasants and soldiers exercised so much that the physical deformation of their bodies was thought natural at the time but it would not be acceptable today. Also, in the Medieval period humans were generally short as the armors in museums can show but very powerful when they used their hands and feet. Nowadays, the study of diseases and how they have affected human History has been given great attention. In the 16th century hearing people speaking and touching things were given more importance than just seeing them compared to 20th and 21st century priority of viewing. In current times we first view, then hear, and then touch. In the 16th century, writing and printing was at its infancy and people were trained to remember what they heard. Regarding language, Hughes uses the example of multi dialects in South France in the 16th century but I will use its Greek equivalent. In the 19th century and until the mid-20th century, there were at least four versions of the modern Greek language that were in use: the first one was the official Greek language (*katharevousa*) that was mainly used in the public administration and the universities; the second one was a simplified Greek version of the official language that was used

⁴ Taine published his *Histoire de la littérature anglaise* in five volumes in 1863 and was translated into English in two volumes in 1871. The translation was slightly revised in 1873 and the work was published complete in one, two, or four volumes.

in the newspapers, by scholars and some literary figures and from the 1950s to the 1970s was taught in high schools; another one was the Greek spoken tongue (*demotike*) that was used by laymen and some literary figures as well as in Greek primary education in the post World war II period; along with the previous ones there were many local Greek tongues spoken in Crete, Moreas (The Peloponnese), Roumeli, (West Central Greece) Epirus, Macedonia, Ionian Islands, Cyprus and were generally understood in full only by the locals. This multi language and dialect phenomenon with versions of Greek mixed in their local variants with additional words and phrases from other languages (mainly from Italian, Albanian, Turkish, Slavic languages) had a great effect on political, social, economic, cultural developments in 20th century Greece. The “victorious” language, current modern Greek of the 21st century in its written form (schools, press, media, official publications, literature), is a mixture of roughly (words and phrases in long texts) 70-80 percent of the typical spoken language (*demotike*) and a 30-20 percent of the old simplified official language (*katharevousa*). In its essence, the current modern Greek language is very similar to Byzantine and Classical Greek, even to Mycenaean Greek considering some words that have survived intact in the last 1600 years or so.

Hughes connected History and psychoanalysis, a branch of early 20th century psychology which had become very popular in Europe and the United States in the 1960s and 1970s. The “how” and the “why” in History writing is very similar to the same questions used in psychoanalysis, he explains, because the central question is the human motive of actions. In this case, our understanding of it is either hidden or imperfectly known. (p. 43). Motives are not always clear in the protagonists of History and historians can usually just find the “preparatory elements” or the “hidden trauma” (p. 52) that led a “historical actor” to one or more choices s/he had to make in his life but this can be substantial contribution to History. The psycho-history studies usually attribute an individual's actions to experiences s/he had in his/her early age. Later studies on a similar basis attributed individual behavior to “youthful struggle for self-definition.” (p. 59). He agrees with Toynbee's idea that institutions can be understood through the study of the elites that controlled them, most successfully in late republican Rome and 18th century England. This could explain the general despair after the Black Death period in the Medieval period and the 19th century aesthetic movement of Romanticism. Hughes wants to liberate History writing from libraries and documents and hopes that some doctoral candidates will concentrate on the “psychological aspects of historical interpretation.” (p. 65). However, there is no way that a historian can be fully trained in the graduate school on using psychoanalysis in History. S/he needs to educate himself/herself. Hugues reminds us what Theodore Mommsen (German, 1817-1903, see below) said in his Rectoral address (1874) at the University of Berlin: “If a professor of history thinks he is able to educate historians in the same sense as classical scholars and mathematicians can be educated, he is under a dangerous and detrimental delusion. The historian ... cannot be educated, he has to educate himself.” (p. 66).

The narrative may be the way a historian conveys how s/he participated in the events of the past. Historians agree that “narrative history is far less simple a matter than it appears to be.” (p. 70). On the other hand, a historian's judgment may be concealed in a narrative as the writer is not providing the explanation and Hughes concludes that narrative History is neither comprehensive nor as “objective” as it is widely believed. In the 1960s it was very hard to find a political history written from the point of view of the voters or a battle narrated from the standpoint of a soldier. Most

probably because their “range of vision” was limited from a historical aspect. Also, the historian must be selective and focus on certain events whose specifics he describes and s/he should provide only a summary for the background. This leads to the eyewitness accounts. The historical question is how much the eyewitness was able to see, how much s/he remembered, and what s/he recorded in his account. A great example is that of Winston Churchill and his multi-volume *The Second World War* (1948-1953). Winston actually saw very little of the war and, I add, he described it from his own perspective only. Also, Hughes says, it is impossible to describe an action of a mob when there are no leaders to tell it. Therefore, the narrative historian can present to the readers the change through time and the gradual transformation of a situation into another but this is still fragmented. S/he is especially interested in “dramatic episodes” (p. 81) that become the peaks of the narration and alternate with the general pictorial picture of the era described.

Then Hughes turns to the question of how “real” contemporary History is as it may lack documentation, perspective, or “objectivity.” Regarding sources, he reminds us that the soviet archives were sealed in the 1960s but he also agrees with Carr that the documents tell us what the author thought it happened or even what he wanted us to believe that happened. But there are other types of “documents” that can be used and, my comment, is that this is especially true in the digital era of the 21st century. Today, a historian may have more sources to study for recent History compared to those that are available to him/her for the 18th and the 19th centuries. There is a lot that has vanished, Hughes continues, from previous centuries either intentionally (destroyed by the owner) or unintentionally (natural phenomena, war, other human action). Historians should be the authors of contemporary History, otherwise “others less qualified will undertake it for us” (p. 93), he writes, and refers to non-trained historians such as journalists. Not that all Histories written by journalists are bad. He agrees with Croce's saying that all History should be considered as contemporary given that the historian expresses his/her own attitudes when s/he write History and therefore each generation of historians write its own version of History and therefore, there is no definite History. Also, themes that historians dealt with in great detail in the beginning of the 20th century, such as the political strife during the epoch of the French Revolution, were later discussed in a summary fashion as religious, social, economic themes had entered the picture. The new themes should be taken into consideration along with the political ones. Regarding objectivity, there is no need, he writes, for a historian to be indifferent to cruel events or to apply moral judgments to events. “If we simply do our job *as historians* with both conscientiousness and imagination, the ethical issues will emerge clearly enough.” (p. 98). Thucydides, after all, wrote a History of the Peloponnesian War of which he was a participant but he felt that the defeat of Athens by Sparta was a turning point in the History of the Greek Cities, of World History or *Oikoumene*,⁵ in ancient world terms. Thucydides admitted that Sparta's military supremacy and Athenian inept had led to the disaster at Syracuse. He managed to detach himself from his Athenian citizenship and try to see the events from both points of view, Athenian and Spartan, and recognize successes and failures on both sides.

Hughes summarizes the History writing questions of an era, the mid-1960s, when Carr had just published his *What is History?* The shift from political and diplomatic History towards social and economic History had just began and the inquiries on the philosophy of History were temporarily put aside in favor of the opportunities that the new sources offered to History writing. He introduced the theme of psycho-

⁵ This Greek world is also spelled as *Oikoumene*, *Oecumene* or *Ecumene*.

analysis and History so that historians understand the motives behind human action, especially of leading figures. He also touched the difficult topics of imagination in History narrative when the sources are silent, truth in History, and the writing of contemporary History. Although he does not explain it at length, he believes that History is both an Art and a Science, in its own terms.

Barzun's psycho-history and quanto-history

More than ten years after the publication of Hughes's book, Jacques Barzun (1907-2012, PhD in History, Columbia University) elaborated on the “New History” of the 1970s, psycho-history and quanto-history. He was bothered by the proclamation of the time that traditional History was dead and especially with the introduction of quantification the discipline became “more efficient.” (p. ix). He wanted to prepare the new student who had just “taken history” (Survey of Western Civilization or World Civilization Survey, most often a two semester/one year introductory History course/module in the US college/university higher education terminology and tradition), and s/he is usually attracted by what is new in a discipline. He sees psychologists, sociologists, economists, statisticians as the new doctors that are trying to cure Clio, the ancient Greek muse of History, from her long lasting diseases. They are the ones who claim that with the application of their tools, History will solve problems. In the 1970s this was reinforced by the dominant position of the social sciences at school, the new art movement, intense commerce, technological miracles and the futurist drive for the “education in the year 2000.” It was thought that History cannot contribute in the contemporary world. After all, History could/can provide no excitement as a discovery in the natural sciences, except from the search for sources and “the play of imagination and judgment upon them.” (p. 4). In comparison with anthropology, psychology, and psychology, History looked old and inexact. In dealing with masses the historian needed to turn to social questions and inevitably to use new tools for counting and measuring. History may had not been more scientific from von Ranken's times but social History emerged as a “historical specialty.” The new History of the mid-20th century though also referred to the use of psychoanalysis in the study of historical personalities and therefore in the writing of biographies.

Barzun begins the study of the use of psychoanalysis in biographies by giving its definition: “[It is] the practice of taking an utterance or an action not at its face value as an expression of straightforward desire or purpose, but as an involuntary symptom which, when properly interpreted, discloses a meaning hidden from the agent and from common observers.” (p. 7). Apart from Homer who was first interested in the characters of Nestor, Ulysses, Achilles and other protagonists of the war, Herodotus was the first to discuss motives and describe the socio-anthropological environment of the places he visited. In his *Politics*, Aristotle, tries to find the causes of revolutions and explains the succession of the forms of government. Plutarch is the ancient author who wrote extensively on the doings and the characters of “great men” and compared them in his *Parallel Lives* as if he could find common laws of human action by studying their common features. Discussions on human character can also be found in Tacitus and Procopius (Byzantine historian, AD 6th century). At this point, I would like to analyze the bad/good human puzzle for the historian. In biography writing or even in general analysis of lives of history figures, matters become sensitive when the historian studies human beings or leaders who are bad or very bad or extremely bad in the mind of the average reader, for example, Hannibal, Peter the Great of Russia, Hitler, Stalin, Metaxas (a dictator in inter-war Greece). The general reader would expect a full condemnation by the historian of those leaders who ordered the torture of their enemies, executions, massacres, the Jewish Holocaust, began wars that cost the lives of

millions of people, abolished democratic institutions. However, without justifying any of their horrible actions, the historian will try to analyze the motives of their actions by investigating in their childhood and adulthood and more specifically will try to find psychological traumas, a timid or aggressive early age character, an anti-social behavior, a passion for power and many other psychological and sociological factors. In fact, though, all these may just be indications of one's future behavior and not proofs. In any case, the malicious character of a personality should not hide from the eyes of the historian the other side of a leader's actions: Hannibal's strategic mind, Peter the Great's reforms, Hitler's policies that benefited the German middle class of the inter-war period and resulted to his full support, Stalin's good theoretical side of the collectivization of the soviet economy, and Metaxa's social policies. In general, dictators benefit the working and the middle classes so that they have their support. Needless to say that the historian should discuss the balance between the beneficial and the catastrophic policies of the historical figure in discussion. However, his/her goal must not be to just hide the crimes and promote their social policies only.

Barzun then turns to a nowadays common place practice, the use of tables and charts, and figures in a History study, especially one that uses statistics of psychology and sociology agents (human beings). Charts and tables and numbers in general should be included in a study of a historical event when they help the reader understand the quantitative argument made by the author. They should be referred to and be explained in the main text but they tell only the truth that their compiler or author wants them to tell. That is why using models, typical in economics and other social sciences, does not help a historian understand a person's or group's action(s). In his criticism of psycho-history methods Barzun includes the following: the sequence of steps taken and results is not explained; a mixture of methods is permitted; the pass from individual psychology to the “mind” of an age or group is not clear, the method of defining and analyzing, defining and measuring is not clear; questions asked may be non-historical. All of the above make a historian very skeptical of new tools to be used for the study and writing of biographical History. Barzun discusses Freud's essay on Leonardo Da Vinci and he finds that his whole argument is “slight as well as doubtful” (p. 51): Leonardo was considered to be a homosexual because he was grown only by his mother but nowadays we know that his sexual orientation is not certain and it is questionable whether the father abandoned the family completely. Also, the hypothesis that Leonardo's habit not to finish his works derived from his now disputed homosexuality does not stand the comparison with Goethe who also found finishing works difficult but he grew up with his two parents and was not a homosexual. Judging from the analysis in Lytton Strachey's *Eminent Victorians* (1918), Barzun concludes that the author believed that “his portraits would seem searching if he took as tell-tale signs something not only small but mean. The isolated, equivocal, unsuspected fact stimulates the fantasy and the habit of pseudo-reasoning, [...]” (p. 53).

On causation Barzun explains the difference between historical causes and the cause-effect situation in the natural sciences. In the latter a single cause leads to a single effect but in History as life consists of a number of conditions, all of them can be conditions that lead to one or more effects. Barzun claims that Psycho-History and Quanto-History wish to solve “pressing problems” (p. 78) using various ways. One study of returning Vietnam veterans tried to show that the “apprehension of death and expose to death” (p. 79) was the most important psychological fact of that era and explained the hatred for war. However, Barzun says that this was not quite History, even in its widest definition. It had already been observed that even in previous wars of the 20th century learned men had argued why they (temporarily) hated German music and

philosophy but the feeling is self-explained. Moreover, there are no good or bad aspects of History and there is no “solution of the problem of the war” (p. 80) that can be derived out of the study of one war, especially because wars differ among themselves. There are so many influences in one's view of the war in human History, such as religion, nationalism, traditional hostility and more, that may not be taken into consideration by a psycho-historian. Solutions to the “immediate problems” (poverty, slavery, urban problems) may require that their student applies *a priori* judgments on facts. A historian begins his/her study with a hypothesis that can be changed in the light of the evidence but an *a priori* moral choice cannot be changed with disgrace to the one who conceived it. The study of the culture of the people or the masses, may hide completely the individual behind historical facts. The focus on the collective mind, the unconscious that sheds light on the conscious of individuals and specialized groups of people, hides the “autonomous force” of “great men” as they appear to be “driven like the rest and by the rest.” (p. 81). Also, the definition of the people for whom psycho-history studies have been published is not clear and do not represent *das Volke*. On the other hand, criminals, lunatics, infants, and even animals have been studied with interesting results in some cases.

There are four criteria, Barzun continues, by which History may be known: narrative, chronology, concreteness, memorability. In principle, History is nothing else but a “story” and it is not required that a historian uses interpretation. The “story” includes political, social, economic, and other changes within time and place but what prevails is the what-happened, concreteness. He uses this axiom and separates History from Biography. Biography may be a study of character, ideas of a person, or “spiritual states” and only few events are used for the analysis. Also, studies of situation such as institutional problems, cultural types, revolutions, decadence, slavery or women studies are similar to Biography. Events in the History of culture can also be described in the form of a narrative and can be History unless the author refers to problems or influences. Last but not least, History is a description of memorable events. Actually, it is what is “worth remembering” and what is “capable of being remembered.” (p. 93) Although what needs to be remembered is different from person to person and from historian to historian, no historian would like to describe in detail all the facts, even if that was possible. My comment is, that this effort would defeat the purpose of writing a coherent “story.” Therefore, Barzun continues, a historian should be selective and follow an “intelligible pattern” in selecting his/her facts. In writing a history, the historian will interrupt his/her story telling to “comment, explain, argue, speculate, moralize, and compare.” (p. 94). This way, there is no single simple formulated truth in his writing but many truths which address the “intuitive mind.” History, he concludes, “like a vast river, propels logs, vegetation, rafts, and debris; it is full of live and dead things, some destined for resurrection; it mingles many wafers and holds in solution invisible substances stolen from distant soils. Anything may become part of it; [...] For history, the reward of eluding method is to escape abstraction.” (p. 95).

Mathematical precision is not important for History and historians because what is significant is the “activity” to be described and discussed. For example, the exact number of Xenophon's Ten Thousand is unimportant. If the number of soldiers was 9900 or 10.200 nothing would be different in what was the History of that Greek army at the end of the 5th century BC. Of course, in my view, the order of the magnitude does matter as well as other points: the route, the time it took the army to reach the sea, the events during the march, the changing feelings between despair and hope, and the final arrival at the coast celebrated by the cry “The sea! The sea!”

“The historian follows the evidence,” (p. 111), Barzun writes and he means that a History may consist of a specific human situation in a certain era, economic and

social life, education, leisure, and many more topics of common life. Even a long list of furniture and other belongings of a person or a family may say something about the living conditions of the period under study. Moreover, a number of historians have refused any role to the “great men” of History because it is said that, for example, if Napoleon did not exist somebody else would have taken his place in leading France because what was done “was bound to be done.” (p. 113). But this means that those events were inevitable. However, who could have foreseen what Napoleon had done before Napoleon did it. This is impossible. On another instance, pure science can claim that if x then the result is y but History can only say that y comes out of x. History connections are undetermined. History is nothing else but “imperfect mosaics” that is held together by a “logic of events” (p. 123) which is perfectly understood between writer and reader.

According to Barzun, “The use of history is for the person. History is formative. Its spectacle of continuity in chaos, of attainment in the heart of disorder, of purpose in the world is what nothing else provides: science denies it, art only invents it.” And he continues: “Nobody can read, even in part, the histories of Caesar, Clarendon, Guizot, Ranke, Motley, Mommsen, Maitland, or Roztovtzeff and be the same person afterwards.” The reader does not read history (=a story) but he reads History because “history is a means of cultivation much more than of instruction.” (pp. 123-124). Finally he concludes with the following aphorisms: History is (a) an antidote against cultural poisoning; (b) an antidote against credulity; (c) an antidote against homogenizing; (d) an antidote against overintellection; (d) an antidote against self-centering, which he explains in detail. When a historian “fuses” with other disciplines, s/he should try to use both and make the best of them for his/her “own declared purposes,” but is this possible? (p. 154).

In this study Barzun tried to search for History, investigate what History is as well as ways of writing it. Also, he discussed and criticized the new at the time genres of psycho-history and quango-history.

Hobsbawm's Marxist history

In his collection of lectures and essays on History, Eric Hobsbawm (1917-2012, PhD, University of Cambridge) makes some important observations. He begins with the duty of the historian. The object of study that historians investigate is real and there is an absolutely “central distinction” between fact and fiction, historical statements that are based on evidence and those which are not. “Objective reality is accessible” (p. viii). The study of History is based on realities like the fact that Rome did defeat Carthage and not that Carthage defeat Rome in the Punic Wars. Although he would easily reject large parts of Karl Marx's (see below) approach to History, Marxism inspired him and he critically accepts that the materialist conception of History is the best guide to History. (p. ix). In defining a Marxist historian he makes the point that although he had already been a declared Marxist, the Soviet authorities never translated any of his books into Russian and important French publishers refused to translate his *Age of Extremes* (1994) “on the grounds that it is ideologically too shocking for Parisian readers.” (p. ix). Yet, in Britain Marxist historians were the ones who understood that the theological conception of the purgatory in Europe in the Medieval period could be explained by the turn of the church from the few nobles to the people for the fulfillment of its financial needs. But were the medievalists Richard Southern (British, 1912-2001) and Jacques Le Goff (French, 1924-2014) Marxists when they quarreled academically in the 1980s on the above matter? In the final analysis, nobody's work should be “judged by the political labels they or others attach to their

lapels.” (p. x). What is important therefore is the historian's outcome not his/her attached or assigned political inclination.

He thought that History compared to nuclear physics could do no harm but by 1992 and by studying nationalism in the 20th century he had understood that History writing could become a bomb. Pakistan history/archaeology writers had claimed that the ancient Indus valley belonged historically to them but the Pakistan state was created in 1947. In the late 20th century, Turkey had claimed that she had rights over Priam's gold treasure of Troy discovered by the German H. Schliemann in the 19th century because the place is now part of modern Turkey, a successor of the Ottoman state that had existed for a few hundred years. The historian, therefore, has a responsibility to historical facts in general as well as for criticizing the political abuses of History. What may confuse a reader trying to understand recent or current History is historical fiction when novelists use modern events to place their stories disregarding the dividing line between fiction and History. This is reinforced by academics in the fields of literature and anthropology who promote post-modernism denying the clear difference between fact and fiction. But for the historian the distinction between the two is fundamental: “We cannot invent our facts.” (p. 6). Modern Greeks, writes Hobsbawm, have claimed that all Macedonia is theirs based on the conquests of Philip II of Macedonia in the 4th century BC but how close was the relationship between Ancient Macedonians and Ancient Greeks and who can deny that the modern geographical area Macedonia is “historically such an inextricable mixture of ethnicities,” (p. 7) which has given the name *macédoine* to the French mixed-fruit salads. History cannot be replaced by myth and invention in order to serve political purposes whether, I comment, justifiable or unjustifiable. School History books, of course, play their nationalistic role all over the world from the Japanese trying to sanitize their war with China and, I add, among Balkan states trying to prove what area belongs to whom or between Turks and Greeks who try to determine their national roles in the 19th and 20th centuries. Nowadays, Hobsbawm continues, schoolteachers, some university professors, journalists, and media producers who teach and write about historical events are educated people and therefore acting as historians they should remember their responsibility to “stand aside from the passions of identity politics” when they speak about historical facts and write History. Historians “must resist the *formation* of national, ethnic and other myths, as they are being formed. It will not make us popular,” (p. 9) he concludes.

As a teacher and a citizen, he remembered what one of his own teachers told him: the college/university teacher will teach mostly average students with boring minds who have no interest in what they study and they write essays just above the passing line. As a teacher you will enjoy teaching the brilliant students but the ones who really need you are the rest, the plain citizen. This applies also to the people anywhere in the world, those who “are not particularly clever or interesting [...] not highly educated, not successful or destined for success.” (p. 9). My comment is that a historian should mainly aim the average educated person and that is why s/he must be clear in his/her communication with him/her or explain the historical confusion in clear terms over a fact or a series of historical facts and their interpretation(s) without undermining of course historical methodology.

In another instance, Hobsbawm tries to justify the use of Marxism in the study of History. History can only “discover the patterns and mechanisms of historical change [...] and “the transformations of human societies during the past few centuries [...]” (pp. 30-31). But this requires an “analytical framework for the analysis of history,” which is nothing else but the human capacity to control nature by manual and intellectual means, technology and the organization of production. In reality, this means

the growth of human population and especially in the past few centuries the growth of production and the productive capacity. This is progress and is the basis on which Marx built his idea and analysis of human History. Hobsbawm accepts that in principle this approach is “indispensable” although Marx can be generally wrong or just inadequate. Any History discussion is possible only when it starts exactly where Marx started and that is “a materialist conception of History.” (p. 31). However, at the end of the 20th century it was true that only a very small percentage of the population of a country needed to work the land in order to feed the rest of the inhabitants and there was a decline in the other “socially necessary productive labour force outside farming.” (p. 32). This is what History is called to explain. Throughout History growth was possible because of inequality but this has recently changed with an enormous growth in total wealth and as a result a large number of wealthy laborers. At the end though, those people who are no longer needed for production will depend on pensions and other means of social welfare, “that is by a political and administrative mechanism of social redistribution.” (p. 33). In a number of countries, the social security and the expanded public sector provided income for a large number of the population. This, Hobsbawm concludes, will create new challenges in the future, towards the end of the 20th century that historians may be asked to explain. My comment is that Hobsbawm lived long enough to witness the financial crisis at the beginning of the 21st century but not long enough to see the survival of laborers in western societies.

In one of his lectures, Hobsbawm touches the notion of progress in the study and writing of History. Scientists in the natural sciences will not, for example, study Newton for knowledge in contrast to philosophers who will return to Plato and Aristotle for knowledge and inspiration. Historians do something similar because they usually read the books of their older colleagues. Sometimes, they read history books written decades or centuries ago admiring the outcome of the historian's work. Gibbon will be read today just for his scholarship and his “literary merits” but not as a source of historical knowledge. Also, they may read an old History work if a topic that was discussed by a historian decades ago has not attracted the interest of more recent historians. But this process cannot be considered progress. Progress in the study of History is, according to Hobsbawm, the new in the late 1970s mixture of History with the social sciences which “moved away the discipline from description and narrative to analysis and explanation.” (p. 63). Of course, social scientists are also looking towards History when they want to give historical perspective to their studies. Marxism, he writes, is the best approach to History because “it is more clearly aware than other approaches of what human beings can do as the subjects and makers of history as well as what, as objects of history, they can't. [...] Marx also evolved a theory about how the ideas of historians themselves are likely to be affected by their social being.” (p. 65).

History is everything and anything that happened in the past, just a second ago. Historians are of course selective in what they are going to study and in what depth, depending on the scope of their work. Hobsbawm insists that History should not be fragmented in sub-fields as it includes everything, it is “total” or “global.” Economic, social, anthropological, psychoanalytical History is just History and it also includes family, women, children, death, human sexuality, rituals, food, climate, crime, human health. Why the “transformations of human kind” –why food gatherers or hunters evolved into the modern industrial (I say now, digital) society– were completed in only one region of the world, is the main question of History.

In the above lecture, the British historian implies that narrative and political History is “easy” History without any intellectual challenge as it is just a chronological presentation of events from the archives. He explains how boring British Parliamentary History can be when the historian just describes the various views expressed

in the Houses. But the other History, especially the economic one, can be very “difficult” as it needs the analysis of data based on models in combination with theories proposed in the appropriate jargon. He returns to his economists and historians and their interaction arguments of his in chapters 7 and 8 of his *On History*. But let me discuss the viewpoint just stated above. As it is explained previously in this chapter, economic History based on collection of data, models, and theories may lead to wrong historical conclusions. From History's point of view, historians should not normally employ methods used by economists with statistics, models and theories on any event of the past unless the required data set is present. Let us discuss this point further. In Europe, there are countries like Great Britain that have kept and do keep statistics religiously for hundreds of years and therefore it might be possible for a historian to retrieve large sets of data and study them. Based on that data, a mathematical/economic model may be created and used to prove or reject a hypothesis related to a historical event. This is possible. On the other hand, in countries like Greece where statistical information is scarce or fragmented, the historian may lack the necessary data in order to create a hypothesis and test it. Therefore, one can admire the complex economic thought, models and theories but this does not mean that they are always useful in History. My own *Land, Peasants, and State Policy in Greece, 1924-1928* which was written in the early 1980s did employ statistics in order to show economic trends but avoided models and theories for the financial situation of the Greeks in the inter-war period as it was too risky to draw conclusions based on very limited data. Also, economists use very frequently the *ceteris paribus* axiom that allows them to freeze time and conditions and apply a model under a desired situation. But a historian cannot do that. S/he has to take into consideration politics, political situation(s), financial situation(s), foreign relations, legal environment and many other parameters as a fact is most of the times influenced by more than one conditions and for a long period of time. Yes, an economic analysis may influence, reinforce or disprove a historian's hypothesis but always in conjunction with other factors. A man of humane letters, a Marxist who studied the mathematically oriented works of Karl Marx, one who has sought straight forward mathematical relations in an economic situation that clarifies a historical hypothesis will definitely be positively shocked by the complex but nicely deployed analysis of an economist and will consider a historical narrative very simple in terms of history writing. However, when a historian wishes to write a narrative, possibly a General History, and give to the reader an as complete as possible picture of an era will need to decide what must be narrated, discussed in more detail, explained from the whole range of human activity (politics, society, economy) that may include subjects such as diplomatic negotiations, sexual life, childhood, the world of the criminals, mentalities, food availability and eating habits, buildings and furniture, legal peculiarities, natural phenomena, scientific discoveries and technological advancements, just to mention a set of possible themes for a sound General History. Therefore, the historian needs to be able to understand economics, laws and their application, science and technology, the mind of people in the past and the present, and present all these in a coherent and apprehensive essay readable and understood by the average educated human being. The result will be an analytical narrative that is extremely difficult to be achieved, a labor of very few historians. History though is fun and I believe we all subscribe to Hobsbawm's phrase: “I am enjoying myself enormously.” (p. 70).

Hobsbawm began one of his lectures/essays with the question: “Can continents have a history as continents?” (p. 217) and he referred to Europe. The name of the continent was given by Ancient Greeks but throughout History it has been “a shifting, divisible, and flexible concept.” (p. 219). The original concept derives from the military confrontation of the Ancient Greeks and the Persians as well as the cultural meet-

ing of Greeks and Scythians around the northern parts of the Black Sea. Apart from military or cultural confrontation this meeting of civilizations can be also seen as “symbiosis and syncretism.” (p. 219) The Mediterranean is a sea of syncretism in classical and late antiquity. Since ancient times, the Greeks lived and flourished in three continents (Europe, Asia, Africa) until their expulsion in the 20th century from Egypt and Asia Minor. From a political point of view, when the Roman and the East Roman Empires (Byzantium) collapsed there was a vacuum that for the next millennium invaders from east, north and south tried to fill or conquer. From Charlemagne, who was the ruler of the only part of Europe that had never been conquered, to the crusades against Islam and the Spanish *reconquista* the wars were not fought in the name of Europe but in the name of Christianity. Only from the 17th century with the conquests of the New World did Europeans recognized Europe as a continent rather than a faith. For the next 500 years Europeans conquered the world and European History became Global History. For more than forty years, between 1945 and 1990, Europe was either Western Europe or Eastern Europe. In the last decade of the 20th century and the first decade of the 21st century Europe acquired a new meaning in economic and political terms with the inclusion of Spain, Italy, Greece and the “doubtfully 'European'” Britain. “There has never been a *single* Europe. Difference cannot be eliminated from our history.” (p. 220). In the last two centuries Europe ended there where the club members of their Europe wanted it to end. Metternich claimed that Asia began at the eastern exit of Vienna where according to a series of articles in a Vienna newspaper the “barbarian-asiatic” Hungarians lived. Romanians proudly recognize themselves as East European Parisians living among the backward Slavs although an Austrian author has essentially described them as “Africans.” Europe, though, is essentially divided between the rich and the poor. There has been a cultural and economic slope that runs from West to East and looks down upon the Russians, a slope from North to South that considers the Spaniards as “Africans” and the same slope from North to South Italy. In any case, since the end of the 15th century world history became Eurocentric. European History exists only because Europe transformed itself and transformed the world. Hobsbawm sees some unity in terms of the 17th century international state system of the era, a community of scholars that first appeared then, the emergence of an urban model of education, culture and ideology but in reality, he explains, “there is no historically homogeneous Europe.” (p. 226). However, Europe is defined as its diversity, the coexistence, its dialectical interaction. The modern world cannot be explained without her. We, Europeans, are not unique in the world and we do not possess unique characteristics that come from our antiquity. However, the History of the continent remains unique if one thinks of two peaks, the neolithic revolution that brought agriculture and then metallurgy, cities, classes and writing and the science, technology and economy revolution of the 17th century and later on. Europe now is not the center of the world and historians need to rethink of European History as both regional and as part of the History of the world.

Hobsbawm is correct. A History of Europe cannot exclude the shores of the Mediterranean and the Ancient Near East in any period of History as even today, in the 21st century, European countries like France and Germany interfere in the affairs of or cooperate with Libya, Egypt, Israel, Lebanon, Syria, Turkey, Cyprus, Greece in order to solve local problems before they become European matters of attention. He is also correct when he writes that there were periods in History when European History became Global History and the reference is to the times of the Discoveries, the so called “Era of Vasco da Gama,” and the period of European imperialism. But Europe, the Europeans, in my view, do have a History and it is the History of the peoples who have lived since Ancient Times from Iceland, Ireland, and Britain to Russia, Asia Mi-

nor (today Western Turkey) and Cyprus and from Scandinavia to Sicily and Crete and even Egypt. Therefore, a History of Europe and/or the Europeans need to deal with events beyond the geographical boundaries of the continent, when it is necessary and this is what I have done in my *The Mediterranean, Greece and Europe. History Archaeology Civilization* (in modern Greek).

It is interesting to conclude that Hobsbawm was attracted to modern History because he experienced the traumatic events of the first half of the 20th century. Also, his political inclination led him study the recent past in order to understand his present in the 20th century. In my opinion, this makes him a historian who used the past – History– for the sake of the present in the same way that Karl Marx did it as Hobsbawm explains in chapters 10 and 11 of his *On History*. On the other hand, the other group of historians comprises of those who study the past so that they understand the human situation in the past and not in the present.

Stone vs Hobsbawm

In 1979 and in 1980, Lawrence Stone (1919-1999, educated at the University of Oxford) and Eric Hobsbawm exchanged ideas on the revival of the narrative in the journal *Past and Present*. It had long been considered that the historical narrative was useless in the post-World War II period of the 20th century as the focus should have been on the new Histories and analysis mainly based on the historian's ideological inclination. But Stone wanted to show that the historical narrative could be used and be seen from a different point of view to that of just story telling. “Narrative is taken to mean the organization of material in a chronologically sequential order and the focusing of the content into a single coherent story, albeit with sub-plot,” Stone explains. The narrative has a theme and an argument. Thucydides's theme was the Peloponnesian War and its destructive effect upon Greek city-state polity and society. Gibbon dealt with the decline and fall of the Roman empire and biographers tell life stories. As defined above, narrative History does include analysis but it is not the main theme of the work. Stone defines three modes of “scientific history” in the 20th century historiography. The first one is the Marxist economic model of the 1930s in its simplistic form of thesis and antithesis and clash of classes, whose 1950s version is concerned with the state, politics, religion, and ideology exactly as the non-Marxist historians do. The second mode is that of the French *Annales* school historians who discuss the shift between food supply and population based on long-term data series on agricultural productivity, demographic changes, food prices. The third mode is the American bred cliometrics used by data oriented historians in economic and demographic politics (voting behavior) History. Scientific historians believed that the major problems of historical explanation (causes of revolutions, the shift from feudalism to capitalism, the change from traditional to modern societies) could be solved by their methods. According to them, changes in the relationship between population and food supply, changes in the means of production and class conflict were the driving forces of History while for some of them intellectual, cultural, religious, psychological, legal, political phenomena were just “epiphenomena.” Therefore, economic and demographic data had to be presented in studies of historical analysis. The French historians used the following pyramid for the study of History in order of importance: economic and demographic facts, social structure, intellectual, religious, cultural, political developments. Characteristically, Le Roy Ladurie claimed that there was no change in the Continental European society from the 14th to the 18th century as the society remained traditional throughout. This was called “l'histoire immobile” and made such movements as Renaissance, Reformation, the Enlightenment as well as the rise of the modern state disappear. Artistic, cultural, literary, scientific, legal, military, fiscal changes

were ignored. Even when some historians used quantitative methods in the analysis of literacy and Christian piety, this was considered as a third stage of priority in historical analysis. However, all these factors are interwoven, i.e. social, economic, and literary factors may interact on one historical fact simultaneously in different degrees of influence.

The collection of large quantities of data, what we might call today in computer science terms “big data,” and the application of sophisticated methods for results to be used in historical analysis possesses various issues. Are historical data sufficient and/or reliable for such mathematical/statistical operations? Can assistants be trusted in the transfer of data (type of original documents and level of detail) into electronic form? Can coding and programming errors be eliminated? Can most historians understand the procedures including the sophistication of mathematical formulae and computer processes applied to data so that they verify the results? In the 1970s world of computing, I comment, these were all valid concerns. Nowadays though, computing and its applications, methods of analysis and results as well as the level of computer literacy of historians can eliminate them. Moreover, Stone claims that pen and paper can do the same work as computers and can be more reliable. Not in big data analysis, though, when it comes, for example, to parish registers, I believe, that is so even when Historians are not expected to produce major results as Stone writes. But when it is about mathematical calculations, the well programmed computer software will make no mistakes. This is the scope of my *Diophant Ancient Measures Converter* software. It is true that History and computing has been unable to solve the great problems of History for the very simple reason that computing is a tool for the presentation and manipulation of historical data and not a new method of historical analysis. It cannot solve the problems all by itself. Stone, proves this point by writing that after thirty years (counting backwards from 1979) of intensive research on demographic History we still do not know (a) why there were population fluctuations in most areas of Europe in the 17th and the 18th centuries; (b) the debate on the causes of the English, French, American revolution is still very hot; (c) the questions on American slavery remain live.

However, E. Le Roy Ladurie prophesied that “tomorrow’s historian will have to be able to programme a computer in order to survive.” (*The Territory of the Historian*, p. 6) = “l’historien de demain sera programmeur ou il ne sera plus” (p. 14). If one takes this literary, Ladurie was wrong. Historians as computer language programmers are very few in the world, and the author of this book is one of them, but generally there is no usable historical data for the programmer to work on. On the other hand, in the 20th century and beyond there is an abundance of data for economists and sociologists to work on, whose specialized studies a historian could use. So, a historian's training should be on understanding and verifying the results of the specialized studies and not on being able to conduct them himself/herself. What an educated historian and computer language programmer can do is create searchable databases in order to be able to find quickly the documents or the information one needs to study for his/her research. Digitization of periodicals, books, and historical documents was and is more important than isolated studies with the use of results from computer data. But Ladurie was right in the sense that historians of the 21st century cannot exist without knowing how to use a computer for researching, studying, writing History. It may sound easy and commonplace but in reality it needs a new skill to be developed by the historian: where and how to find what s/he needs and at the same time evaluate what s/he may find. It is the electronic library skills that a 21st century historian must develop.

Stone believes that the new mixture of other disciplines with History leads historians back to the narrative as well as their attempt to reach the wider intelligent public. The new History questions that are asked and the new methods used are merely a dialog among experts with a lot of statistical data and other sophisticated tools which need to be presented in an apprehensive form to the interested public. The public is ready to digest studies on political power, authority, and leadership, youth, old age, disease and death, birth, sex, marriage, contraception and abortion, family, work, leisure, the relationship between religion, science, and magic, the concepts of love, fear, lust and hate, literacy, community, nation, class and race, crime and punishment, the significance and results of popular protest, ecological questions. In the 1980s writing a historical narrative was not considered scholarly work or it was thought that the author had accepted the publisher's offer just for the money. Regardless of the type of writing, the method and the mode of History writing are there in any historical study, whether a narrative or an in depth monograph of a specific topic. In these narratives historians are not concerned with the great and mighty but with the lives, feelings, and behavior of “the poor and obscure,” the narrative is mixed with analysis, new historical sources (family papers, police reports, transcripts of interrogation of criminals) are used and historians explore the unconsciousness and behaviors. They use the History of a person, a battle, a trade, a trial, a historical episode in order to reveal “the internal workings of a past culture and society.” These approaches, though, create problems when a study of a microcosm is used from historians to extract general conclusions for a historical period or era. This is the fallacy of generalization. In any case, the new narrative is not based on the traditional political and diplomatic History but on the “New Histories” which need it in order to reach a wider public and convince for their existence as readable Histories by the general educated and interested public.

Eric Hobsbawm replied and challenged Stone's opinion on the revival of the narrative. The works on economic and social History published by French and British historians after World War II and before 1980 may not represent the new narrative historians that Stone claims they exist as he concentrates on a tiny portion of the members of the profession. However, it is true that the narrative and biography historians do exist and they are not looked down upon by the avant-garde of the 1970s. For the new narrative historians, the event, the individual, the way of thinking of the past “are not ends in themselves but the means of illuminating some wider question, which goes far beyond the particular story and its character.” Those historians continue to be interested in the “big *why questions*” of History but they do not go back to the old “antiquarian” methods of narrative that still survive in detailed political Histories. In any case, Hobsbawm states that attempts for a comprehensive History present complexities which historians try to overcome using various ways. He suggests synthesis but incorporating politics, society, science, education, literature and possibly other human activities makes the task very difficult. But the new political and biographical History instead may be seen as complementing the socio-economic works. Historians may see the world either through a microscope or a telescope, “the choice between microcosm and macrocosm is a matter of selecting the appropriate technique.” “We are all anxious to discover where historians are going,” Hobsbawm concludes and rejects Stone's judgment “about what are good, and what are less good, modes of historical writing.”

My comment is that the narrative as a synthesis of sources and opinions of historians on certain topics is more than necessary so that interested academics are able

to be informed on the state of research and publications as fast as possible. Otherwise, they would have to search by themselves for the literature, which is usually a time consuming and tiring process that may lead one to the conclusion that a certain topic is not useful for a certain historical research. On the other hand, the narrative as a General History is extremely helpful to students and the general public who would like to read the basics on certain historical periods. It may also be a start for anybody who is preparing the writing of a monograph within a certain period and would like to have a grasp of a longer historical period before s/he begins. Narratives in the 21st century should not just be political History but as it has become the norm in the surveys of European or world History in the USA they must include politics, diplomacy, economy, society, science, technology, religion. They will all be discussed very briefly in about a thousand pages but these publications are usually stepping stones for historians-to-be.

Braudel's longue durée

It was in 1958 when Fernand Braudel (1902-1985, French educated at Sorbonne Université) wrote about the time in History and especially about the *longue durée*, the long term of historical time. Historians define the time periods they study in their works. In traditional Histories the historical time is short and the themes are about individuals and events. The economic and social History works in historical cycles that may, for example, concern changes in prices of goods. Therefore, there are monographs with historical discussions of isolated political events that may have lasted from a day to a few months and other History studies on socio-economic events that inevitably span over a long period of time, from years to decades. However, Historians can concern themselves with even longer time periods of centuries, which is what Braudel names *longue durée* and it is beyond the traditional period of “*l’histoire événementielle*,” the History of events. In other words, in a traditional History monograph the historian will work on a political or diplomatic event discussing actions of individuals that lasted for a short period of time (instant time). On the other hand, the economic and social historian will work on phenomena that may even only directly refer to people, such as prices, births and deaths, shifting social customs and ideas that by definition took a long time to develop and they need to be studied for very long time periods (long time). The distinction to be made in historical time is between the *event* that lasts for a moment and does not have long time impact on human lives and the economic or social *cycle* that lasts for a long time and has a great impact on the lives of those affected. A day's life for a human being may include a number of political, economic, social, cultural, natural *events* such as a political fight, the price of milk, a railway accident, a storm, the death of an important person, the opening of an artistic event and many more manifestations of every day life whose historical time though is very short and “does not make up all of reality.” (p. 28). So, a political History of even a century has always been worked on the principle of “great events” and by definition of short sliced historical time. This history is driven only by the discovery and use of documents that tell us the “whole truth.” Historians of traditional History promulgate that if we allow the documents (ambassadorial letters or parliamentary debates) one after the other to speak by themselves, the chain of historical facts and events will be reconstructed almost automatically before our eyes. Apart from this criticism, Braudel does recognize that there were some 19th century historians who managed to recapture the long time in their work and he refers to Jules Michelet

(1798-1874, see below),⁶ Leopold von Ranke (1795-1886, see below),⁷ Jacob Burckhardt (1818-1897),⁸ Fustel de Coulanges (1830-1889, see below).⁹ The cycles of rise and fall of prices in the 19th century, though, as well as changes in economic growth, income, gross national product need to be studied under a very long time span. Braudel is a strong believer of statistics and insists that historians should use them for studies even as back as the 16th century (p. 51). However, my comment is, that a historian must be very careful with statistics as numbers may lie if not collected and used properly.

For Braudel “history is the total of all possible histories – an assemblage of professions and points of view, from yesterday, today, and tomorrow.” and he adds, “all the human sciences, history included, are affected by one another.” (p. 34). Braudel's statement above needs further discussion. My comment is that as History (human and natural), in my opinion, is the total of human and non-human activity from just a moment ago to the beginning of the universe, it is by definition inclusive of all manifestations of life. Human activity is affected by all forces of life, natural, political, economic, social, legal, cultural and they all belong to the sphere of History. A historian though cannot be an expert in sciences, politics, economics, sociology, anthropology, psychology, law, literature, geology and so many other distinct sciences as they have been developed in the 20th and the 21st century. But s/he needs to be able to understand the principles of all those sciences so that s/he is prepared to understand the various forces that operate on one or more events s/he studies.

In my first book, *Land, Peasants, and State Policy in Greece, 1924-1928* written in the early 1980s, I decided to work on the transformation of Greek agriculture and peasant life in the 1920s, a decade that changed the very large rural part of the country for half a century. That study begun with a survey of the land proprietorship from the establishment of the modern Greek state to the end of World War I in South Eastern Europe (1830-1919) and then I discussed the major social and economic event of pre-World War II Greece, which was the influx of the Orthodox Greek refugees from Asia Minor (West Turkey) to mainland Greece. A fact that was caused by the defeat of the Greek army in its attempt to reach Ankara and conquer West Turkey. Then, the agricultural settlement as well as the social problems of the refugee establishment were studied. One of the major issues discussed was the distribution of the large estates that dominated rural Greece until then. Separate chapters were devoted to new institutions for Greece, agricultural credit and banks, agricultural education, the construction of public works and their technical difficulties, widespread diseases and public sanitation. A final conclusion emphasizing the central social and economic phenomenon in Greece of the early 20th century ended the study. All of the above were based on archival research as well as social and economic studies of the period in Greek, English and French. It was very helpful that in parallel to my History courses/modules at university I had studied economic History and economics as well as the principles of sociology and I was able to understand the relevant works I read. But my book required more specialized legal and technical knowledge that I had to acquire by studying relevant works but not to the point that I became a lawyer, a doctor, an architect or civil engineer.

⁶ He defined the word Renaissance in his nineteen volume *Histoire de France* (1833-1866).

⁷ He was the founder of 19th century historical methods based on primary sources (empiricism), narrative History, international politics. Major work: *Die römischen Päpste in den letzten vier Jahrhunderten*.

⁸ Major work: *Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien*, 1860.

⁹ Major work: *La Cité Antique*, 1864.

In my yet unfinished work *The Mediterranean, Greece and Europe. History Archaeology Civilization (3000 BC- AD 2000)* I have recognized three great cycles or periods of change in European History. I have defined Europe as the geographical area inhabited by people (Europeans) from Iceland to Greece and Western Russia included and from Scandinavia to Sicily and Crete but with moving frontiers (Asia Minor, Africa, Asia, Oceania) depending on the historical period. From ancient times until the 1950s Europeans (mainly Greeks and British) lived in Egypt and influenced the local civilization. From ancient times until 1922 Greeks lived in Asia Minor (today West Turkey) and influenced the local civilization. Also Greeks and Romans in the East Roman or Byzantine Empire influenced the civilization of the Russians and the other Slavic peoples from the 8th century onward. The influx and the settlement of the Germanic tribes into the European continent from the 2nd century BC to about 800 AD added to the European flock and created the New Europeans who dominate the European civilizations until nowadays. However, since the late 15th century the European civilizations became global with the Great Discoveries of the Americas, Oceania, South East Asia, and Sub-Saharan Africa. Thus, within this moving geographical frontier three changes occurred to the European Civilizations. Civilization is defined as any manifestation of human activity, positive or negative, that was exercised by Europeans in groups of nations or by individual nations/states throughout their existence on Earth. Before the beginning of the European cycles, I recognize a pre-human period of Earth History (creation of the Universe and the Earth) as well as a non-European human Pre-History and History on Africa and the Ancient Near East that influenced the European civilization of the Greeks and the Romans. Although for reasons of conformity with what is widely known by the layman I will still make the distinction between Pre-History and History with the latter beginning with written records, I accept proto-human technology and burial customs as culture/civilization and specifically material culture/civilization. However, what defines the intellectual borders of my three big periods of European civilization is the interaction or non-interaction of Europeans with religion or the magic. The first period which begins with the Greeks and ends with the rise of Constantine the Great to the throne of the Eastern Roman Empire (c. 1800BC-337AD) is named the “Age of Statues” as the Greek civilization had separated religion (ritual and myths) from science and this separation was accepted by those of the Romans who followed the Greeks and of course it is shown in Roman law. There may be no clear answer why the Greeks broke the Middle Eastern tradition of religion or magic as the driving force of creating a civilization but historians have proposed among others the climate of Greece, the rise of participatory political systems (democracy or oligarchy), the rise of philosophy as a distinct system of thought from religion and the radical idea of the use of Chaos (new ideas created by the Greeks from nothing, non-existent, zero). In mythology, the Greeks attributed the beginning of the world to Chaos, that is, the use of nothing for the creation of something or a number of somethings. Chaos was an inexhaustible source of thought that Greeks used to create religion, laws, political systems, philosophy, art, science and History. This is the “Age of Statues” as the European civilizations are characterized by clarity, it is exactly what is shown, what a beholder sees throughout the more than 2000 years that it lasted. The second period (337-1571) is named “The Age of the Holy Icons” and the word icon represents the images (icons or statues) of God, Son, Virgin Mary and the Saints as well as the image of Emperors, Kings and political leaders as gods. In this period, Christianity dominated the European civilizations and any reference to life, after life, the natural or the supra-natural world needed to be in line with Christian belief. Christianity utilized or slightly adapted and used from the ancient past the Greek and Latin languages as well as modified ancient religious customs. Christian re-

ligion and beliefs dominated the “Age of the Holy Icons,” the end point of which are the years 1571 and 1572. Two very important events for European History and European civilizations took place in those years. In 1571, in the naval battle of Lepanto (Naupactus, off Patras, Greece) the united Catholic Christian fleet (mainly of the Spanish Empire and the Venetian Republic) of the Holy League arranged by Pope Pius V defeated the naval force of the Ottoman Empire and stopped its political and religious (Islam) expansion westwards into Europe. It is the last battle to be fought entirely between rowing vessels, the galleys that were the direct descendants of the ancient triremes. It closes a technological era and opens a new one and it constitutes a landmark in the territorial safety and Christian continuity of Europe. There was a second infantry battle between the Holy Roman Empire (Hapsburg Empire and combined Polish-Lithuanian army) and the Ottoman Empire near Vienna in 1683 which marks the final defeat of the Ottoman Empire in her attempt to expand into Europe. The second very important event that happened in 1572 was the discovery of the Supernova star SN 1572 (Tycho's Supernova). It became the object of study of astronomer Tycho Brahe and constituted until then the most important observation in the History of astronomy and science because it eventually changed the human understanding of heaven. When in 1605 Galileo Galilei was informed about and studied the Supernova, he was led to the conclusion that the Aristotelian notion that the Earth is in the center of our planetary system must be questioned. He initiated the era of science independent of religious beliefs. This begins the third unfinished yet cycle of European History, “The Age of the Idols,” that is characterized by idols such as Philip II of Spain, the Burbons in France, Henry VIII of England and the Stuarts all the way to Hitler, Churchill, the Kennedies, Lenin, Stalin, Mao as well as the idol of pure science and technological advancements but independent of religion. This is my definition of the *longue durée*, the big cycles of which do include shorter cycles of continuities and discontinuities of European civilization in the economy, the society, the arts. The backbone of the narration is political and military History but the economy, the society, political and legal systems, literature, women, children, slaves, criminals, prostitutes, human sexuality, the animals as well as natural phenomena and the History of the Universe are also discussed in their own *longue durée*.

In two essays, Braudel discussed in detail the theory of the History of civilization. He criticized the theories of civilization put forward until 1960 and mainly Toynbee's theory of the twenty-one or more civilizations throughout human History. He discussed the meanings of civilization and culture and introduced the idea of structures in civilizations. He did not forget to praise France as possessing the dominant civilization in continental Europe, he began the European civilization in the 5th century and forgot all about Ancient Greece, Rome, and Byzantium. In those essays, he tried to explain the idea of civilizations (society, economy, mentalities, continuities, structures) as forces of History in contrast to politics and diplomacy. Nowadays, there is no doubt that History must examine civilizations whatever the definition is to be given to the word.

Beard's American definition of History

The discussion of the American culture introduced to other nations (coca cola, chewing gum, jeans, music) was a popular theme in the 1970s and 1980s mainly among sociologists and current History analysts but American historians had already talked about the American civilization in the 1920s in a different context. Charles Austin Beard (1874-1948) received a PhD in History from Columbia University and in 1927 along with his wife Mary R. Beard co-authored *The Rise of American Civilization*. In the introduction of this book he wrote: “The history of a civilization, if in-

telligently conceived, may be an instrument of civilization. Surveying life as a whole, as distinguished from microscopic analysis by departments, it ought to come nearer than any partial history to the requirements of illumination. [...] Dealing with all the manifestations of the inner powers of a people, as well as the trappings of war and politics, the history of a civilization is essentially dynamic [...].” In that same introduction he insists that the History of a civilization is not only concerned with arts and letters but with trade and industry as well. This is because “business enterprise wrests upon the whole heritage of western civilization – its religious disciplines, its laws and morals, its crafts and skills, its sciences and arts, its tastes and aspirations” as “thought and the materials of life evolve together.” Apart from women's relations to arts and letters their power as buyers of goods draws them “into the main stream of history as thought.” This is the idea of bringing women into the light of History. Beard points out that the fact that a history of civilization includes apart from politics, ecclesiastical affairs, commerce, finance, science, the fine arts must be attributed to Voltaire (1694-1778) and his work *Le Siècle de Louis XIV* (1751). Beard's book is the political and diplomatic History of the American nation but it does include analysis on economic developments as well as references to cultural manifestations of life.

A few years later, in his 1935 essay “That Noble Dream,” Beard discussed the shift from the typical 19th century theory of History as developed and used by Leopold von Ranke, the search for the “objective truth,” a noble dream, to the new for the time economic interpretation of History. The search for the truth in History contains certain assumptions. First that the object of History exists “outside the mind of the historian.” The second is that the historian can know and describe that object as “objectively existed” and therefore it would have been the finally written History that would permit no other modification. The new students of History would just have to read the masters and learn them by heart. The third is that the historian views this object impartially, without any religious, political, philosophical, social, sex, economic, moral, and aesthetic “interest.” The fourth is that the events of History have some “structural organization” which the impartial historian can apprehend “by inquiry and observation and accurately reproduce or describe in written history.” The fifth is that history can be grasped “by purely rational or intellectual efforts.” This theory of Historicism includes all the implications of empiricism and positivism as well as History's “purely experiential aspects.” Although von Ranke saw History as revelation of God, the historical facts as they had happened, and he was against positivism in History, he still “was controlled by a kind of *Pantheismus*” [all gods, all religions]. However, he did write the History of the Popes pleasing both Catholics and Protestants of the upper class and was convinced that he had written it exactly as it had been. However, the question is: was the papacy an institution of the Son of God or a man made power? How could von Ranke avoid answering this question? But his personal life story has shown that “impartial” Ranke became a “bulwark for Prussian authoritarianism,” unable to separate his political from his historical conceptions. Therefore, even von Ranke had been unable to avoid been impartial, actually expressing the view of the “conservative reaction in Europe.” Von Ranke's theory of History and its culmination in Historicism had been criticized by German historians of his era and others and the arguments can be summarized as follows: (a) It is believed that History took place in the past as actuality and outside the mind of the contemporary historian; (b) and that the historian sees History only through the documents; (c) but the relics of History cover only part of the actuality of History; (d) the historian can very rarely be certain that s/he has collected all the documents of an era, s/he usually works on a selection of them; (e) the historian does not know the total actuality as s/he works on part of the sources; (f) the idea that the structured events in the past are there to be discovered by

the historian after s/he examines part of the historical record is only a hypothesis; (g) events and personalities of History involve ethical and aesthetic considerations by nature; (h) coherence and structure in events of the past in written History can be given only with the employment of some interpretation; (i) the historian cannot work on the selected relics of the past with a neutral mind that just views History being revealed through the reading of a series of documents because he remains a human, a creature of his time, place, circumstances, interest, preconceived ideas, culture; (j) the material selected and used is influenced by the historian's personality and philosophy; (k) the historian might search but never find the “objective truth” of History or write it “as it actually was” (“wie es eigentlich gewesen”). Von Ranke's theory, which crystallized as Historicism, suffers from internal contradictions and is rejected by modern thought.

In the final analysis and by using economic history as an example, Beard continues, one can observe the following: (a) economic history is only a part of the total events of History; (b) it is an explanation, a version, not the absolute truth of History as no one interpretation of History can be considered as valid and final because we are not in a position to know the past as it actually was; (c) an economic History is not inferior of any History written with the principles of historicism; (d) an economic Historian may be as doctrinaire as any other historian who seeks the past as it actually was; (e) the study of economic History does not mean that by definition the historian follows Marxian theories only because s/he may draw information from the writings of the *Federalists*, the fathers of the American nation, Daniel Webster, Locke, Hobbes, Machiavelli, Aristotle and Marx himself. Beard was the first historian in the US, in the bosom of the *American Historical Association*, who set the direction for the “New History” in the mid-1930s. History is not just political ideas and diplomacy, it is also other human activities such as the economy. He, also, explains to the historians that no historian can be impartial and no written History can reflect the “objective truth” as there are factors that influence the historian, his methods, and his writing of History. Nevertheless, Beard is to be remembered as the first History professor who used in his teaching in class the nowadays required –at least in the US– compilation of historical documents for discussion and examination.

Before the middle of the 20th century, US historians felt that History needed a definition. In a 1946 report of the Committee on Historiography of the US Social Science Research Council, Beard provided three complementary definitions (p. 5 n. 1). Specifically he wrote that “[...] history-as-actuality means all that has been felt, thought, imagined, said, and done by human beings as such and in relation to one another and to their environment since the beginning of mankind's operations on this planet. *Written-history* is a systematic or fragmentary narration or account purporting to deal with all or part of this history-as-actuality. *History-as-record* consists of the documents and memorials pertaining to history-as-actuality on which written-history is or should be based.” In that same report, Beard explained that the choice of words used by historians for written History are of great importance so that “falsities and uncertainties” (p. 107) are avoided. Moreover, a short terminology list with explanations was compiled in order to guide historians in the correct use of terms such as analogy, cause, change, development, progress, civilization and culture, dialectic, fact, generalization as well as prepositions (pp. 134-140) for researching and writing History.

Thus, Beard working from within a public agency tried to formulate definitions and rules regarding the discipline of History and on how historians should work. This was a great step forwards and away from von Ranke's “formula” of historical research and writing. However, Bear's political views after World War II and during the Cold War undermined his contribution to the theory of History.

Huizinga's definition of History

Just a few years earlier in 1936, a European historian had given his own definition of History. He wanted to distinguish History from other disciplines as this was a time in Europe when History was considered to be part of philology, archaeology, linguistics, anthropology. Johan Huizinga (1872-1945) was an idiosyncratic Dutch historian (doktorandus = M.A. in literature, Leiden University, The Netherlands) who had studied linguistics and literature but because of his great interest in medieval history, he was eventually appointed as Professor of History at Groningen University in 1905 and Professor of General History at Leiden University in 1915. He was very much interested in cultural History and what we now call History of mentalities. His main work focused on Medieval History, which he viewed as decay in culture. Huizinga in his essay “A Definition of the Concept of History” wanted to define History not because he saw any utility for the discipline but in order to “get the concept clear.” (p. 4). He considered History as a “phenomenon of civilization” (p. 4) and he viewed it as a representation of a portion of the past but “not the reconstruction or the reproduction of a given past.” For Huizinga, civilizations have a past of their own and he concludes that classical antiquity, the ancient and the more near East, the primitive civilizations of the world have become non detachable parts of our own (Western) civilization and “our history is the first to be world history.” Therefore “History is the intellectual form in which a civilization renders account to itself of its past.” In this definition, Huizinga, claims that with the use of the term “intellectual form” we avoid the distinction between historical research and historiography and what is common between History and art. The term “a civilization” suggests the subjectivity implied in every History. There is plurality in History forms. The rendering account to itself is “the intellectual activity from which History takes its rise” and bridges research and composition. It includes every form of narrative, pragmatic, genetic treatment of History and every form of historical source (annalist, memoir writer, historical philosopher, and the researcher) as well as any written historical form from a monograph to a world History. History becomes eventually “an integral constituent of the civilization.” This is an open definition without restrictions related to cycles, definitions, abstract or concrete character of History, particular or general interest of History. It “leaves room for all sorts of controversial systems and conceptions.” My comment is that in plain English, Huizinga, means that every civilization has a History and its History is its representation. So, any form of History is acceptable as long as it reflects its civilization and this matches perfectly with the conception of the civilization and its History in the Medieval period.

In another essay, (“The idea of History” included in Stern's *The Varieties of History*) Huizinga states that “historical thinking is always teleological” (p. 293) and points to what he calls dangers for History. He begins with discussing anthropomorphism when human characteristics are given to concepts such as civilizations (grow, live, die), he continues with inflation of terms when the term Renaissance is applied from the 13th to the 17th century and concludes with stereotypes. The use of stereotypes such as capitalism, feudalism, reaction, bourgeoisie, democracy may be dangerous when they are applied in a different context from the one they were invented for. Periodization is an example by which he illustrates his point. Christian authors saw the History of the world until the end of the Roman Empire as a glorious succession of empires, their current period as the Modern Era and the in between time as the Medieval period (the middle period), that is, the period of “barbarism and darkness” (p. 296) that separated them from the splendor of Ancient Times. When these three divisions were accepted in about 1700 by academic scholarship they still preserved their emotional content: glory of antiquity, decay for the Medieval period, progress for the

Modern Period, the era of Discoveries (The New World), renovations in art and religion, science. Eventually, the Medieval period was covered with a luster of beauty and nostalgia and all three periods were given the “value of a cultural idea with positive content.” (p. 297). However, the debate on strict chronological boundaries for the beginning and end of these periods shaded their cultural connotation. For a historian, those terms must actually mean nothing but a tool of assisting him/her study human History. He also explains that for the general understanding of a period, a particular event must always relate to a more general. “The unique event is comprehensible only in its general context.” (p. 298). The life of the masses, their work and suffering, their hopes and delusions, their passion and violence is not understood without the individuals who formed ideas, performed deeds, who won or lost. The historian must analyze and synthesize. These are basically practical instructions to historians as Huizinga insisted that he never occupied himself seriously with the theory of History.

Meinecke's revival of historicism

A historian though who did write about the theory of History was the German Friedrich Meinecke (1862-1954) who was educated at the University of Bonn and the University of Berlin and was a professor at the University of Strasbourg. He tried to revive historicism by analyzing the most important ideas of statesmen and political thinkers and adding intellectual History. In his book *Staat und Persönlichkeit* (1933) he also dealt with values and causation in History (included in Stern's *The Varieties of History*). He distinguished three modes of causality: (a) mechanistic; (b) biological; (c) spiritual-moral. The mechanistic includes equality between cause and effect. The biological allows the effect to grow from an embryonic condition to grown-up life with its own “structure, purpose, and lawfulness.” (p. 268). According to the spiritual-moral mode, the activities of human beings which cannot be explained by the mechanistic or biological modes are affected by the “spontaneous and purposive impulses of personality.” (p. 268). The historian who searches for the reasons of the poverty and the wealth of nations, their victories and defeats in wars, will come up with causes that are purely mechanistic. A process of crystallization works in events as forms and shapes of the human community develop, flourish, and decline. Until the Age of the Enlightenment, historiography saw History as the result of individual and personal decisions and actions according to the rationality or irrationality of their motives. Later historiography added other causalities and processes but undermined the role of the individual and considered him/her as part of “collective forms and forces.” Also, there has been a tendency to assign biological characteristics to individual historical phenomena as done by Oscar Spengler [German, PhD in Philosophy, 1880-1936 wrote *Der Untergang des Abendlandes*, 1918-1922 (translated as *The Decline of the West*)]. But the scientific approach to History by von Ranke accepted the interaction and interpretation of the three modes and now the one, now the other as exercising greater influence. “In explaining individual phenomena and assembling them in larger sequences and structures it [History/historiography] preferred to be guided more by indefinable finesse than by an explicit and principled position.” (p. 270). The artistic intuition and the shaping of events by guided artistic intuition as both a beautiful and superfluous part of an historical substance “discovered purely causally” was also regarded by History/historiography as an essential technique. Thus, History uses tools of art. For History to remain a causal “science” it would be required to accept as its domain the totality of human events. But History is selective and the historian is interested in what is influential but this cannot determine what is essential for him/her. Causality can be determined by “physical conditions and necessities of life” (the soil and the sun, hunger and love) as well as by power struggles of nations and states. Every scien-

tist should seek for truth, for true causalities, undisturbed by “practical distractions.” Historians, as servants of science, cannot be full unless they are filled with the aspiration for truth, which becomes “a culture and a way of life.” A historian cannot avoid subjective tendencies because the mere selection of facts requires his/her evaluation because he selects the material for study according to his/her “living interest” in the content. “Although the historian may, in form, abstain from value-judgments of his own, they are there between the lines and act as such upon the reader.” (p. 273). Even a historian's implicit value judgment will arouse the reader's own “evaluating activity.” A natural scientist is motivated by the value of truth but of the three values in the humanities “distinguishing, choosing, and judging,” s/he uses only the first. It is the “scientist of culture” who needs to use all three as they can be understood only under this condition. At the end, Meinecke creates a definition of History and believes that “history is nothing but the history of culture, culture signifying the production of unique spiritual values, of historical individualities.” (p. 285). However, the central place of historical sciences is occupied by political History because it is closest to life although there are debatable arguments for economic and social History regarding their relations to life. They can be considered as “interpenetration of nature and culture.” But the state (political History) will always be the most influential in life and a human being who wants to be perfect will only be in a state which aspires to perfection. He agrees with von Ranke that if states reach the level of spiritual entities they will combine practical and spiritual things and then the question will be whether the source of cultural value rests in the state or in the minds above it. Is it located in the Greek city-state or the platonic idea which grew out of it? In some cases the first one is true, in other cases it is the second. Most of Meinecke's ideas come from von Ranke. The student had the opportunity to praise his spiritual teacher delivering a memorial address in 1936.

In the 1957 German edition of Meinecke's book on historicism the editors included the address he delivered in 1936 in commemoration of von Ranke's death. It is in this speech that he summarizes the teacher's views and achievements in the development of historical studies. Von Ranke, writes Meinecke, believed that major decisions of statements were derived from high motives. For the state's benefit and in turn for the world's benefit. However, von Ranke's tendency to emphasize these motives grew higher and higher as he got older and older. Initially, Napoleon was portrayed as a conqueror who wanted to rule the world, later Napoleon's actions were reconsidered in the light of the struggle between France and England and the reason is that he let himself be guided by his sources. But then the question that had emerged in the early 19th century was whether the historian should interpret great deeds as achievements of individuals or human communities. Von Ranke recognized some truth in the statement that men (human beings) make history because he saw no problem with those two different interpretations but he insisted that great personalities make all the difference in History making. Von Ranke stated clearly that “everything, both general and individual, is an expression of spiritual life.” (p. 502). In von Ranke's mind everything spiritual is attached to the real world. He believed that the historian should always look for the general, by which he meant the events on a large scale, “the peaks and ridges” of the course of History. When he dealt with world History, he was interested in the contacts of the peoples and he brought to the foreground those peoples who had been the most influential. He did not describe in depth the lives of the peoples, conditions, cultures, popular and spiritual movements because he focused on the “destinies of peoples and states, on which everything else was dependent.” But for von Ranke, there was a line that separated God from his creation, the world, which was though inspired by His spirit. This idea derives from his Lutheran belief but he was very reluctant to

allow the hand of God interfere in History “as much from a sense of reverence for the divine mysteries, as from a feeling of critical responsibility.” (p. 506). He saw the “general” as individual, containing many individualities, in an earthy life but related to God. He represented the “German spirit” of the early 19th century that wished either to shape reality or to acquire knowledge about it. He was inspired by Johann Gottlieb Fichte's (German philosopher, 1762–1814) aphorism that “the divine idea is fundamental to all the phenomena of life” and by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (German man of letters, 1749–1832), who represented all the efforts of the German spirit of the 18th century. Von Ranke's work would be impossible without the principles of the sense of the individual, the forces that shape human beings and things from within, awareness of individual developments, and a common basis in life that knits everything together. The attempt of German thinkers in the 18th century to marry the ideal and the real can only take us back to the Ancient World, to Plato and Plotinus, who influenced Leibniz and Goethe and von Ranke. The concept of the world, the ideal and the real, being both universal and individual. This is the *σύννοια πάντα* (*sympnoia panta*)¹⁰ idea of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (German philosopher, 1646-1716), which was based on Hippocrates of Kos (c. 460–370 BC) writings.

In the early 20th century, Meinecke tried to revive historicism by adding intellectualism to von Ranke's thought, that is, the History of ideas. He agreed that History was a combination of the ideal and the real, the individual and the universal, that go hand in hand (*sympnoia panta*). Both von Ranke and Meinecke were greatly influenced by the German thought of the 18th century and the “Great Germany” ideal of the 19th century. Meinecke's main contribution to historiography is the discussion of the relations between nation and state in 19th century Germany with the use of political and intellectual History through the study of the thought of German intellectuals and politicians from Alexander von Humboldt (German philosopher, 1769-1859) to Goethe, von Ranke and Otto von Bismarck (German politician, 1815–1898). Although he does not represent any school of historiography, his study of political History and History of ideas together influenced historians in the 20th century.

Lord Acton & Henri Berr's General Histories

It was in the late 19th century when a collaborative universal History was conceived in both England and France independently and in a different magnitude. In England Lord Acton planned the *Cambridge Modern History* (12 vols, 1902-1910) and a similar multi-volume work in the form of a journal was conceived in France where a group of historians were interested in historical synthesis. The heart of it was Henri Berr (philosopher, 1863-1954) and the organ to promote the idea was the journal *Revue de synthèse historique* (founded 1900). In his letter to the future contributors of the *Cambridge Modern History* Lord Acton explained that the goal was a written synthesis of the best History permitted by the published and unpublished sources. The narrative was to serve all readers with notes in critical parts and inclusive bibliography. No writer's text should have revealed the country of origin, the religion or his/her political inclination as the only goal of it was the “increase of accurate knowledge.” The work was going to serve the student by summarizing recent scholarly knowledge on the topics discussed. Universal History is different, Lord Acton explained, from the combined History of all countries. Country Histories will be told but according to the “time and the degree they contribute to the common fortunes of

¹⁰ Meaning, together. It is mentioned in paragraph 61 of the 1714 text *Monadology* of Leibniz in which he conceives the world as being composed of individual building blocks (monas) that eventually make a whole.

mankind.” And he concludes by stating that the Waterloo battle discussion should satisfy “French and English, Germans and Dutch alike.”

My comment is that this was and is a very difficult task and requires a clear mind by the historian. A clear mind means focus on what is being written, guidance by the sources only without the interference of a historian's inclinations regarding religion, political opinion, specific ideology, sexism, national prejudice. That being said it is understood that it may be impossible for a historian to observe all of them at the same time. But bells should be ringing in his/her mind while s/he is writing opinions or interpretations that may reveal specific inclinations and bias. On the other hand, a historian cannot write a History or even a critical History without showing feelings as described below for Alexander the Great, Ancient Greek City-States, Plato, the Parthenon, Caesar, Roman Republic, Charlemagne, troubadours, the English manor, Palaiologos, Eugene of Savoy, English parliament, Elisabeth I of England, the Encyclopaedia, Haydn, the mob in the French Revolution, Marxism, Presidential republic, Nazism, John Cage the musician, US pop art, post-modernism, the European Union and China, just to mention a few History personalities and topics. However, it should be made certain that, if available, more than one aspects of the same topic should be discussed: the Athenian expedition or invasion of Syracuse from the Athenian and the Syracusan point of view, the contribution of East Roman or Byzantine Empire to European History, the role of women in History events, those who won at Waterloo, Bismarck as a German or European statesman, Sartre as a Marxist philosopher, whether 20th century post-modern art is art. History writing is definitely not a wooden narration of personalities, actions, results. Showing feelings will exclude the words, great, horrible, good, bad and their derivatives but will include words that may describe the human being(s) and their activities, the event itself, the trend in relation to its impact to later developments and always as they are justified by the sources. The historian is a byproduct of the age s/he lives in and s/he carries in his/her mind, his/her life experiences as well as his/her ideology and cannot escape from them. However, his/her conclusions and interpretations that are based on his/her experiences and ideology (conservative, liberal, radical) must be supported by the sources. Whether they are convincing, remains to be decided by other historians and the general reader.

Henri Berr in his call for papers for the newly founded *Revue de synthèse historique* explains that they would like to publish articles which will show “what political history, economic history, history of religion, and what histories of philosophy, science, and art have in common and what distinguishes each from the other,” as well as views of thinkers on the theory of History. In any case the journal did not encourage “fantasies unrelated to science.” Science in this case meant the disciplines of History and psychology and sociology and ethnology. Generalizations based on fantasy were not going to be tolerated as the requirement was for generalizations based on acquired knowledge. “It is science that we wish to practice here, true science, science in its entirety,” writes Berr. In both the address of Lord Acton and the guidelines issued by Berr, it is emphasized that the authors should handle History as a science and not as imagination. My comment is that even nowadays, at the beginning of the third decade of the 21st century, it is not clear to all readers that there is a great difference between a History book written by a trained historian at university and a historical novel written by a literary author. The latter will use a historical setting in order to unfold a fictitious plot while the former will not let his/her imagination loose in the description of facts and their interpretation but will base his narrative, conclusions and

interpretation on historical sources. The is what is required of any historian writing a History book.

Walsh's meaning of History

Jumping forward in time, sometime in the middle of the 20th century, W. H. Walsh (1913–1986), a British philosopher (degree in Classics, University of Oxford) wrote an article on meaning in History. Lord Acton and Berr urged their writers to be scientific in their approach to History but what would be the meaning of the History their authors were going to write? Is there a meaning in the historical process or is History a “chaotic aggregate of unconnected events and processes lacking all rhyme and reason?” This is the question that Walsh addressed in his short essay. The historian's goal of course is to make the past as intelligible as possible but s/he will recognize that there are difficulties in understanding the events they study and therefore History is meaningful. History makes sense only when a historian finds or sees connections among the various events. Thus, the sequence of events, the forces and factors that were in operation at the time, the realization or not of policies will be shown. The role of the historian is both to establish what happened and explain why it did occur. The “*significant*” narrative written by a historian contains both the order of events as well as their connections. In answering causation questions one may say, for example, that the cause was Spartan xenophobia or German nationalism but s/he may also try to see the purpose of the actions of personalities by investigating what they had in mind while they were pursuing a certain goal. It is more important to give “the reason for the action rather than specifying its cause.” A historian must be as impersonal as any scientist and his/her conclusions must be based on evidence. Also, s/he must be concerned with the details of the past. Historians look for the meaning or significance of events in a limited context and this is why they write History. However, to find meaning in History as a whole is a different matter. This brings up the question: “Does History make sense?” which is basically a philosophical question. This question involves two different inquiries: (a) some believe that they have found certain constant factors that govern all historical change (race, climate, forces of production) or (b) others have tried to find a plot or pattern in the whole course of History. For the second group, History makes sense only if it is going somewhere, a goal which we can morally approve. However, no thinker has been able to produce any “reputable” law that governs the course of History although we can recall August Comte's¹¹ Law of the Three Stages, Marx's Law of economic factors in History, Toynbee's Law of Challenge and Response, which are isolated and incomplete generalizations rather than proper scientific laws. When we try to apply them we understand that their specifications are vague and imprecise. They may belong to the sphere of metaphysics. When a historian has an *idée fixe* (fixed idea) in mind s/he will see the historical facts the way s/he wants to see them.

Walsh's main point is that historians should not try to find a universal meaning in History and he criticizes heavily Toynbee's attempt. He implies that the meaning in History is the discussion of the sources and the interpretation that connects them but it is an attempt in vain for anyone to search for the meaning of History, which is a philosophical question. A historian's work is not metaphysical but on the contrary his/her role is to present the past in an intelligible manner. A historian's History must make sense.

¹¹ August Comte (1798-1857) was a French philosopher.

Toynbee's Study of History

Arnold Toynbee (British, 1889–1975) earned a degree in Classics from The University of Oxford and he is remembered for his monumental *A Study of History* (12 volumes, 1934/1935, 1939, 1954, 1959, 1961) in which he discussed the rise and fall of civilizations in the world since Ancient Times. In his essay “Civilization on Trial” included in his book *Civilization on Trial* he explained his theory. He tried to show the History of all civilizations that ever appeared on earth “as a unity” by identifying two ways by which this could be achieved. The first one was the encounters between civilizations because they bring civilizations under the same light of examination and because that was how the higher religions were born. The second method is by comparing the individual Histories of civilizations. Their common experiences can be compared if the principle phases in their Histories are mapped. In the essay on the Greco-Roman civilization he states that civilizations come to birth and grow by responding to successive challenges but they break into pieces when they fail to confront successfully one of the challenges. He placed great emphasis on religions and their being the basic unit of society. His civilizations are not identified with single nations but they include a number of societies. My comment is that a historian cannot squeeze parts of History in a certain mold and cannot find laws that apply to all civilizations throughout human History.

My observation is that one can think of cycles of situations and intellectual conceptions that may rise, mature, and disappear or may pass to the next cycle and merge with the rise, maturity and decline of that cycle. One example could be the Ancient Greek civilization and its influence on the Roman Civilization or the Hellenistic kingdoms in contrast to the Greek city-states. In any case, there is nothing magic in this or metaphysical, it is just a visualization of the appearance and disappearance throughout History of certain elements of what we call civilization or of different civilizations. History is determined by events that one can lead to another in the short or the long term (the invasion of the “Germanic tribes” eventually led to the creation of European states; changes in social life lead to impressionism in the arts), trends that last (the rise of the power of the people in Europe after the French Revolution; romanticism), movements that died soon (fascism; Nazism, dada). They all constitute cycles that have closed, partially closed or are still open and influence current life or they have transmitted their legacy to the next cycle: from the French Revolution to the 19th century republics to modern presidential or parliamentary democracies. These cycles may appear in one or more countries or nations. Regardless of the mode used by the historian, a good History must be readable as a novel without being a novel. This was achieved by George Macaulay Trevelyan at the beginning of the 20th century.

Trevelyan's Muse

G. M. Trevelyan (1876-1962) was educated at the University of Cambridge and served as a professor of History at the same university for sixteen years. He liked very much writing History in a way that it could be read as literature and explained that thoroughly in his essay about Clio, the muse. He distinguished the English History writing tradition from the German one as he believed in the “free, popular, literary tradition” of English historians. History writing, he explains, is not just an exchange of information and ideas between scholars but it should reach the wider public. History should help in the spread of patriotism and “certain qualities of mind and heart.” He wanted to answer the fundamental question why historians write History: as just a self fulfillment task or to teach their neighbor the past? He expected that the answer to this question would “have practical effects on the teaching and learning, the writing and reading of history.” This leads to the question whether History ought to be just a col-

lection of facts about the past or the interpretation of those facts and opinions “*in their full emotional and intellectual value* to a wide public by the difficult art of literature.” (p. 5). The word emotion he uses leads to the question whether History should be just a discussion of causes and effects without any emotional feelings shown by its writer. He does not see any science in History because the discipline is not a physical science. Physical sciences are utilized for producing in practical fields and for deducing laws of cause and effect. History “has no practical utility” in inventions, technology, medicine, agriculture and cannot be used to discover universal laws of cause and effect. The law of gravitation can be proven scientifically but that starvation always results to people's revolt does not have general application. No historical event can be isolated from its circumstances so that a universal law is deduced. As a historian needs to use his mind instead of scientific experiments and tools, “history is not a scientific deduction, but an imaginative guess at the most likely generalisations.” (p. 9). Imagination is needed by a historian so that he discovers the causes of actions of human beings by revealing their passions and thoughts. An ingredient of literary flow in History writing is humor and History's main value is educational. The study of the past can educate the minds of people. It is not only the facts that interest a historian but the feelings, speculations and actions of plain people (for example, soldiers) when they are the protagonists of History making. A historian must be very modest when s/he guesses in terms of cause and effect and makes generalizations. Trevelyan is against what he calls scientific History, the statement of facts based on sources, and he insists that a historian should strive for the “art of narrative” in which instead of “ponds” of facts there are running streams of phrases. History is after all a “tale” of “character drawing, study of social and intellectual movements, speculations as to probable causes and effects” and whatever else the historian can use “to illuminate the past.” (p. 14). A historian should always have in mind that the past was the present for those who lived at a certain point or period in time and they were quite uncertain about their future. However, it is very difficult to recover “our ancestors real thoughts and feelings.” A historian must rely on the documents which can tell us the truth about the past but at the same time he must be able to make the subject of his History live again in his narrative. A description of a historical moment, like a specific day during the French Revolution, does not necessarily need to be absolutely accurate but it must recreate the original effect it had on the lives of people at the specific time. This is how people in the present can understand and be educated by the past.

History may educate the people in various ways. It can train their minds as citizens so that they have a just view of political problems. It can produce “a new state of mind,” he wrote and meant that History should teach the people moral and ethical values. Through a presentation of massacres and murders of a historical event it can produce “sympathy and shame” and make readers understand that the sins of politicians and peoples of the past may have effects on their descendants and after generations. In this case, the historical cause and effect may have some validity and train the citizens in their decision making without necessarily forcing them to change their political views. Another educational effect of History is that a human being can see the present in perspective and at the same time understand the differences between the present and the past regarding social and economic structures, ideals and interests. History helps cure people of “political prejudice” by showing them and make them respect different points of view that they had never before realized that existed. History will also expose her readers to “ancient thoughts and feelings” as the ideals of our epoch or of any other epoch are not sufficient for interpreting life. One of the most important educational functions of History is the ideals and heroes from previous ages that she presents to the reader. Hence, “the events should be both written and read with intel-

lectual passion.” (p. 23). Understanding of literary History is one more aspect of the educational function of History so that the reader enjoys literature fully. In a number of instances, literature has a meaning only if the reader is aware of the historical framework within which the literary piece is taking place.

History is both an art and a science, claims Trevelyan. He recognizes three functions of History: the scientific, the imaginative or speculative, the literary. The element of science comes in when the historian collects and evaluates “evidence as to facts.” The imaginative or speculative phase is completed after s/he selects and classifies the facts, makes guesses and generalizations. The literary function comes when s/he combines in written form the results of science and imagination in order to “attract and educate” the readers. The literary function is a difficult one because the historian needs to plan and write “a powerful narrative of historical events.” It needs a lot of effort for the arrangement, the composition and the writing of the narrative in the style required because this is the primary task of a historian. With literature he means any good writing, fiction and non-fiction, but in this case the emphasis is on historical literature, the good writing of English historians before his times that all students of History should read. “Life is short, art is long, but history is longest, for it is art added to scholarship. [...] What is easy to read has been difficult to write.” (p. 34) because it involves writing and rewriting, correcting and recorrecting. History is very complex, never repeats itself but ever creates new forms depending on the time and the place. There is no “verdict of history”, the one and only truth of a historical event, but merely the opinion of the historian because he can see only a fraction of the truth. Therefore, the reader should read several “good” historians in order to draw his/her own conclusions.

Toward the end of the 20th century, Richard Evans (see above) wrote one of the most complete books on the theories of History (*In Defense of History*, 1997) but at the beginning of the 20th century, Trevelyan wrote the first comprehensive essay on Clio. He touches, in his own way, on the most important aspects of History research and writing and developed definite ideas on how a historian should do the work. Although the reliance of historians on sources and the von Ranke's method continued in the 20th century, he had set the standards of literary History until about the middle of the century when E. H. Carr published his *What is History?* and introduced new ideas (see above). In his last works, Trevelyan, finally undertook serious archival work, the results of which incorporated in his books without abandoning his literary style.

Trevelyan's original motivation for that essay was the inaugural lecture of J. B. Bury (John Bagnell Bury, 1861–1927) at the University of Cambridge in 1902 (published 1903). Bury insisted that scientific History was exercised only when historians presented facts in the way they happened. But this was von Ranke's belief and practice in its enlarged form to include more than just political History. Against Bury's thesis, Trevelyan supported the view that a historian should write in a literary way with emotion so that History is not presented to the readers “as a chronicle of bare facts.” It is interesting that in the writing of History Trevelyan makes reference to the historian's intuition for a text that will be effective with readers, the general public. The historian must be able to write in a way that will touch the feelings of the general public, a result which Trevelyan admits that can occur by the hand of only a few History writers. My comment is that History should be written for the general reader, even if it is a specialized monograph. I subscribe to Trevelyan's opinion that the text must be so well written that it is fully understood by the general reader although this needs literary skill and a lot of writing, rewriting and correcting. However, the reliance on sources is unquestionable.

Collingwood's idea of History

R. G. Collingwood (1889-1943) had received a degree in classics for the University of Oxford and he was mainly interested in the philosophy of History. In the 1930s he wrote a number of essays which were published after his death under the title *The Idea of History*. History, he writes, is “a kind of research or inquiry” and belongs to the sciences because we ask questions and then we try to answer them. (p. 9). Science means that we try to discover something we do not know. History finds *res gestae*, the human activity of the past, and interprets the evidence (documents). Humans use History to acquire knowledge, to learn about their nature as human beings, to know what they can do by knowing what they have already done. The value of History is that it teaches human beings what they have already achieved and thus what they are. The historian distinguishes between the “outside” and the “inside” of an event in the past. The outside is the physical representation of an event such as Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon river or his blood on the floor of the Senate house after he was stabbed. The inside of an event is what a historian can describe by thought such as Caesar's hostility against Republican law. A historian will always examine both because he is interested in actions and an action is represented by both the outside and the inside of an event. It is not the event itself that is examined by History but the thought in it. When a historian asks the question “why did Brutus stab Caesar?” he means what thoughts made Brutus decide to kill Caesar. The cause of the event is the thought in the mind of the human subject. “All history is the history of thought.” (p. 215). A historian must try to understand what Caesar thought about a certain situation and his option in dealing with it, to re-enact the situation. This demands by the historian the full power of his mind because the re-enactment requires active, “critical thinking.” A historian reenacts the thoughts of historical person in the “context of his own knowledge” and therefore, he criticizes them, makes value judgments, corrects his own possible errors. A historian is not interested in what represents human “animal nature” (eat, sleep, make love, any natural appetite) but in the social customs created by the thoughts within which they will satisfy those appetites. History is not a succession of events that show some change. The historian is only interested in the events that express thoughts. Historical knowledge is the knowledge of the activity of the mind in the past and at the same time the re-enactment of it in the present. Collingwood comments on the aphorism *die Weltgeschichte ist das Weltgericht* (world history is world judgment) and concludes that it is the historian himself who makes the judgment that reveals his/her strengths and weaknesses, his/her virtues and vices.

Historical imagination is “structural” to historical writing as otherwise there is no narrative to be written. Imagination does “the entire work of historical construction” (p. 241), insists Collingwood. A historical truth is not given but it is constructed by the historian's “*a priori* imagination.” However, a historian needs to have his imagination verified by documents but this would create a new problem, the question of the documents' authenticity. Historians work from data, historical facts, such as the Peloponnesian War was presented in statements by Thucydides. However, literary, they are just marks on paper that are perceived by the historian as facts. It is he, though, who is responsible for the results of his study after criticizing them. Collingwood explains imaginative construction with the following example. A historian reads in Suetonius that Nero at one time intended to evacuate Britain. S/he rejects Suetonius claim because the reconstruction of Nero's policy based on Tacitus will not allow him/her to think that Suetonius is right. In this case, the historian just prefers Tacitus to Suetonius. S/he does so just because s/he finds his/herself “able to incorporate what Tacitus tells [him/her] into a coherent and continuous picture” of his/her own which s/he cannot do for Suetonius. (p. 245). It is therefore, the historian's conception of the past,

his/her *a priori* imagination, that justifies the sources used in its historical construction and this is how these sources are justified as credible. The historian ought to evaluate and confirm that his/her sources are not biased, dated wrongly, archaeologically or textually out of their context, and that misread inscriptions are correct. This can be verified only if the picture of the past based on the sources and drawn by the historian is continuous, coherent and apprehended.

According to Collingwood, both the novelist and the historian use their imagination in order to construct their coherent story that includes a narration of events, “a description of situations, exhibition of motives, analysis of characters” but there is a difference. The historian must prove that his story is true, that he describes “things as they really were and [...] events as they really happened.” (p. 246). Because of this, the historian is required to apply three rules of method. The historian's “picture” must be localized in space and time, the story must be consistent with itself as in the historical world the relations in it must be topographical and chronological, and historical statements are only true if they rely on documents. The perceptible world can be used as evidence by a historian as long as s/he can use it. S/he can use it only if s/he approaches the evidence with the “right kind of historical knowledge.” Evidence exists only if it is viewed historically, otherwise it is historically dumb. In History no written work is final as the evidence used may change with a different historical method or depending on the competence of the historian. Moreover, the interpretation of the evidence may change as the historian will use his/her own historical knowledge, what s/he knows about nature and human beings, mathematical and philosophical knowledge along with his/her own “mental habits and possessions of every kind.” Because of all these “every new generation must rewrite history in its own way.” (p. 248). Every new historian must revise the historical questions himself/herself in order to give new answers. Collingwood, insists that the criterion of historical truth is “the idea of an imaginary picture of the past” because the historian can never be satisfied with his/her idea of the past. My comment is that what he means is that a historian's work is only his/her picture of the past as it has been constructed in his/her mind by the evidence.

History is a science if the Greek word *episteme* or latin *scientia* means an organized body of knowledge, a definition which agrees with J. B. Bury's aphorism that History “is herself simply a science, no less and no more.” A historian's work is not to invent anything as it happens in the natural sciences but to discover. Natural sciences depend “on relations of logical priority and posteriority” while in History there is the chronological sequence of events. History, therefore is a special kind of science because it studies events that cannot be seen through accessible evidence. In the late Greco-Roman world and in the Medieval period History was called the “scissors and paste” or what we call today “copy and paste” method according to which parts of writings or oral sayings of authorities were put together in a literary sort of narrative in order to prove a philosophical, political, or theological thesis. It was only after the 17th century that historians began examining the credibility of authorities (“critical history”) and sources beyond the literary ones such as coins and inscriptions.

The “who killed John Doe?” question becomes important in Collingwood's explanation of his theory of History as it gives a vivid picture of evidence and judgment used in History researcher and writing. In his mystery parable, nobody had seen or knew who stabbed in the heart John Doe. When his neighbor, an elderly spinster, appeared in the Police Station and claimed that she had killed him with her own hands because he had made an attempt upon her virtue was sent home to get an aspirin. Another testimony that was seen with indifference was that somebody had been seen climbing in John's study window. Later the priest's daughter admitted to the Police

that she had done it but this reminded the policeman that her boyfriend, Richard, who had spent the night of the murder at the priest's house, was a medical student and he knew where the heart was on someone's body. When questioned, Richard admitted that the night of the murder he had left the house but he did not want to say when and where he went. It was eventually known that John Doe was a blackmailer and he had been blackmailing the priest for revealing an extra-marital affair of his dead wife when she was young. The fruit of this affair was the priest's daughter, born just six months after the marriage of the priest with his now dead wife, a fact that could be proven by the letters John Doe had in his possession. When the priest killed him, he found that his wife's seducer was John Doe who was the recipient of the letters sent to him by her. The Scotland-Yard inspector found ashes in the dustbin of the priest's residence proving the burning of the letters along with other evidence that demonstrated that the priest was guilty. The evidence judged by the jury resulted in the priest's sentence to death. Comparing the jury's decision to the historian's investigation, Collingwood claims that the historian must be convinced that his decision after the examination of all the evidence is based on them and despite obvious clues s/he must investigate all possibilities thoroughly in order to find the truth. And the historian may take all the time s/he needs in order to do this instead of a jury that must decide in a limited period of time.

In Collingwood's opinion, Herodotus, Thucydides, Livy, and Tacitus, just to use the most known ancient historiographers, can be read in two different ways. In the scissors and paste method, the reader is using parts of what they have written without questioning them and s/he “waits to hear what they choose to tell him.” (p. 269). According to the scientific History method, though, a historian reads the same books as the scissors and paste reader not only because s/he wants to know what they wrote but with questions in mind. He wants to decide by himself what s/he wants to know from them, what they do not write but may be implied, hidden in between the lines. In the John Doe example above, the policeman did not accept those who confessed the murder but it was obvious that they could not have committed it. He did not also accept the priest's daughter confession face value but by using the methods of critical History he tried to understand what were the characteristics (the profile) of the murderer: she or he was the strong person and knew where to stab the victim in order to kill him. Although the priest's daughter does not fulfill this profile of a murderer, the scientific historian continues asking questions like: 'Why is she lying?' 'Is she protecting someone and who, her father or her boyfriend?' The first evidence point to Richard but a closer look disqualifies him as the murderer. The murderer was somebody who knew the place outside and inside very well and Richard was a visitor. Richard's refusal to say where he was implies that he wants to protect somebody: 'Was he the priest?' But how did the priest kill John Doe. A historical argument will be valid if a number of original questions (not typical or ready made) are asked in the correct order and answered along its development. The questions are asked by the historian to himself as Socrates did to his students asking them questions that they should have asked themselves. The inspector in the example above tests himself the statement made by the priest's daughter that she killed John Doe instead of just accepting it as true or false.

The important question that Collingwood asks in one of his essays is on what conditions can the historian know the past. He cannot apprehend the past empirically because he was not an eyewitness of what he wants to know. He cannot rely on a witness who experienced the event and left a record of it because his role is not to believe in witnesses but to criticize them. “[...] the historian must re-enact the past in his own mind.” (p. 282). When the historian has in front of him written documents, s/he must discover what the person(s) who wrote those words meant. In order to discover the

thoughts behind the words, the historian needs to think them again for himself. If he reads an edict of an emperor, he must think of the situation that the emperor faced and try to put himself in his shoes and try to see the possible alternatives and the reasons for choosing one of them so that he re-enacts the thought and the process that the emperor went through and issued that edict. This is how he will acquire historical knowledge as opposed to just philological knowledge of the text itself. An operation of thought performed by a person in the past may be called a fact but it is a fact we cannot know, “we can only at most believe it on testimony.” (p. 299). It is not enough for a historian to find what a person of History thought but whether it is also true. Also, the historian cannot apprehend an act of thought as it really happened but only the part that s/he shares with the thinker. Historical knowledge means the act of thinking itself, not things thought about. The scientist, the historian, and the philosopher follow a certain plan, think on purpose and arrive at results that can be evaluated against criteria set at the planning stage. Collingwood's main conclusion repeated in a number of his essays is that “historical knowledge is simply the re-enactment of past experiences in the mind of the present thinker.” (p. 326).

In practical terms and regarding persons, Collingwood believes that a historian does understand only the thought(s) that s/he can derive by studying the documents, the relics of History. S/he can only acquire part of this thought of the person(s) under investigation, the “shared” knowledge between the historical figure(s) and himself/herself. The historian needs to ask original questions to the relics of History in order to receive the answers that s/he wants. All these involve the historian's imagination in the sense that s/he will need to read between the lines or connect pieces of information always based on the sources studied. If the historian has used his/her wild imagination, has read the sources in the way s/he wanted and has argued for example that Alexander the Great was only a genuine Epirote (from Epirus) because of his mother's place of birth and not a Macedonian at all, s/he has gone beyond Collingwood's suggestion. In the question though 'Why Alexander killed his companion Philotas as well as his companion's father?' there is plenty of room for thinking based on the sources that have survived. This can be achieved only if the historian re-enacts in his mind as much as possible Alexander's thoughts based on the evidence.

Croce's true History as contemporary History & Le Goff's Periodization Objection

Benedetto Croce (1866–1952) was an Italian philosopher, historian, politician who never graduated from the Law School of the University of Naples but he wrote on a variety of topics including the philosophy of History. Some of his essays originally printed between 1912 and 1913 were collected in a book entitled *Teoria e storia della storiografia*, the second edition of which appeared in 1920. Croce distinguishes between what he names “contemporary” History and “non-contemporary” History. Contemporary History can be named only that which comes into being immediately after the accomplishment of an act. This is one of the acts of the spirit, it is not linked to time, it is formed at the same time of the act to which is linked, and it is not chronologically distinguished from it but by an ideal distinction. Non-contemporary History or past History finds itself in the presence of a History already formed and it is the criticism of that History regardless of time, from a minute ago to thousands of years ago. A narrative or a series of narratives [I believe he means sequences of events] of a fact will now become facts themselves, “documents” to be interpreted and judged. History is always constructed from documents. Both contemporary and non-contemporary history spring from life because only if the historian is interested in the life of the present will investigate a fact of the past. In this sense, “every true history is contemporary history.” (p. 12). If a historian is not presently interested in the Pelopon-

nesian War then this fact is not History but just a historical work. It will become History only when s/he thinks it or was a History when s/he thought about it earlier. The relation between History and life is that of synthetic *unity* [sic]. He points out that the History of ancient Greek painting is a History without documents as we do not have paintings themselves to judge by ourselves but just names of painters, anecdotal biographical information and references to paintings that existed. Therefore, this History is just a “tissue of empty words.” (p. 17) and all Histories without their living documents are empty narratives without truth. As life is a present, those histories are irrevocable past, a past *καθ’ αὐτό* [sic] (that is, isolated), in the literary meaning of the word. Chronicle (individual, private, unimportant facts are attributed to it), and History (general, public facts are attributed to it) are not two complementary forms of History or one subordinate to the other. They are two “different spiritual *attitudes*. History is living chronicle, chronicle is dead history; history is contemporary history, chronicle is past history; history is principally an act of thought, chronicle an act of will.” When History is not thought it becomes chronicle and in terms of operation “*first comes history then chronicle.*” [p. 20]. History is the living being, chronicle is the corpse (“Prima la storia, poi la cronaca. Prima il vivente poi il cadavere”).

Croce turns now to Universal History and defines it as a “claim” that tries to view all things that had happened to human beings from its origins to just a moment ago. My comment is that earlier in his writing Croce had stated that we know nothing of the history of the earth, of the solar system, of the whole cosmos, which he writes that is lost in the obscurity of its origin. He was correct for 1916 but today we do have some knowledge of the History of our cosmos and our environment and this is what is known and recorded as “big history.” Croce supports the idea that Universal History is actually Universal Histories, “particular histories,” focus on “a particular interest centered in a particular problem,” and include only the facts related to that particular problem. He brings as examples Polybius History that dealt with Roman leadership, the formation of the Roman world and only those peoples which had contacts with the Romans, Augustine (St. Augustine or Augustine of Hippo, 354-430) who discusses the penetration of Paganism by Christianity, and the *Philosophy of History* or *Universal History* by Georg Hegel (1770–1831). He concludes that Universal History “disappears in the world of illusions” (p. 59) along with other “Utopias” such as Universal art or justice but the universal in History exists because of the universal in its concreteness (universal judgments, inseparable syntheses). Universal Histories written with geographical barriers (Europe, Asia, Africa etc) become historical dictionaries. My comment is that it is true that a Universal History either written by many authors or by just one cannot contain all the details and analyses that individual Histories will but this is not the purpose of Universal History in the 21st century. Its purpose is the *longue durée*, what can a historian see by examining very long periods of History or the whole History of Humanity including the History of the earth and the cosmos. Historians who have written General or Universal Histories have tried to view cycles in History, life and death of civilizations, common patterns in the development of History, decline or progress and they have been influenced by their times (wars, political ideas, social movements) and the spirit of their eras (general optimism or pessimism).

Historians select the historical facts they will deal with as the intelligent collector of antiques manages his/her collection. There are objects that s/he places in glass cases, saves others in chests, shows no interest for others that are placed in the basement and may eventually be thrown away. However, there is no logical criterion for the selection and the same happens with documents and archivists, who follow the same method. Although the selection may be based on logical distinction such as public and private facts, primary and secondary documents, beautiful or ugly, significant

or insignificant monuments the final decision is derived by practical motives and focuses on preserving or neglecting. Then facts can be divided between those that are worthy and those that are not worthy of History but all this “is an affair of imagination, of vocabulary, and of rhetoric, which in no way changes the substance of things.” (p. 110). In History, the choice is never between two or more facts but the creation of the unique fact, the “fact thought.” The selection can be made in traces of facts such as news, documents, monuments but non-historical facts (“facts that have not been thought”) would be nothing. Therefore, there is no distinction between historical and non-historical facts as it is a false assumption.

Croce refers to the periodization model “ancient-medieval-modern period” and finds it meaningless as there can be no pause or stop in the flow of History as it is not true what one of his professors used to tell his students: “the curtain fell upon the acting of ancient history in 476, to rise again immediately afterward on the beginning of the Medieval period.” (p. 114). However, Jacques Le Goff (French, 1924-2014, Agrégation d'histoire), the French medievalist, disagreed with both Croce and his Medieval History professor at university in his *Faut-il vraiment découper l'histoire en tranches?* (2014). Le Goff writes that periodization is important in History not only with chronological borders but in terms of societal development, change, turning point, even rejection of the society and the values of a previous epoch. Therefore, the succession, the continuity, the change that take place during the course of History is a matter of thought for the historian. Periodization was initially used by religious writers who wanted to divide the History of man from creation to the present according to religious themes. The first model was used by Daniel in the Old Testament. He describes a dream he had in which the world was divided into kingdoms headed by four beasts, which are exterminated one after the other. Then, the Son of man came to the Ancient of days and he was given “dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him.” (*Holy Bible*, “Daniel,” VII.1-14 and *Tanakh*, “Kethuvim-Daniel,” 7.1-14). The dominion is everlasting and shall not be destroyed. This idea of periodization into four epochs returned in the writings of chroniclers and theologians from the 12th century and it is repeated by Voltaire (see below) in his *Le Siècle de Louis XIV*, in which he refers to four centuries, meaning four golden eras of History. He distinguishes the *siècle* of ancient Greece (Pericles of Athens, Philip II of Macedonia, Alexander the Great, Demosthenes, Plato, Aristotle and so on), the century of Caesar and Augustus, the third century is that after the 1453 fall of Constantinople with the events and developments in Italy, and the fourth is that of Louis IV of France that tends to perfection as there is progress in logic, philosophy, arts, spirit, ethics and government. However, this periodization skips the Medieval period because it is considered to be a dark era. From the 14th century but mainly in the 15th century mostly Italian intellectuals believed that they lived in a high civilization era, after the end of a period of decadence that had begun with the fall of the Roman Empire and was at its end. In their minds that period between the glorious Antiquity and their modern era was the middle epoch (*media aetas*), the Medieval period. In the 17th century England this era was known as the *dark ages*. In the 17th century in Germany, historian Christoph Keller or Cellarius identified chronologically the Medieval period as the period between emperor Constantine the Great and the fall of Constantinople in 1453. It was only in the 19th century that the Medieval period began to be reconsidered, identified as a period of historical importance and studied intensively. Marc Bloch (1886-1944) was one of the first historians who recognized the bright and the dark aspects of the Medieval period.

Today, historians understand that any periodization is artificial and temporary and develops along with History. Historians who need to use periodization must take

into consideration a multitude of aspects of a civilization. Generally, it is thought that European History originates from two sources: from Herodotus and Greek thought after the 5th century BC and from the Judo-Christian thought in the Bible. However, in terms of periodization historians are called to decide when the Medieval period ends and the Renaissance begins. Le Goff explains that this is very difficult because historical studies have shown that in some cases the Medieval period can reach the beginning of the 16th century and the origins of the Renaissance can be traced back to the beginning of the 15th century. In many aspects characteristics of the two periods co-exist or clash during the 15th century. This is what I mean with continuities and discontinuities from one cycle or epoch to the other in my *The Mediterranean, Greece and Europe. History Archaeology Civilization (3000 BC- AD 2000)*. Le Goff concludes that clear discontinuities or ruptures from one period to another are rare in History. What a historian can usually observe is shorter or longer and more or less profound changes, turning points, internal rebirths.

After having discussed the current approach to the old problem of periodization as analyzed by Le Goff we can now return to Croce and his explanation of the distinction between History and natural history. We must distinguish, Croce writes, between genuine History such as the History of the Peloponnesian War or the Egyptian civilization and the history of the organisms of the animals, the geological changes of the Earth, the birth and evolution of the universe. Actually, at the beginning of the 20th century it was noted in the Conference of German Historians that in some studies History of civilization and natural history were connected in the sense that the latter precedes the former historically. By the end of the Conference it was decided that natural history “was very accurately defined as an apparently chronological arrangement of things spatially distinct” (p. 129) and was named *metastoria*. This *metastoria* should never enter the field of human History (p. 133). Indeed, Croce, continues, natural history constructions were nothing else but “classificatory schemes, from the more simple to the more complex.” (p. 129). Those “universal histories” that begin with the biological cell and go all the way to the French Revolution are not composed of pure critical thinking but of thought mixed with imagination related to myths. According to Croce the evolutionists of his days were trying to rewrite the chapter of the Genesis in the Bible in an inferior manner to that of the composers of the Holy Book. He also, claims that the development of a language is not related to the history of literature.

My comment is that his use of the word *metastoria* in the form of *metahistory* was used by postmodernism in not a very different context if we think that it departs from what Croce named “contemporary history.” Natural history is of course not History and nowadays there is no confusion about it but the evolution of the human species could be considered as relevant to human History and part of Pre-History. Nevertheless, it is a special part of anthropology and biology and can be included in a History narrative as ethnographic elements could be included in social History. The historians of the *Annales* school have already written their essays on the history of the climate and how this may have affected the life of the peoples. The history of the creation of our planetary system, our galaxy and the universe (called nowadays “big history”) are not anymore just human imagination. There are theories based on scientific observations and evidence that allow a historian to consider including this history in a General History along with Pre-history that will become part of it as well. Definitely this evolution of the universe belongs to the natural sciences and especially astrophysics but History in its extended meaning includes any physical phenomenon that has affected human life. Earthquakes, eruption of volcanoes, tsunamis, floods and

generally extreme weather conditions have changed the course of human life locally where it occurred or in large areas of the Earth.

Dilthey's Geisteswissenschaften & Hermeneutics

Wilhelm Dilthey (1833–1911) was a German philosopher (Doctoral degree in philosophy, University of Berlin) who also wrote on the philosophy of History. I have tried to summarize and put together some of his not so clear thoughts from his highly fragmented writings. In his 1910 work on the historical world in the human sciences (*Der Aufbau der geschichtlichen Welt in den Geisteswissenschaften*) he discussed History. The first problem that preoccupies his thought is the relationship between life and History. At every historical point there is a living and productive *psyche* that has powers and is sensitive to influence. Every important document is the expression of such a *psyche*. These written records are very rare because historical memory is selective. “History lets everything that does not have meaning turn to dust and ashes.” (Vol.III, p. 273/254). Everything has meaning if it were a living experience at some point in time. Historians use certain people in order to represent or create an image of an era through human memory. Human sciences (*Geisteswissenschaften*) are to be understood through lived experience, “which provides a structural nexus.” This life-nexus is present when the human sciences represent life and it is there when we hear or read about a historical deed, an economic matter, legal matters, or the political system in a constitution. The life-nexus of these systems help us understand them. Historical value and purpose originate from lived experience. When we look back in time we find meaning trying to understand and relate nexus to itself. When a nexus appears in History we use the idea of meaning, which is applied to all reality. History is there where life has been and is intelligible and it is there that we find meaning. Meaning is present when individuals gather it within themselves. Values are the building block of the historical world. Each value compared to a musical note has its own loudness, pitch, and length but each one of them is unique and indefinable. History consists of all manifestations of life from the perspective of humanity as a whole. These individuals, who as values constitute life and history, are productive forces filled with purposes. “History is expected to teach what life is.” (Vol.III, p. 281/262). Purposes will eventually become independent productive forces. The historical nexus as defined by Georg Hegel (1770–1831) is the ideal stage of spirit in which the self recognizes itself as absolute spirit. History is a set of concepts. When something cannot be possibly understood (for example, a tree) then it does not have meaning or value. Therefore, the history of nature is different from human History. History is when we try to understand a “life-course” through our memory of the manifestations of life. The historical world can be formed after the purification of the confused and corrupted historical memory of humanity about itself. This will be done critically with interpretation. The fundamental historical science is philology in the form of the study of the language in which tradition has been deposited. So, the legacy of the human past needs to be studied for errors and the relatedness of its documents, and be ordered chronologically. Philology designates the initial scope of History procedures. If the nexus of a viewpoint –among the many that is composed– is grasped as it happened, then historical objectivity is possible. History is driven by non satisfaction in a cultural situation that stimulates the urge to go beyond that point. Biography, the History of nations, cultural systems and organizations are presuppositions for the understanding of universal-historical understanding. Thucydides is the first historian who leaves his mark in the universal-historical understanding. His object of History writing is a productive system in which the art of war, statecraft, culture, politics, and disputes on the function of the political system “work together to determine power in Greece.” (Vol.III, p. 291/272)

Polybius represents the next stage of universal-historical understanding. The meaning of historical moments is relevant to their relation with the political organization of Rome and the way they contribute to its world domination. All human sciences (Geisteswissenschaften) depend on the study of History from the whole of its course until the present, which includes human experience, what has been understood, and what has been raised to consciousness. Because human beings are the makers of History and those who investigate about it, universally valid historical judgments are possible. In understanding, we recreate lived experience. We study History so that we know what “the human” is. The effort of the historian to recall the deeds, the words, the sounds, the images of the souls of the past is an interpretation of the relics that have remained. This interpretation is a hermeneutical [explanatory] art.

In one of his university lectures Dilthey explained that the goal of studying the sources of History is the understanding of the past. “This act of understanding is that of the historian.” (Vol. IV, p. 234/110). He distinguishes three different levels. The chronicler is only interested in the epic. The pragmatic historian has a political interest. The task of the universal historian is to reconstruct inner life. The works of Thucydides and Polybius are not History for us. We need to study them and make them History because we cannot accept them as given and use them to provide History with facts. These fragmentary thoughts became stepping stones for some of the philosophers of History who built their theories in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

Mommsen's History practicing

Theodor Mommsen (1817–1903), the only trained historian who was awarded the Nobel prize in literature for a history book (*History of Rome*, 1854-1856 & 1885/1909) in 1902, received his doctoral degree from the University of Kiel. He could just not afford living and studying in Berlin as a law student and moved to Kiel to complete his degree but he eventually became a professor of Roman history at Berlin University. He was a practicing historian and he is known for his multi-volume *History of Rome* although he also did very important pioneering work with Latin inscriptions which was published in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*.

Let's take ourselves back to 1874, in Humboldt-Universität in Berlin, sit on one of the back chairs of the lecture hall and listen to him in the last part of his rectorial address... “History is one of those academic subjects which cannot be directly acquired through precept and learning.” History is the knowledge of what has happened and it consists on the one hand of the discovery and examination of the available evidence and on the other on the composition of a narrative based on the sources discovered and studied. The writing of History also depends on the historian's understanding of the human beings who “shaped the events and the conditions that prevailed.” (p. 192). The first part of a historian's work is to study his/her sources critically and the last one to write the History of what s/he has studied. However, in life each one of us who is a thinking human being is a searcher of evidence and a History writer. Because the elements of historical discipline are simple and self-evident they cannot be taught or instructed. History does not have a “theoretical exposition” and cannot be enhanced through “theoretical presets” but only through “practical exercises.” A historian needs no theory in order to evaluate correctly the available sources and connect material that may seem unrelated and contradicting in order to establish the order of events. This is a simple process that can be applied in very many ways that makes theory obsolete. “The historian has perhaps greater affinity with the artist than with the scholar” (p. 193) because he studies individuals and peoples at such a high mental level that cannot be taught or learned. It is impossible for students to become masters of History after the conclusion of the training in the brief period of their undergraduate studies. The

historian is not trained but born compared to a mathematician or a philologist who can acquire all the training they need for their disciplines at university. The historian is not educated but self-educated. It is imperative for the historian to know the language and the law of the peoples s/he studies so that s/he understands firsthand the sources written in that language because it is not enough for him/her to just have a general idea. The study and grasp of Hebrew, Greek, Latin, the languages of the Ancient Near East as well as the legal systems of peoples who spoke those ancient languages will give historians a clear conception of the most important elements of “pragmatic history.” The study of History is not an easy way out of the hardships of the study of philology, it is not easy study as you might have thought because it just requires systematic work with sources and historical pragmatism. If a student does not acquire this preparation then s/he will be one of those “who thought they could learn history as a craft and discovered later, to their horror, that it is an art.” (p. 195).

Mommsen states bluntly that he is greatly disturbed when he sees in university records that someone is a student registered to acquire a History degree because he is not sure how serious in his study the young man is going to be. If he is not serious, then nemesis will follow soon. At the end, the young man is not going to be prepared to become a historian and will follow the requirements of the discipline of History in just a mechanical way. On the other hand, a History student will prepare himself at university only indirectly for his future work. Only those who leave university with a thorough knowledge of Greek, Latin, and German and of the political institutions of these peoples will be prepared to become historians. After the completion of this preparation the critical method and the “pragmatic presentation of history” will come to the History graduate by themselves. “And now, gentlemen, let us begin our common work of teaching and learning, in full awareness of the difficulties of the task and with the full and wholehearted determination to master it.” (p. 196).

Mommsen speaks to students in a direct manner, in a clear and plain language, the same way he wrote all his works, telling them about the difficulties of the profession they have decided to be trained for. It seems that this is the only writing of his in which he expresses some thoughts about the study and practice of History. He denies any theory as a driven force for a historian. Hard work and only hard work will make students historians after they graduate and after they use their university preparation for this goal. Hasn't actually been this the situation all these years of History university education all over the world? Out of the thousands of students that were taught in my courses only two eventually became trained historians and university teachers themselves. I am not blaming or looking down upon the others who did not. They followed their own paths and became university administrators, professionals, businessmen and businesswomen and a number of other highly esteemed professions. But historians, only two. A professor cannot teach the History profession to students who are indifferent, Ioannis Karayannopoulos, a Greek Byzantinologist who had studied in Germany, wrote in the preface of his book on the introduction to historical studies. Mommsen had set the requirements for a graduate to become an ancient historian and of course by analogy a history of any civilization and any period in time. He also explained that the true trained historian is not the one who ends his/her serious historical research and writing with the completion of the doctoral dissertation/thesis. A true historian is only s/he who practices History in his/her whole life and s/he who educates him/herself continuously.

Coulanges's History of all epochs

Numa Denis Fustel de Coulanges (French, 1830–1889, doctorate from the University of Paris) was an archaeologist and a historian and served as professor of

History at the University of Strasbourg. According to the regulations of the University, a History professor should change each year the topic of his lectures and should lecture successively on ancient, medieval, modern History. Therefore Fustel de Coulanges in his 1862 inaugural address at the University he spoke about ancient History. He found this ancient-medieval-modern History teaching model very useful to both students and professors because this way the teaching and learning of History surveyed “all epochs and all ages of mankind.” History's task is fulfilled only when it covers a long period of time. History is not pursued just to entertain us or to satisfy our curiosity of past events or make us remember what happened in the past. “History is and should be a science.” (p. 179). The object of its study is the human being himself/herself. The psychologist and the historian study the sole of human beings but the historian is interested in beliefs, trends and changes of ideas along with what is transformed by those ideas, and specifically laws, institutions, art, and science. During the time of their existence human beings have changed continuously the form of their lives, their social conditions, the conception of their intelligence, their ideas on law and morality. In the last few thousand years, human beings have changed, they live differently, they think differently, and therefore, they can be known only through History. Historians are not satisfied by studying a single period of human existence in every detail that will delight or move their audience. They must go back to antiquity and understand the institutions of peoples of that distant past, they have “to breathe life into the ancient generations that are no longer even dust.” (p. 181). History exists there where human beings have lived and they have left behind traces of their life and intelligence. Students and professors of History must acquaint themselves with human beings throughout their existence, in antiquity, in the medieval period, in modern times.

Fustel de Coulanges' focus on antiquity in the academic year 1862 included mainly the Greeks and the Romans with references to the Italian peoples, the Etruscans, the Celts and the Thracians, the Ancient Near East and India because of its racial (he means Indo-European) connection with the Greeks and the Romans and the similarities of their institutions. Regarding Greek and Roman institutions, he had chosen to throw light to family along with local, civil, political institutions and the laws that are related to them on his Saturday lectures. His students had heard about Greece and Rome since childhood at school but they were not aware even at that year in university of the number of problems and difficulties that raised the study of them, especially of their institutions. In his youth Fustel de Coulanges heard people talking to him about the Greeks and the Romans as if they were French or English of his time and were governed in the same way. However, later, by reading the ancient authors he saw the customs, the beliefs, the needs, the laws of the ancient peoples and in this way their institutions were illuminated for him. Therefore, in our study of the Greeks and the Romans, Coulanges explains, we must understand the environment they originated and lived and the state of mind and their beliefs for whom the institutions were made. There is a bond between beliefs and institutions and one explains the other. However, nowadays we should not try to imitate their institutions as it happened during the French Revolution. Back then, they were misunderstood and because they were meant for different peoples at different times they led to the Reign of Terror. “[...] It would have been very desirable if antiquity had been studied without prejudice or partisanship [...], to know what these ancients thought of matters of government and civil law, and thus to understand one of the strangest ages of mankind.” (pp. 187-188).

In the introduction to his multi-volume work on the political institutions of ancient France, Fustel de Coulanges refers to the research and writing of History again. History is a difficult science, he writes, because it deals with complex subjects. Hu-

man society can be understood only if a historian studies all of its components separately. We need to focus on the particular so that we apprehend the whole. “Pour un jour de synthèse il faut des années d'analyse (One day of synthesis requires years of analysis).” My comment is that practicing historians know very well what Coulanges means and explains why History is not an easy discipline to practice. We historians do research, study the sources we have collected and then we need to express what we have found and we believe in writing. Many times just a sentence of ours in a History book may be the result of a lot of research and thinking. Coulanges also mentions that historians must see the past in its own times and not try to understand and explain it with the mind of the present. The historian needs to do the required research and view the peoples, their leaders, their societies in the same way that they viewed them themselves to the degree that this is permitted by the sources.

Coulanges makes reference to the university requirement that professors and students discuss ancient and medieval and modern times from a historical perspective. My comment is that it is common in US universities but not in the European ones that historians, even for their first degree, are trained in a number of historical periods and/or in the Histories of more than one continents. The Kent State University, Ohio, USA, my alma mater, states (2020) this clearly on the web page for the master's program in History. “While students will be able to develop a core competence in their chosen field of the study, our program requires that M.A. students also enroll in courses that detail the histories of regions and times far removed from one's central interests. Students may also pursue interdisciplinary work in cognate fields composed of courses in outside disciplines. [...] Our Kent [State University] program aims to produce educated scholar-citizens committed to historical empathy and in possession of critical thinking and communication skills [...]” And on the Ph.D. program page: “Students select three fields in which to concentrate their studies, including a transnational field focused on a particular thematic area and encompassing two distinct time periods or parts of the world.” The University of Strasbourg even today (2020) requires History students to study the Mediterranean region and Europe from antiquity to modern times. In my opinion, it is very important for a graduate/post-graduate student of European History and civilization to have been exposed to all historical periods as well as to the Histories of non-Europeans because there have never been silos in world societies. The Greeks and the Romans had contacts with the Egyptians, the Hebrews, the Phoenicians, the Carthaginians, the Celts, the Iberians, the Chinese (?) and other ancient peoples. In late antiquity, the western and eastern Romans had contacts with the peoples of the Mediterranean, the northeastern invaders and other peoples. At some point in time Spain was Muslim and Christian. In the epoch of the Great Discoveries the Europeans traveled all over the world and met new to them peoples and their civilizations. In the 19th century European imperialism reached Africa, Asia, the Americas. Nowadays, the USA, the European Union, Russia and China are politically, financially, socially and even militarily involved in many regions of the world and in some cases on the other side of their position on Earth. Therefore, only historians who will have been exposed to other than their own or their region's History, civilization, and culture will be able to understand and write on global History. The historian's preparation in ancient, medieval, modern languages and dialects, his/her familiarity with and the study of the sources, his/her experience in History writing demand a great effort. Precision in History writing is similar to that of the surgeon when s/he dissects, to the lawyer who makes a case in a court, to the engineer who makes calculations in order to erect a stable and safe building and even to the classical music composer when s/he records his/her music. But sometimes the historian may need to be vague when the sources are vague and not to unleash his/her imagination to construct

theories, explanations, and interpretations on towers built by playing cards. “L'histoire n'est pas une science facile.”

Plekhanov's individuals in History

Georgi V. Plekhanov (1856-1918) was a Russian revolutionary who initially studied in the Voronezh Military Academy that he abandoned in order to study at St. Petersburg Metallurgical Institute but he never graduated because he was involved in the politics against the Tsarist regime. Eventually, he emigrated to Western Europe where he was introduced to the works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels and he identified himself as “Marxist.” In 1898 he published his study on the role of the individual in History defending the Marxist theory against the bourgeois idea of the Great Men of History. In part IV of his study he states that there has been a controversy among German historians over “great men” in History. Some believe that the only force of historical development comes from the political activities of those great men while others claim that apart from great men and political deeds History must view historical life as a whole. He referred to a quote from a speech given by Chancellor Bismarck in the North German Reichstag in 1869: “We cannot make history: we must wait while it is being made” (part IV), which a German historian used to claim that even the strongest individual cannot change historical circumstances. But Plekhanov writes that this is not the solution to the problem of the role of the individual in History. Every protagonist in History uses an “act of securing” of the results of proceeding developments and a link to the series of events that will result in future outcomes. In other words, individuals or groups of individuals are not that powerful so that they force the making of History. They just take advantage of the opportunities they are given in order to achieve their future goals. However, the question is what does their power depend on, how it grows, and how it diminishes. Plekhanov does not share the then new idea about the “New History,” the discussion of economic and social History along with or beyond political and diplomatic History because he claims that these ideas, as stated, are vague. Of course, he agrees that the most important task of History is to study social institutions and economic conditions and this had already started by historians at the beginning of the 19th century but the role of the individual in History has not been dealt with. After the French Revolution one could not believe that History was made by “prominent”, “noble and enlightened” individuals who at their own will would fill the minds and the hearts of the masses with certain sentiments and ideas. At the end, the great event of the 18th century, the French Revolution, proved that the historical course was not “determined solely by the conscious actions of men” and this suggested that the events were “due to the influence of some hidden necessity.” (part V). This necessity operated like the forces of Nature, not aiming at any specific goal or direction, but according to “immutable laws.” History has proven that the mental and moral qualities and character of individuals who play a role in public life are acquired as a result of actions that are accidents of private life. As examples, Plekhanov writes, we can think of the refusal of Louis XV to annex part of today's Belgium after the War of the Austrian Succession claiming that he was fighting as a King not as a merchant. During the Seven Years War the generals of France suffered humiliating defeats because one devoted his time to plunder and two others were engaged in personal disputes rather than the war and in one case the one refused to help the other while he was being attacked by the enemy. One more example is how during the above war Frederick [the Great] was unexpectedly saved when an enemy general suddenly withdrew his forces from the battle field. Moreover, the death of empress Elisabeth a few months later, one more accidental event, changed the whole situation in favor of Frederick. A French historian claimed that apart from the major events that were consid-

ered as causes of the French Revolution, there were other minor ones like the death of Mirabeau, the survival of Robespierre until the end of his reign, Bonaparte's survival during the battles he fought. My comment is that this is a similar argument to the one for Cleopatra's nose, originally written by Pascal in his *Pensée* (paragraph 413/162, ed. Seuil, 1962), that History would have taken an entirely different course had Cleopatra's nose been shorter. “The character of an individual is a 'factor' in social development only where, when, and to the extent that social relations permit it to be such” (part VI), writes Plekhanov. However, accidental events in History are always relative. It appears only when two or more processes meet as inevitable. The appearance of Europeans in Mexico and South America was accidental because it was not a result of the social development of these peoples. But the passion of West Europeans for navigation at that time was not accidental nor the fact that they managed to defeat the natives easily. The outcome of their conquest was not accidental and was due to the economic situation of these peoples and the economic position of the conquerors. Therefore, the individuals do influence societies which is determined by “the internal structure of that society” and its interaction with other societies. Also, even if psychological causes (the personal qualities of individuals) are interwoven in the causes of an event, the main drive remains the social needs as it occurred in the French Revolution. The personal qualities of an individual cannot eliminate the given economic relations as in France the social need demanded new institutions that would better serve her economic system. Even if the fate of the lives of the protagonists in the French Revolution was different, this would not have changed the final outcome of the event. These individuals influence only “individual features of events” but “they cannot change their general trend.” These trends are determined by other forces. Also, Napoleon's personal power appeared magnified because it is the social power which is hidden behind it, that one which made him stand out and supported him. An individual's special talent may influence an event under two conditions: (a) this talent must conform with the social needs of a given era and (b) the existing social order must not be an obstacle to the activities of that individual at that given time. It was the fall of the old order in France which permitted the rise of Napoleon. Great talents appear there where the social conditions favor their existence and “every man of talent who becomes a social force, is the product of social relations.” (part VII). These talents can change only individual features of events but not the general trend because they are the product of this trend. In any case, the personal elements of individuals do play a significant role in History. History is not simply a chain of accidental events and the French Revolution has shown that events are not solely determined by the “conscious actions” of individuals alone. Human nature is not the final and the main cause of historical progress. The development of productive forces are the final and most general cause of the historical progress of mankind but there are also particular causes such as the historical situation as well as individual causes such as the character of public figures. The last ones cannot determine the particular or the general cause and therefore the concept of a “great man” is only relative.

My comment is that the contribution of any individual in History making depends on a number of factors: his/her educational, social, cultural preparation and condition until manhood/womanhood, his/her personal qualities, skills, and character, his/her involvement and inclusion in a social group, the suitable environment for his/her ideas to ripen and actions to happen, the politically, and/or economic and/or social milieu of the era the person is living and acting. In this sense, any historical figure is important regardless of the prefix “great” given by historians in some cases justifiably in order to distinguish two figures with the same name. Also, Alexander III of Macedon was “great” for some Greeks when he lived and for later historians but not

“great” at all for the conquered peoples in Asia. The same is true for a lot of leaders or even humble people throughout History. Gavrilo Princip was “great” for his fellow Serbs in the early 20th century when he killed Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria and his wife at Sarajevo in 1914 but an “assassin” for Austro-Hungarian Empire and the rest of Europe as without knowing it he put fire to the fuse for the beginning of World War I. Nevertheless, both Alexander and Gavrilo fulfilled the conditions we set above for the role of the individual in History.

Marx and Engel's historical materialism

Karl Marx (German, 1818-1883) was mainly a philosopher with a doctorate in philosophy from the University of Berlin. Friedrich Engels (English, 1820-1895) was the son of a manufacturer in England. None of them has written purely History works but the theory of materialism they developed is related to the theory of History. In their works there are references to their materialistic conception of History or historical materialism. What is most important though is that they greatly influenced historians in the late 19th and the 20th century, one of whom was Eric Hobsbawm I discussed above. There is a whole generation of historians who used the Marxian theory in order to study ancient, medieval, and modern History mainly in Europe and the Soviet Union, today's Russia was part of it. In the period of communist rule in Russia (1917-1989) it was required that all History books began with some reference to Karl Marx and his theory of historical materialism regardless of the time and the topic they discussed. In Britain a generation of historians used historical materialism in order to study the transition from feudalism to capitalism (Maurice Dobb, 1900-1976), feudalism and the English peasantry (Rodney Hilton, 1916–2002), the English Revolution (Christopher Hill, 1912–2003), European History (Eric Hobsbawm, 1917-2012), the making of the English working class (E. P. Thompson, 1924-1993). However, there had already been some thinkers in France in the late 19th century who had been influenced by socialist ideas in the writing of their history books with the most prominent one being Jean Jaurès (1859-1914, see below).

The core theme in understanding the communist perspective of History is historical materialism. According to Georg Hegel (1770–1831), whose theories were critically studied by Marx and Engels, there is an “abstract or absolute spirit” that is consciously carried by humanity. The History of humanity is the History of the abstract spirit of humanity and that spirit is above and beyond the human being. In their *German Ideology* (written in 1845-1846) Marx and Engels rejected this idea of abstraction that can be made only in one's imagination and introduced the real individual with his/her activities and real life conditions, which could be established through an empirical way. Human beings are different from animals because they produce their means of living and this mode of production is a mode of life because in this way they express their lives. The relations between nations depend on how much they have developed their productive forces, division of labor and external and internal interaction. The determinant factor for the development of the productive forces of a nation is the degree of the division of labor. Initially, the division of labor leads to the separation of industrial and commercial labor from agricultural. Then it is the separation of town and country and eventually the separation of commercial from industrial labor. History does not include the relation between human beings and nature, which is therefore an antithesis. Also, it cannot be explained by references to spiritual forces (ideas or ideologies) but in the material that human beings make and use in order to make a living. Based on this, manifestations of social life such as legal and political institutions as well as moral, religious, philosophical and other ideas can be interpreted and understood. In Marx and Engel's philosophy the basis is the real human being and his/her

real life (solid facts) not what humans say, imagine, believe or narrate. The phantoms of morality, religion, metaphysics, other ideologies are not independent and they have no History or development. It is human material production and interaction that alters their existence, thinking and the outcome of their thinking. The History of humanity must always be studied in relation to the history of industry and commerce because there is a materialistic connection among human beings. This is in brief the essence of historical materialism.

In his *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (1859) Marx explains the historical development of the material forces of production. Forms of State and legal relations exist in the material conditions of life, which Hegel names civil society. The anatomy of the civil society must be investigated in political economy and the general conclusion is that all relations of production developed by individuals constitute the economic structure of society. It is the mode of production of tangible things that determines the social, political, and spiritual processes of life and not the consciousness of human beings. There is a point in time when the material forces of production in society come in conflict with the property relations of the society as they have become their “fetters” and then occurs a social revolution. Higher relations of production appear only when the material conditions of their existence have grown within the old society. Marx distinguishes four modes of production: Asiatic, ancient, feudal, modern bourgeois, in the progression of the economic formation of society. The bourgeois mode is the last antagonistic mode because of conflict due to the conditions surrounding the lives of individuals in society. The productive forces that are grown within the bourgeois society create the material conditions for the end of this antagonism and the new social formation puts an end to the prehistory of human society. My comment here is that Marx's last point is so vague without the clear explanation of his “relations of production” and how the property relations have become the “fetters” of the material forces that a number of explanations is possible. A simplistic political explanation, Marx continuous, would be that throughout History the poor have been chained by the rich during the economic development of the society but there is a point when the poor acquire the critical mass needed and they revolt. This revolution will lead to a non antagonistic mode of production within the new society. History, therefore, is just the successive stages of modes of production that lead to the ideal society.

In the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (1848), a pamphlet written by Marx and Engels for the 19th century workers' apprehension of their view of the development of human society, class conflict is explained in plain words. Writing in the light of the 1848 revolutions in Europe Marx and Engels begin the preamble of the publication with these words: “A spectre is haunting Europe — the spectre of communism.” They both believed that they/the communist party is making History and they wanted to explain the historical progress that had led to that great moment and the future. “The history of all hitherto existing society is the (written) history of class struggles” between freemen and slaves, patricians and plebeians, lords and serfs, guild-masters and journeymen in the Middle Ages, in two words, oppressor and oppressed. The conflict between these two classes resulted either in a revolution or in their collapse. In the times of the bourgeoisie [it was the year 1848 when the pamphlet was written], society is split up into two hostile camps, the bourgeoisie on the one hand and the proletariat on the other. The bourgeoisie is the class of the capitalists, owners of the means of social production and employers and the proletariat is the class of wage laborers who have no means of production of their own and sell their labor power in order to live. The bourgeoisie built its power on means of production that were generated in the feudal society of the Middle Ages and has undergone a long process of develop-

ment through revolutions in the modes of production and commerce. The conflict in 1848 was and according to Marx and Engels in the future it will continue to be between the oppressing (capitalists) and the oppressed (proletarians), between capital and wage labor.

In his 17 April 1871 letter to Louis/Ludwig Kugelmann (1828-1902) and during the Paris Commune rule of the capital of France, Marx explained that world History would be very easy to make if there were always favorable chances for the struggle with no mistakes and it would be impossible if “accidents” had no role in it. These “accidents” are part of the historical development and they are “compensated for” by other “accidents.” In this case the reference is to the appearance of the Prussians before Paris during the Franco-Prussian War of 1871 and when the radicals had taken over the government in Paris. These “accidents,” therefore, determine how slow or how fast events will run and include the “accident” of the protagonists of History. And Marx concludes this letter with his comments on the situation in Paris by writing the following: “The struggle of the working class against the capitalist class and its state has entered upon a new phase with the struggle in Paris. Whatever the immediate results may be, a new point of departure of world historic importance has been gained.” My comment is that according to Marx there are no “great men” theories and that “accidents” in the sense of combinations of favorable or unfavorable conditions could play a decisive role in History. However, according to him, the most important factor in History was/is class struggle.

Jean Jaurès, the first socialist historian

Jean Jaurès (1859-1914, doctorate in philosophy, University of Toulouse) was a French socialist politician and historian who tried to reconcile materialism with idealism. He wrote a History of the French Revolution after doing an extensive research in French archives for the workers and the farmers and he explains the socialist approach in his introduction. In his interpretation of History he followed both Marx with his historical materialism and Michelet (see below) with his mysticism and patriotism. Both the mechanism of human History and its basis, he claims, are founded on economic life but at the same time human beings are thinking forces and they are aspired to the life of thought. Apart from its economic interpretation, History has moral values such as liberty and humanity, which were used in the 19th century as a cover for exploitation and oppression. Although the French Revolution proclaimed the Rights of Man, the wealthy managed to include the rights of the bourgeoisie and the capitalists. The social revolution will occur by the force of circumstances and by the consciousness and will of human beings. Jaurès' socialist History of the French Revolution and its aftermath will include all parts of human life and even those who read Plutarch's “Lives,” the intellectuals. He will try to understand the economic evolution in society, the spirit's strive for total truth, and the “human consciousness defying suffering, tyranny, and death.” The proletariat will free him/herself and become humanity only if s/he becomes fully conscious of the role of economic activity. In his History of the French Revolution he recognized two revolutionary forces: “On one hand the French nation had reached intellectual maturity, and on the other the French bourgeoisie had reached social maturity. French thought had become conscious of its grandeur and it wanted to apply its methods of analysis and deduction to all aspects of reality.” And he concludes: “A historian is always allowed to oppose hypotheses to destiny. He is allowed to say here are the faults of men and parties and to imagine that without these faults events would have followed another course. [...] But what must never be forgotten when judging these men is that the problems destiny imposed on them were formidable and probably beyond human strength. [...]. Socialism [...] is a democratic

party to the highest degree, since it wants to organize the sovereignty of all in both the economic and political orders.” My comment is that for Jaurès History making is not only driven by economic forces but by destiny as well. At the end of the 19th century this was democracy and socialism, his political belief. Jaurès' patriotic tone in his history writing was inspired from the writings of historian Jules Michelet.

Michelet's patriotism in History writing

Jules Michelet (French, 1798-1874) received his doctorate from the University of Paris and was the one who invented the term “Renaissance” in order to show the great difference of that period compared to the Middle Ages, which he loathed. So, in terms of historical periodization he created the modern era. Apart from teaching he devoted his life in History writing and his major work and contribution to French and European historiography was his nineteen volume *Histoire de France* (1833-1866). He did not write anything specific on his theory of History but the method he used is revealed in his works because “his History has actually become a philosophy of History.” (Barthe, p. 25). First of all, his whole work is apocalyptic in essence and is driven by a strong feeling of patriotism for the greatness and glories of France against mainly England, Germany and Russia. There are three main categories of topics that run throughout his work: the evil, the good, the paired. There are evil and good hegemones/states and leaders. The paired themes include ideas such as Grace and Justice, union in his discussion of the History of nations and unity for France only.

Roland Barthes makes some interesting observations about Jules Michelet and his work. History for him was not merely a succession of facts but a continuity of identities. He is not interested in cause and effect, facts are just different moments. However, his kind of causation is related to the “realms of morality” and it can be taken as mechanical causes. Greece was light and therefore it cannot be homosexual; Frederick the Great had a very strong soul and nerves of steel that make it impossible for him to be a pederast, be fond of boys; the family is a protestant characteristic and therefore it must not exist in catholic France. History moves on by equalities. Jeanne d'Arc is not the product of previous events but she equals both the People and the Revolution, she is both the seed and the fruit. History is homogeneous and is composed of a chain of identities, it is a continuity of identical objects. Michelet has recognized in the plain peasant the People, who are the common principal substance to all History. Justice remains the basis of all historical moments. On the level of ideas, History progresses by transformations more than by evolutions because Michelet chooses “the movement of continuity, not its structure.” (Barthe, p. 37). Every History event is “Grace or Justice, Fatality or Freedom, Christianity or Revolution” where one fights the other in a succession of halts and advances. For example, Syria, Alexandria, the Jews, the Jesuits, the monarchy, Spinoza, Hegel, Molinos, Hobbes are all Grace while Persia, Greece, Witchcraft, the Protestants, Leibniz, the 18th century are Justice. Certain periods of History such as the Middle Ages or Napoleon's rule are bored, “a sign that History stops growing.” The word that characterizes the Middle Ages is imitation. In his very emotional and written in a very personal style introduction to his seven volume *Histoire de la Révolution Française* (1847-1853) Michelet writes: “I define the Revolution, – The advent of the Law, the resurrection of Right, and the reaction of Justice. [...] In other words, is the Revolution Christian or Anti-Christian? [and further down] I see upon the stage but two grand facts, two principles, two actors and two persons, Christianity and the Revolution.” And Barthes comments that for Michelet Grace and Justice are Christianity (the milieu) and Revolution (the force) and they are complementary. “History is an amorous combat.” (Barthes, p. 60). After he writes so many good words about Louis XI in the Preface of the first volume of his

Histoire de France, Michelet, continues: “I entered with Louis XI upon the monarchic centuries. I was about to commit myself to them when a sort of accident inspired me with second thoughts. One day, passing through Rheims, I examined in great detail the magnificent cathedral, the splendid church of the Rites of Coronation. [...] In the empty immensity, one thinks one still hears the great official clamor, what used to be called the voice of the people.” The History of the people was his main concern throughout his work. The role of the historian in Michelet's practice is not to reconstitute History but a “body to embrace. The historian exists only to recognize a warmth.” (Barthes, p. 81). The documents are used as voices [‘as memory of past bodies’] not as witnesses and therefore, the legend (the national tradition) is superior to the texts. The collective consciousness of the People is better to the dry one of individuals. The historian does not read past ideas, forces, causes, systems but the “carnal death.” The life of the protagonists of History is understood only after their death, when they have completed goal in life. “The historian [according to Michelet] is precisely the magus who receives from the dead their actions, their sufferings, their sacrifices, and gives them a place in History's universal memory.” (Barthes, p. 82). He is not impartial between what is good and evil, what is good and right and he declares that in plain words in the conclusion he writes for the 16th century in his *Histoire de France*. “Je déclare, cette histoire n’est pas impartiale. Elle ne garde pas un sage et prudent équilibre entre le bien et le mal. Au contraire, elle est partielle, franchement et vigoureusement, pour le droit et la vérité. [...] Je crois l’avoir vu au visage, ce siècle, et j’ai tâché de le faire voir. J’ai donné tout au moins une impression vraie de sa physionomie.”¹²

He described the physical appearance of History figures on the basis of busts and paintings as for example with Napoleon. “Au contraire, madame Laetitia, dans ses portraits Italiens [...]. Les yeux noirs et fixes, tout grand ouverts, n'en sont pas moins énigmatiques. S'ils regardent, c'est en dedans, leur rêve ou leur passion.”¹³ (*Histoire du XIXe siècle*, vol. I, section III, part I). And for Marie-Louise of Austria before her marriage to Napoleon: “Ce fut un sacrifice humain. Marie-Louise, sous son éclat sanguin, et sous sa fraîcheur de vingt ans, était comme une morte. On la livrait au Minotaure [Napoleon], au grand ennemi de sa famille, à l'assassin du duc d'Enghien. N'allait-il pas la dévorer?...”¹⁴ (*Histoire du XIXe siècle*, vol. III, section IV, part VIII). Because of the marriage arrangement with the French Emperor, she is described as a dead woman regardless of her “rosy luster” and her freshness as a twenty-year old girl.

The horror of the Great Terror and the end of Robespierre, a very important moment in the History of the French Revolution, are described with intense emotions and passion.

“[In the promenade of the carts] There were dead and dying men, miserable bleeding bodies handed over to the joys of the mob. To make them stand on their feet, they were bound with ropes to the rails of the carts, their legs, arms and heads wagging. [...] Robespierre, head wrapped in a

¹² “I declare, this history is not impartial. It does not keep a wise and careful balance between good and evil. On the contrary, it is biased, frankly and vigorously, for right and truth. [...] I believe I saw it in the face, this century, and I tried to make it visible. I gave at least a true impression of his physiognomy.”

¹³ “On the contrary, Madame Laetitia, in her Italian portraits [...]. The black, fixed eyes, wide open, are no less enigmatic. If they look, it is within, their dream or their passion.”

¹⁴ “It was a human sacrifice. Marie-Louise, beneath her sanguine glow, and beneath her twenty-year-old freshness, was like a dead woman. She was delivered to the Minotaur [Napoleon], to the great enemy of her family, to the assassin of the Duke of Enghien. Was he not going to devour her? ...”

filthy bloodstained rag which bound up his dislocated jaw, in that horrible situation which no defeated man had ever endured –bearing the dread weight of a whole people's curse– kept his stiff posture, his firm bearing, his dry, fixed gaze. [...] The women [...] leaning out into the rue Saint-Honore, with the men behind them, they screamed in shrill voices: "To death! To the guillotine!" [...] Robespierre had drunk with wormwood all that the world contains. At last he reached the gateway, the Place de la Revolution. He mounted the steps of the scaffold with a steady tread. [...] He died worthy, grave, and simple. France will never be consoled for such a hope; this man was great with a greatness that was his own, owing nothing to fortune, and he alone would have been strong enough to make the sword tremble before the Law." (trans. in Barthe, pp. 112-117 from *Histoire de la Révolution Française*, vol. IX, book XXI, part X).

His *Histoire de la Révolution Française* is the first ever History of the event from a republican, anti-clerical, evangelical point of view.

Although Michelet looked at every possible primary and secondary source for his works his vivid imagination, his anti-clerical feelings and his political inclination against the empire gave them a strong personal point of view. He emphasized the circumstances that satisfied his points while he passed lightly or even dismissed others just to glorify the People. But he was the first to understand the geographical factor in History, an idea that was latter revisited by the *Annales* school historians. His description of the geography of France ("Tableaux de la France"), the features, climate, inhabitants, character, contribution to national life of each province, in Book III of his *Histoire de France* is breath taking. Generally, his work stands out for his passion for the people, its patriotic and republican greatness and its literary finesse. My comment is that it requires great literary skill for a historian to write vivid and passionate descriptions of historical events that are not just his/her imagination but are based on the sources. At least General History must not be a dry set of facts, explanations and interpretation but must include vivid pictures of its great moments.

Carlyle's heroes

Great moments do involve peoples and leaders. Thomas Carlyle (Scottish, 1795–1881) was greatly fond of leaders-heroes, the great men of History. After he attended the University of Edinburgh he became a teacher of mathematics but eventually became a writer. His writings include a *History of the French Revolution* (3 volumes, 1837) and *The History of Friedrich II of Prussia, Called Frederick the Great* (6 volumes, 1858-1865). Before writing any History work, he had decided what was History for him and published his ideas in 1830. History is actually man's first spiritual expression, thought. With History one looks at the Past and to the Future and their combination completes the meaning of both. Some tribes may not be able to count beyond five but they have attempted History. "In a certain sense all men are historians." Human memory has written stories, joy and mourning, conquest and defeat, foreign and domestic politics of even little kingdoms that are recorded. Human beings narrate and enact History, they recite it. However, History proper, which records remarkable actions, has always been considered "among the highest arts." The learned advise: 'Examine History for it is Philosophy teaching by Experience' but this cannot be achieved because before philosophy can teach by experience, the latter must be "gathered and intelligibly recorded." Social life includes all human beings lives who constitute society and History is a complete set of human biographies. But which was the most important person in human History, Hannibal with his deeds or "the nameless

boor who first hammered out for himself an iron spade?” Only very important events such as the crossing of the Alps or the battle of Marathon may be remembered although there have been many battles. Also, one must recognize that the inventions, traditions, and habits with which we live are the work of peoples such as the Phoenicians, the Italian masons, the Saxon metallurgists, of “philosophers, alchemists, prophets” and not of law makers in assemblies. There is a great difference between what the most gifted human being can observe and then record. What is written History is not by definition what the eye witnesses saw, experienced or perceived. Historical events happen simultaneously and may be the outcome of many other events. Events may combine to produce a new event. In History writing there are Artists and Artisans. The former are the ones who work mechanically without understanding and knowing that there is a Whole and the latter those who know the Whole and understand that in the Whole is the Partial to be perceived. Historians should not believe that their study of a combination of “political, moral, economical” circumstances and other issues that lead to an event, could assist them conclude that certain properties belong to human society and the same circumstances will produce again the same issue. Matters studied in the way described above are inexhaustible. The political historian is not any more the sole “cultivator” of History but there are others who take care of other manifestation of human life such as the ecclesiastical historian. But ecclesiastical History should study not only the Church administration documents. It should also look into the hearts of the believers where one can find progress and decline. “The History of the Church is a History of the invisible as well as of the Visible Church.” Apart from the above though, more Histories exist: of Art and Literature, of the Sciences, of Mathematics, but we should not loose the Whole for the Parts.

Carlyle's main idea on History develops in his 1840 series of six lectures on heroes. His topics are the hero as divinity (mythology), the hero as prophet (Islam), the hero as poet (Dante, Shakespeare), the hero as priest (Reformation heroes), the hero as man of letters, the hero as king. So, the main theme is “Great Men” (Lecture I), the Heroes, how they appeared in the world and in History, what they did, what is “hero-worship” and what is heroic in human deeds. This topic is as large as Universal History because what human beings have accomplished in this world is in the bottom line “the History of the Great men who have worked here.” They led other men and women and they were the creators of what humanity has managed to achieve, they were the ones who generated the Thoughts for human accomplishments. The heart of world History is their History. “The great man, with his free force direct out of God’s own hand, is the lightning” (Lecture I) because all can believe in his “wise healing word.” The History of the world is just the biography of Great Men. In all historical eras Great men have been the saviors of their epoch, their lightning. A man of genius is the most precious present that Heaven can give to the Earth (Lecture II). A human being must conform himself to the laws of nature. “At all moments the Flame-image glares-in upon him; [...] – I wish you to take this as my primary definition of a Great Man.” (Lecture II). Dante is world-great because he is world-deep because he “pierces” into the heart of “Being.” (Lecture III). Shakespeare, on the other hand, was “wide, placid, far-seeing, as the Sun, the upper light of the world.” The last form of heroism for Carlyle is kingship. “The Commander over Men,” the most important of “Great Men,” the Ablest Man, the Noblest Man (Lecture VI). If these men are raised to the supreme place, then we have the perfect government for a country. The worshiping of a Hero exists forever and is everywhere and it extends from “divine adoration” to simple life practicalities. The mission of a hero is to change chaos into order. A leader's career is not conceived and planned just before it begins and unfolds little by little as a “program of a whole drama.” No, that man is not an “ὕποκριτής” (an ac-

tor). He is a noble silent man, “silently thinking, silently hoping, silently working.” (Summary of Lecture VI). It has been established among historians that Carlyle's History writings must be understood within his “wider social criticism” (Encycl. of Historians, 1:178).

G. P. Gooch explains in his analysis of Carlyle's works that in the first essay about History above and before he began practicing History writing he emphasized the role of the humble in History making. However, later on, in his History works, it was the biography of great men he worshiped not the anonymous human beings who lived in the ages he dealt with. Carlyle's highly esteemed *History of the French Revolution* is a literary dramatic work of the highest level, full of passion as he embedded in it his moral and religious ideas. “It has come hot out of my own soul, born in blackness, whirlwind and sorrow,” wrote in one of his letters (Gooch, p. 303). In his narration of the dramatic scenes (Bastille, raid on Versailles, Varennes, trial of the King, Danton, Robespierre) he can only be compared to Michelet as his historical figures actually bled through the book. He was a poet writing History. However, his research lacked the use of important sources such as pamphlets and archives that had not been organized yet. Therefore, compared to modern standards, there are so many errors or omissions and acceptance of legends that he basically imagined the French Revolution. This revolution was for him destructive as he failed to recognize collective life and aim to the masses. He only saw individuals. So, there is no cause and effect in his History. In contrast to Michelet's History, he does not see the seeds of democracy in the events and the ideas of the French Revolution. Among the pages of his History, he emerges as a great showman and the least of interpreters. He was very careless in his selection of sources, especially regarding their authenticity and text establishment. It was his study of Cromwell's life and actions which convinced him that “men of action formed the backbone of history.” (Gooch, p. 307). He had no faith in democracy or science, he considered parliament a weakness not a strength of the political system of his era and little by little he turned to great men, the great minds of all centuries. His book on Frederick II of Prussia (the Great) introduced the ruler to the English public as 'the last of the kings.’ With his books Carlyle kept the imagination of his readers alive but “his whole philosophy was that the common herd must be drilled and punished by their superiors.” (Gooch, p. 309).

My comment is that undoubtedly this idea of “Great Men” seems rather parochial about two hundred years after Carlyle put it forward. In reality he just followed the path of Arrian with his biography of Alexander and so many other historians after him until very recently when the “great men” theory was abandoned. To be realistic no one else but Alexander of Macedonia, Charlemagne, Justinian, Cromwell, Lenin, F. D. Roosevelt, Schmidt Chancellor of Germany could have done what they did in their respective era and the public admires them. However, for a historian there are no great men in History but human beings who fulfill their mission of serving their fellow human beings successfully and this may include statesmen/stateswomen, army officers, public servants, doctors, writers, teachers, just mothers and fathers and so many others.

Macauley's intellectual prodigy

Just two years before the publication of Carlyle's essay on History, Thomas Macauley (British, 1800-1859) published in 1828 his own idea about what History is. He was just twenty eight years old but already a man of advanced age, in terms of the average life expectancy of the times, when he hid his opinion in a book review. He studied law at Cambridge University and he was called to the bar in 1826 but he was mainly involved in politics. At the beginning of his essay he defines what a good his-

torian is. To summarize diplomatic correspondence and to discuss about the character of great men in order to write History is easy, writes Macauley, but to be a great historian is very rare. A perfect historian must have an imagination powerful enough in order “to make his narrative affecting and picturesque” but without additions of his own. He must have strong reasoning skills but without trying to adjust the facts so that they fit his hypothesis. As a general rule one can say that “history begins in Novel and ends in Essay.” In Herodotus's *Histories* there are so many facts as fictions so that we are not sure where the truth lies. Herodotus faults in his History writing are those of an imaginative mind narrating in a dramatic fashion. But with the development of culture in Athens, Thucydides's History made a difference. At that time, the Greeks were interested less and less in gossiping and picturesque narrations and more in accuracy and a sort of scientific mode of writing. Herodotus accepted the archetype of History writing but Thucydides created it. The best fiction writers are the worst History writers because they are used to employing their imagination in order to invent a story and then narrate it while a historian needs to narrate without inventing. “No picture is exactly like the original; nor is a picture good in proportion as it is like the original.” History cannot be “perfectly and absolutely true” because it would have to record “all” the slightest events. The annals we keep in libraries tell us very little of the whole story. “No picture, then, and no history, can present us with the whole truth: but those are the best pictures and the best histories which exhibit such parts of the truth as most nearly produce the effect of the whole.”

In History writing, events that are in History's foreground must be represented on a large scale, the others in her background must be diminished. A historian such as Thucydides will give the general effect of the great majority of events “in a few slight touches” and will focus on the great picture. Thucydides has managed to stimulate the reader's imagination without inventing events. The most difficult part of a historian's work is from the facts to find the principles that are like gold in the ore and his most difficult task is to separate them. Macaulay criticizes Polybius and Arrian that their “authentic” accounts include only the facts and that they lacked a “comprehensive mind,” the art of narrating in an interesting way. On the other hand, they did not mislead their readers and they did understand the “character” of the times they wrote about. But Livy (Titus Livius, Roman historian, 59 BC-AD 17), although he does form a class by himself, he showed complete “indifference to truth.” He was only interested in drawing beautiful pictures by using words and descriptions that are very vivid. He looked at the past with interest because “it had led to the present” and because he wanted to “trace the progress” of Roman glory. Livy glorifies Rome and its institutions that sustain liberty. A “great historian” should always have in mind that s/he writes about people of the past who cannot reply to the historian's interpretations. A historian's work is similar to that of a dramatist's in the mode of conception but the former only disposes facts while the latter creates them. Although historians of Macaulay's era had managed to “deduce general principles from facts” they had “fallen into the error of distorting facts to suit general principles.” They use some of the sources and adjust the rest to suit the theory they have come up with. A historian should be able to narrate, keep the interest of his readers, present “images to [their] imagination” without violating truth. No event of the past is important by itself but only if it leads us to form “calculations with respect to the future.” A history filled with battles, treaties and various disturbances is useless if it does not serve the above purpose. “The perfect historian is he in whose character the spirit of an age is exhibited in miniature.” His/her facts and characterizations must be backed up by “sufficient testimony” and s/he must focus on both the detail (court, camp, senate) and the general picture (nation), the people and the government, the knights and the pilgrims. S/he

must be able to understand that revolutions are the outcomes of moral changes which have developed little by little and require the knowledge of the domestic Histories of nations. In his conclusion, Macaulay stated that the ideal historian described in his essay would be an “intellectual prodigy.”

Apart from the heavy criticism on some of his writings, it has been said that “if Macaulay did not invent the historical essay, he found it of brick and left it of marble.” (Gooch, p. 279) and because of this and his writings on the History of England he raised the interest of the public for History. He is a fascinating story-teller, the “Rubens of historiography,” equal to Carlyle and Michelet. My comment is that I would keep from Macaulay's essay that a good historian should use his imagination where necessary in order to write his History but without adjusting the facts to a theory of his/her own. S/he should be selective and focus on the great image as well as on the necessary detail and should write in a way that keeps the interest of his/her readers alive throughout his/her work.

Von Ranke's “wie es eigentlich gewesen”

The great majority of the historians discussed above as well as almost any writer who analyzes the historiography of the last two centuries makes reference to Leopold von Ranke (German, 1795-1886), the father of modern History writing. Von Ranke was thrilled with the study of History that made him live through the ages again. “It is so sweet to revel in the wealth of all the centuries, to meet all the heroes face to face, to live through everything again.” (in Gooch, pp. 73-74). As the reader may have already observed, the interpretations by other authors of the historical methods he used are many and some present them in a way that seem to be totally wrong. Of course, History writing has been developed and has incorporated various methods of other disciplines as well as new ideas but von Ranke's principles are those used by a great number of History writers even today. As his ideas discussed by various authors above and elsewhere are not very clear, I decided to study his own works about the theory of History and make myself a close summary of them as I have done with all other historians in this work. However, a short introduction to his studies, career and method will be useful before we discuss his own words about History and History writing.

Leopold von Ranke studied ancient Greek, Latin and Lutheranism at the University of Leipzig and eventually became a professor at the University of Berlin in 1824. He introduced the historical seminar and the critical study of sources for History writing (the document laboratory) in 1833, both of which have become the norm in university History studies in Europe and the USA. The search for History sources as opposed to the Renaissance use of literary works, their critical study as well as their exclusive use in History writing is what later authors named historicism (*historicismus*). Historicism has become the basis of most historical scholarship since the late 19th century. Critics have accused von Ranke and mainly his successors of being narrow minded based on his phrase that he wanted to write History “as it really happened” (“wie es eigentlich gewesen”), interpreted as just the facts of History. The facts that were to speak by themselves could be found in the state papers that von Ranke used in order to write strictly political History. Also, it has been noted in the 20th century that the word “eigentlich” in its early 19th century context was used to mean “actually/real-ly” as well as “essential” or “characteristic,” which is the meaning that von Ranke gave frequently to the word and especially in this phrase: “what essentially happened.” Therefore, the meaning of the word in this phrase “is not factuality, but the emphasis on the essential that makes an account historical.” (Iggers & Moltke, p. xx). Von Ranke has to be read in the light of the intellectual environment of the 19th

century and it must be understood that along with Michelet and Macaulay, they “were men relatively at peace with the dominant political trends in their countries and satisfied to live in the nineteenth century.” (Iggers & Moltke, p. xxi). A careful study of von Ranke's writings about History theory reveal many other aspects of his ideas and theories on the practice of History.

Von Ranke's ideas, though, as part of German *Ideenlehre* (Doctrine of ideas), were heard for the first time from the mouth of Wilhelm von Humboldt (German, 1767-1835). Humboldt was a philosopher who worked mainly on the philosophy of language and on “public state education” and published his ideas in 1792. He never completed university education himself but he was the one who devised a system of public instruction with primary and secondary education, state examinations and inspections. He founded the University of Berlin, the present Humboldt-Universität, in 1809. He wanted to create well informed citizens rather than just artisans, merchants, businesspersons with vocational training. It was Humboldt who invited von Ranke in 1824 to teach History in Berlin. A few years earlier, in 1821, the German philosopher delivered a speech in the Prussian Academy of Sciences under the title “On the Historian's task” that begins with the phrase “The historian's task is to present what actually happened” (“Die Aufgabe des Geschichtschreibers ist die Darstellung des Geschehenen.”) He begins by discussing the idea of the event. The whole event, he writes, cannot be seen by the historian and the missing part must be completed by “intuition, inference, and guesswork.” It is History's raw material but not History itself. An event is fragmented and observation can only detect circumstances that accompany it or follow one another, not “their inner causal nexus” on which their truth depends. A narrative which is absolutely true is very rare and historical truth are clouds that are seen as a whole only from a distance. The truth of an event will be revealed only when the historian adds what is missing, that which he could not have grasped “as it really was.” Then, like a poet but in a different way s/he must put everything together into one whole by using his/her imagination. However, his imagination that does not act as pure fantasy needs to be subordinated to experience and investigation of reality. Two methods have to be used for the recovery of historical truth: (a) “the exact, impartial, critical investigation of events”; (b) the connecting and the understanding of the events. This way, the historian will avoid falsification of truth and understand the actions of human beings through intuition and study. “[...] History strives to attain the vision of man's fate in its complete truth [...]” and the historian will fulfill it by “the simple narration of events,” which must stir the reader's emotions as if the latter experienced the reality of the events. So, that's how History is related to active life. History does not teach us by example but influences our acting on reality. The historian must be able to show individual events as part of a whole and reveal the form of History in the events described. He must separate the necessary events from the accidental and make visible their activating forces in order to reveal truth and accuracy. Events are only half understood or distorted if one just views them but the trained historian can reveal their true form. An historical presentation is an imitation of nature and its basis “is the recognition of the true form, the discovery of the necessary, the elimination of the accidental.” The historian's work will not be satisfactory if s/he just presents the specific circumstances of an event. S/he must reveal their inner nexus, their active forces, their trends in a given moment, and inquire into their relation with the existing state of affairs. An understanding of the individual presupposes knowledge of the general, under which is comprehended and in this sense “the understanding of events must be guided by ideas.”

“Every human individuality is an idea rooted in actuality,” an active drive that gives shape to its inner, unique nature and it is the same with the individuality of na-

tions. Their inner drive is more recognizable than in individuals. “Human judgment cannot perceive the plans of the governance of the world directly but can only divine them in the ideas through which they manifest themselves, and therefore all history is the realization of an idea.” Therefore, the goal of History is the actualization of the idea. There is an idea in everything that happens which cannot be directly perceived but can be recognized in the events themselves. Apart from material sources, the historian must include the power of the idea or “leave room for the activity of the idea” in his presentation. But he must be careful not to assign to reality ideas that he has created by himself. The historian must be free “to perceive events in their scope and depth.” History differs from art and literature, it is an autonomous discipline.

Humboldt claims, therefore, that there is an inner idea in events and therefore in History writing but this should not be an invented one by the historian himself/herself. Imagination but not fantasy must be used by the historian in order to complete the missing part of the events. There is a true form in the events that only a trained historian can reveal due to his study and experience. The individual fact can be understood only as part of a whole. Historians can only “divine” the plans of God about the world in their manifested ideas and therefore History “is the realization of an idea,” which is understood as the German *Ideenlehre*.

When von Ranke taught “The Study of History” module in 1831-1832, he was well informed of Humboldt's framework of German historical idealism as presented above. Very early in his studies he had separated fiction from History in his mind and in one of his late age dictated fragments he said: “I found by comparison that the truth was more interesting and beautiful than the romance. I turned away from it and resolved to avoid all invention and imagination in my works and stick to facts.” (in Gooch, p. 74). The von Ranke's university lecture notes (translated into English in Igers & Konrad) reveal that the historian took the whole theme a step further and formulated specific principles in the theory and practice of History. On the relations between philosophy and History lecture he defends the autonomy of History. Philosophy, he writes, claims that humankind is on a continuous progress towards perfection. This is based though on the lives of few people while those of the rest of human beings are disregarded. We can acquire knowledge about human deeds through the understanding of the particular (History) and through abstraction (philosophy). History, in its own way, can move from the investigation and the observation of the particular “to a general view of events.” A true historian will be fond of humans with all their goods and evils and will have an interest in the particular and in the general without preconceived ideas. People enter world History when they come to contact with other people and it is exactly this relation that must be made special reference in general History and the peoples who have “made their mark in history” (influence, struggles, their development, their spiritual basis and content) are the ones to attract the historian's attention.

In the lecture on the character of historical science, von Ranke claims that History is both an art and a science, never the one without the other. It is a science because the historian collects, finds, penetrates and it is an art because s/he recreates and presents the findings. Recreation is fundamental in History writing. Philosophy and poetry are in the sphere of the ideal but History relies on reality. It is important that the principle, the scope, and the unity of world History are explained. The vital principle of History is that it “recognizes something infinite in every existence: in every condition, in every being, something eternal, coming from God” because nothing can be without “the divine basis of its existence.” And von Ranke insists on his conviction and writes that “we believe that there is nothing without God, and nothing lives except through God. [...] all our efforts stem from a higher, religious source.” This supreme

principle demands from the historian's practice pure love for truth through a profound and penetrating study of the documentation around the event. The initial study begins with its condition, its surrounding so that it becomes known to us. Then, its essence and content as any unity “can only be grasped through spiritual apperception.” Historians must have a “universal interest” about History, which means that they must devote their study to civic institutions, political History, scientific progress, the arts as aspects of society are present always together. S/he must penetrate and recognize the causal nexus because there is an inner connection of cause and effect. Historians must be impartial. When there are two figures the role of the historian is to penetrate them “to the bottom of their existence” and present them with impartiality. History must be just toward both movement (as evolution not revolution) and resistance and “the struggle will be decided according to God's will.” Historians should strive for totality but the difficulty of the task becomes obvious in world History. “What an infinite amount of material! What diverse efforts! How difficult it is only to grasp the particular. Since, moreover, there is much that we do not know, how are we to understand the causal nexus everywhere, not to mention getting to the bottom of the essence of totality?” This is very difficult to be solved as “God alone knows world history” but historians do recognize the unity that exists, “a progression, a development.” Von Ranke makes a number of references to God and his involvement in the progress of History. However, it has been noted that apart from his religious beliefs, his works have not been affected by theological convictions. (Gooch, p. 74).

Universal History can be discussed with regard to sequence, simultaneity, individual developments. History embraces all mankind although much of it is lost or unknown to us. Still alive are only those that History remembers through the documentary traces. Due to the fact that there are no surviving documents Prehistory, the creation of the world, the solar system and the earth must be excluded from History. Myths may occasionally contain a historical element but they generally express the thoughts of peoples. Historians must always investigate the particular in a larger context. In this sense, local history is related to the History of a country, a biography is related to a larger event at political or religious administration level, “to an epoch of national or general history.” These epochs constitute the totality we name “universal history,” (a history of mankind) whose conception and composition is the historian's ultimate goal for the benefit of all mankind. A historian should “work in two directions: the investigation of the effective forces behind events and the perception of their general connection.” Von Ranke recognized the usefulness of the in depth research for the particular as a prerequisite for the validity of the general: “Without a general view, research would become sterile; without exact research, the general view would deteriorate into fantasy.” My comment is that this is exactly why today a General History with less or more detail can be written as it can be safely based on mountains of research on the particulars, readily available.

In the prefaces of his works, von Ranke explains the scope of the specific book and some ideas of his theory of History. In the *Histories of the Latin and Germanic Nations* (1824) he writes: “To history has been given the function of judging the past, of instructing men for the profit of future years. The present attempt does not aspire to such a lofty undertaking. It merely wants to show how, essentially, things happened.” This is a newer translation of the German original: “Man hat der Historie das Amt, die Vergangenheit zu richten, die Mitwelt zum Nutzen zukünftiger Jahre zu belehren, beigemessen: so hoher Aemter unterwindet sich gegenwärtiger Versuch nicht: er will bloß zeigen, wie es eigentlich gewesen.” [Leopold von Ranke, *Geschichten der romanischen und germanischen Völker von 1494 bis 1535* (Leipzig: Reimer, 1824), pp. v-vi.]. He also stated his sources for that book which included “memoirs, diaries, letters,

reports from embassies, and original narratives of eyewitnesses.” Peoples, powers, individuals were discussed in detail only when they acquired an important or leading role in History. In all his prefaces, von Ranke mentions the archives and the collections of documents he found and studied. In his book about the Popes, he was, of course, unable to study every source because this would take him “a whole life” but he was satisfied that he had “achieved a view of the objective nature of the great facts” based on original and reliable sources. He had paid little attention to “less significant events” and he had focused mainly on the events of “world-historical importance.” It was in this period that he wrote: “No history can be written but universal history.” (in Gooch, p. 83). In the preface to the History of England, he explains that he is going to write about the antagonisms of earlier times, before the core of his study, how they came into conflict, the strengths of each side, what decisions brought about successes and final decisions as well as how well individuals conducted their affairs. Were certain circumstances stronger than the participants? Were the individuals “equal to the situation”? “To introduce the interests of the present time into the work of the historian usually ends in restricting its free execution,” writes von Ranke and warns historians not to allow the interference of the present in the historian's view of the past. In the preface of Universal History –published in 1880–, which he understands as “the events of all times and nations,” he sets the beginning of History “at the point where monuments become intelligible and documentary evidence of a trustworthy character is forthcoming [...]” In his idealistic conception of History, von Ranke believes that historical development arises from the nations in conflict for territory or political supremacy. This conflict affects culture, where “the great powers of History are formed.” The History of mankind appears within the Histories of individual nations and it is in their conflict where Universal History comes into being. It is worth writing a Universal History because part of human heritage consists of “immortal works of genius” in poetry and literature, in science and art, which although local in origin, they “represent what is common to all mankind.” With this tradition “are inseparably combined the memories of the events, the institutions, and the great men of the past.” In conclusion, my comment is that according to von Ranke of the late 19th century, Universal History must combine “inseparably” political, diplomatic, literary, scientific, and artistic Histories as well.

Von Ranke's theory and practice of History has been the main method in the historiography of the last two hundred years. It has definitely evolved and actively incorporated social, economic, cultural, intellectual History as defined by a variety of schools of historiography without betraying its basic principles. History writing must be based on a critical view of the available sources. Of course, historians have generalized, have used their creative imagination in order to fill in the blanks of the sources but no History can be written without being based on evidence, relics, of the past. A lot of stories can be written based on human imagination or on historical events, fiction or historical fiction is very amusing reading and may be the beloved child of post-modernism, but they are not History. The reader must be very cautious to differentiate between History books and books that claim to be history books. Some history books entitled “A Short/Complete History of ...” may just contain highly generalized statements not based on any evidence, just the author's wild opinion. After all, the reason why historians include footnotes/endnotes/content notes in their books is because they invite the reader to be convinced by their arguments which are based on historical sources (documents, artifacts, buildings, numismatics) and for intellectual History, extracts of authors writings. I systematically check authors footnotes and I am very skeptical when an opinion is expressed (even by well known historians) in a book

without notes at all unless of course it is intellectual History and the bibliography at the end can justify the author's opinion.

The American (USA) scene of historiography

So far, I have mainly focused on British, French, German historians and their impact on the European historiographical scene of the last two centuries but I have generally, with one exception, neglected those who worked on the American continent, in the United States of America. Peter Novick has surveyed the developments on the other side of the Atlantic and has used as the epicenter of his study the idea of historical objectivity. In the late 19th century, and before the organization of History departments in major universities, Americans who wanted to study History went to Germany and mainly to Göttingen, Heidelberg, Leipzig, Freiburg, Berlin. They avoided England because it trained “gentlemen, not scholars” and France because foreigners had difficulties in pursuing advanced degrees because of the system of higher education. Moreover, Paris was generally full of flesh distractions. Therefore, most of young Americans arrived at German universities where higher education was cheap, only one third of the same education at a US university; universities had educational structures and values that could not be found at home; student life was strictly regulated; recitation was the norm in classes; intellectual innovation was considered a threat to Protestant piety. In principle, though, academic excellence was based on rigorous scholarship away from religious or ideological norms. The community of advanced scholars, the professors, focused on their researches and were involved in the preparation of the next generation of scholars. The ruler of this system was *Herr Professor* who was paid very well and had the social status of a state administrator in the highest ranks of government. The two words that dominated higher education were *Wissenschaft* and *Objektivität*. *Wissenschaft*, which generally means “discipline” or “science,” it does have a number of meanings in different context such as “scholarship” or “learning,” all part of the German idealistic philosophy of the era. “*Wissenschaft* signified a dedicated, sanctified pursuit. It implied not just knowledge, but self-fulfillment; not practical knowledge, but knowledge of ultimate meanings.” (in Novick, p. 24). History was by definition a *eine Geisteswissenschaft*, a discipline of the spirit, a discipline of humanities. Objectivity as a word that means just the facts without any bias (the historical truth) was introduced into the English language in the late 19th century through the German *Objektivität*. Until then, the context the word was used was basically philosophical. This was due to the fact that the inspirational model of the late 19th century US historian was Leopold von Ranke, who had been idolized.

One of those young American students in Germany, Herbert Levi Osgood, wrote about von Ranke that “may men of his character be multiplied elsewhere, especially on this side [American] of the Atlantic, where the need of such is imperative. American scholars, especially of the younger generation, owe a debt of gratitude to him which cannot be easily repaid.” (in Novick, p. 26). However, von Ranke had retired before the coming of the American students and none of them had first hand experience with him as a teacher although his works were widely read. On the other hand, just quoting phrases from his works or fragments of writings had and has lead to an one-side interpretation of his ideas. He was seen as an “unphilosophical empiricist,” who reinforced the already present American intellectual feeling against “philosophical speculation about history.” But in reality American historians could not see and understand the great gap between Anglo-American and German thinking from a philosophical point of view. From the great pool of thought of German idealism they just adopted von Ranke's specific ideas about the criticism of the sources and the seminar ignoring that philosophical empiricism had been criticized in Germany. In its

American context, his “wie es eigentlich gewesen” was just interpreted as the accurate representation of the truth, a thought not held in Germany since Kant. Also, *Wissenschaft* now just meant “science” and the historical seminar had become “a laboratory of scientific truth.” (pp. 31 & 33). If science, which meant facts, empiricism and hypothesis, was systematically employed by historians it could eventually lead to “ultimate history” and this conception of objectivity led back to von Ranke. Moreover, similar signals came from France when in the 1900 Paris World Exhibition and at the First International Congress of Historians, Henri Houssaye said: “We want nothing more to do with the approximations of hypotheses, useless systems, theories as brilliant as they are deceptive, superfluous moralities. Facts, facts, facts – which carry within themselves their lesson and their philosophy. The truth, all the truth, nothing but the truth.” Also, “pas de documents, pas d'histoire” and “plus de documents, plus d'histoire,” conceptions were gladly accepted and separated clearly Pre-history from History. (in Novick, pp. 37-39). At that time, the scientificomania hit literature (Flaubert, Zola) and painting (Constable, Courbet, Monet) first in Europe and then in the USA (Henry James, Stephen Crane, Frank Norris, Theodore Dreiser), where it included journalism (*New York Times*, *Baltimore Sun*, *Evening Post*). They all worshiped the “scientific cult of the 'objective facts.’” (p. 42). It was the times of science and objectivity.

The first separation among the American historians was on the Civil War, Reconstruction, and racism but toward the end of the 19th century there was willingness of both the northerners and the southerners to reconcile opinions. In the 1880s and 1890s, many southerners accepted that secession that had led to the Civil War was unconstitutional and that slavery, in the final analysis, had been wrong and some of them were even satisfied with the outcome of the war. On the other hand, some northern historians insisted on the constitutional rigidity of the states' rights and stated that the only correct view was that of the North, that there was no justification for the secession of the southern states and their rebellion. Soon, though, there were attempts for reconciliation and they became critical of the abolitionists as “irresponsible agitators” and accepted a soften picture of slavery. (pp. 76-77). The next challenge for American historiography was the “New History” and the “Progressive historians” of the pre-World War I years, which included a cooperation of History and social sciences. The most prominent and different from other members of this group was Charles Beard. This group had both lost their belief in the American historical conservatism as well as their religious belief. So, the belief in secular progress was “almost the only vital conviction left to us,” (in Novick, p. 97) wrote one of them. They believed in the uses of History in the present, as a beacon for future US state legislation, for “conservative reform.” Another one wrote that “historical thinking ... is a social instrument” that would make “the world's work more effectively done.” (in Novick, p. 98). In the inter war period, Beard was the one historian who urged his colleagues but without success to read the German thought. The works he suggested were never translated into English, which was proven to be the main reason why they could not influence American historians. Another important one was the rise of Hitler and Nazism, which made German thought unattractive. However, it is claimed that most probably Beard used German thought selectively as he used Croce. (pp. 157-158).

The great impact of World War I and especially of World War II on the US college/university curriculum was the “Western Civilization” or WestCiv course (one or two modules) at introductory or first year level, generally part of a requirement of all disciplines. The WestCiv course is a broad survey of European History since Pre-history or ancient times. It seems that the purpose of the course was to answer the social question why Americans participated in World War I and why the US were in-

volved in World War II. And the answer was that Americans fought for a free society and democracy against totalitarianism, for the safeguarding of western heritage and “the need to provide a 'common learning' for all Americans as a foundation of national unity.” (p. 312). It was used as a protection against communist theories and to show how close was America to Western Europe and far away from Russia (then the Soviet Union) and her satellites in Eastern Europe. American Historian William H. McNeill in his *The Rise of the West: A History of the Human Community* (first published in 1963, new preface in 1991) stressed the trail of civilization from Ancient Greece to Rome to West Europe to the USA. Although at the beginning the two modules were tied to US foreign policy, eventually “they were undoubtedly frequently taught from idiosyncratic ideological perspectives, quite at odds with those of their founders.” (p. 314). In any case, the WestCiv course, which soon became WorldCiv (World Civilization) avoiding Eurocentrism, was taught widely in the US until the 1990s. For most historians, it was seen as an introduction to World History, the civilizations and cultures of the World since Pre-history, a theme that most Americans had not been exposed to at school. On the other hand, some historians thought that it was a great opportunity to show to their students national Histories as well as continuities and discontinuities in civilizations, a holistic topic that even the History student would not have the chance to see in his studies again.

The late 1940s and early 1950s were marked by Beard's inspired and partially written report of the Committee on Historiography of the US Social Science Research Council. As we have already mentioned above, this report included the draft prepositions for the study and writing of history. The reaction to them was highly critical. It was thought that it “should gain acceptance from all but the most devout believers in history *wie es eigentlich gewesen*” or that it was generally “unsatisfactory” and it disagreed with “the selection of facts.” The prepositions revealed “a lack of systematic thinking, a confusion in thought, a frequent internal inconsistency, and a vagueness, which makes them useless.” (in Novick, pp. 391-392). The result was that by the middle of the 20th century historians sought for autonomy of their discipline and away from analytic philosophers of History. Some would accept R. G. Collingwood's *The Idea of History* (1936) as it repeatedly mentioned the need for autonomy of History.

The New Left Movement among US historians rose in the 1960s and its members, some of them close to the Communist Party, were for the “objective truth” and to “see things as they really were” (Historian William A. Williams quoted in Novick, p. 423) without being influenced by their background and values. The Left wing historians, who were divided into two opposing groups (the scholars and the activists), believed that what they supported was the only truth. They wrote against the New Deal and the Kennedy-Johnson foreign policy and especially US involvement in Vietnam and confronted the liberal historians. Little by little and toward the end of the 20th century, European and American Marxist historiography became more and more acceptable in the US but that scholarship in general was limited. “There was no overall synthetic work which embodied the new perspective” and works by historian William A. Williams (1921-1990) and his students promoted the idea of “corporate liberalism.” The general idea was of a stabilized capitalism with the collaboration of big corporations, government and syndicated labor. All parties were to strive for business regulations and expansion overseas so that the economic pie would enlarge but the distribution of shares and power would remain unchanged. In short, it was consensus History. In the 1960s and the 1970s, the percentage of doctoral dissertations in social History quadrupled and surpassed the previously hot topics in intellectual History. (pp. 438-440). The book that influenced American historians, especially those of the Left, was *The Making of the English Working Class* (1964) by the English Marxist historian E.

P. Thompson, a History from the bottom up. He was a historian with highly esteemed academic work as well as an activist and he focused on the central role of the working class and its class struggle but at the same time criticized the Marxian use of these concepts. On the other hand, some historians pointed to the book's weaknesses regarding exaggeration in the consideration of “the spontaneity” of some protest as well as empiricism that supported the facts-speak-for-themselves idea. (pp. 441-442).

The US foreign policy debate that began in the 1960s questioned American what-we-are question. Should the US stay away from international affairs and continue the traditional policy of isolation or the opposite? The US had already experienced an imperialistic policy at the turn of the 20th century and had already been involved in World War II as well as the Korean War. Therefore, in the middle decade of the 20th century the US had already used the diplomatic policy of “globalism and interventionism” and there were many Americans who would support it in order to overthrow or contain “unfriendly” regimes. Historian William Appleman Williams with his *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy* (1959) tried to show that the globalization and intervention policy was not new but a continuation of the 19th century frontier and Latin American experience and policy. In short, the US was after all for economic imperialism and global intervention from the 19th century onward. Williams and his “revisionist” school of US diplomacy eventually triggered the thought that the US fought the wrong war in Vietnam and many welcomed the victory of the communist Viet Cong. So, although at the beginning of the Cold War the US foreign policy was considered by most American historians as the battle of the free world against communist aggression, later on, the revisionists claimed that after the end of World War II the Soviets were mainly interested in “security and reconstruction rather than expansion and global subversion.” According to revisionists, this meant that US had to accept the Soviet sphere of influence on the globe instead of escalating world tension in its attempt to “contain” communism fearing the domino effect of communism expansion. Eventually, archives showed that one of the proofs for unnecessary US world military assistance was that American help in post-World War II Greece through the Marshal Plan and the Truman Doctrine in order to stop the support of Greek communists by Stalin was false as it was proven that Stalin was not going to help in a communist insurrection for power in Greece. This US policy had led to the arms race during the Cold War period, which meant high US spending on arms. Revisionist historians were accused of pro-Communist theses and their books were criticized with falsifications and fabrications. Their colleagues thought that they considered the Soviet Union as an equal state, which they rejected as an *a priori* wrong conception. Eventually, a “postrevisionist” movement arose with “interpretations of the origins of the cold war which incorporated many of the revisionist findings, but did so within a context which emphasized Soviet depravity and American virtue.” This was culminated in John Lewis Gaddis's (see above) book *United States and the Origins of the Cold War*, 1972. (pp. 446-454).

What has characterized American historical writing in the last decades of the 20th century and into the 21st century is “its inability to move toward any overarching interpretation which could organize American, or for that matter, non-American, history.” This included historians who focused their works on the History of the blacks and the History of women and whose work remained particularistic and known within the profession only. (pp. 457-458). Also, beginning in the 1980s and on it has been observed that History was not a “coherent discipline” anymore; “there was no whole – only parts,” observes Novick for the 1980s. (p. 577). It is not clear who is a historian and what a historian does as scholars use terminology, concepts and methods of various disciplines and especially of the social sciences. Sociology, political science, an-

thropology, economics and economic History, history of science works influenced historical study positively, a large number of historians admitted. But at the same time, historians who adopted the methods and theories of each or more of the disciplines above found themselves in scholarly conflict with one another. At the end of the 20th century, there was no common methodological background in the study of History. History was imprisoned by jargon; it did not employ plain language anymore and a historian using sociological or anthropological terms was not understood by the one who applied political science or economic jargon. Needless to mention that those works were not addressed to the average person down the street. Novick puts that very clearly: “As subcommunities of historians came to express themselves in the language of statistics, depth psychology, structuralist Marxism, and semiotics, the result was not just that they communicated less effectively with the laity [...] but that they had increasing difficulty in speaking to each other.” A characteristic example of the situation is that Fogel and Engerman's conclusion about the economic results of slavery ended up in a complex mathematical equation that historians had great difficulty or inability to understand. (pp. 586-589). There is too much fragmentation in scholarship and especially in the understanding of the past as more and more disciplines and their scholars investigate the past from their methodological point of view. “One thing the American historical community could not do was sustain a discipline wide discussion on the meaning of the historical venture as a whole.” (p. 592). In the American scene, the past is not historical only anymore but it is seen from a sociological, political science, anthropological, economic or even scientific perspective that may not be comprehensible to the trained historian, I comment. History as a discipline seems to have missed her role among the arts and the sciences; it has mixed and mingled too much with the other disciplines; it has abandoned her principal methodological tools; it has left the general picture, General History, to non-trained amateurs or ill-trained journalist style historians.

There is a great difference between History written in the 1880s and that written in the 1980s as Novick observes and there were historians who warned the profession that little by little it diverted from the “wie es eigentlich gewesen” goal, objectivity and truth. Others though thought that History was at its best, quantified, scientific, value-free, objective until the coming of post-modernism with its flagship Hayden White (see above), who returned to the very old concept that History is a branch of literature. For him and his followers “it was the historian's poetic consciousness which was decisive” (p. 599) in History and History writing and the terminology he used was purely literary (metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, irony). In his writings he drew a very blurred dividing line between History and fiction as well as a great similarity in their aims that historians did not and do not accept. (pp. 599-603) In practice, the impact of the postmodernists, Novick, concludes, “had little positive resonance within the historical profession, and practically none outside the subdiscipline of European intellectual history.” It was only those who worked on the ideas of philosophers such as Foucault and Derrida or those working in the areas of literary theory that showed their interest in these ideas. According to two historians, reviewers of White's *Metahistory*, his “intellectual liberation [...] destroy[s] any criterion of truth” and that these ideas were part of the fashion of historical writing of the times. (pp. 605-607).

My comment is that objectivity in History is a concept difficult to define as there might be no objectivity in the events themselves. A historian must be impartial in the sense that there is no right or wrong in the historical facts. The role of the historian is to be impartial by presenting both or all sides of event participants or viewers. In most cases there are at least two views in a historian's understanding of an event even if the sources are one sided. We know that the sources include the opinion of

their maker and the historian must try to find (if possible) the other side of the hill, the other opinion. What is the view of the defeated on the reasons of their defeat, the view of the assassin about the murder, the opinion of the Athenians about their expedition against Syracuse and that of the people of Syracuse about the Athenian invasion? What did the Popes think of the Emperors and vice versa? What was the share of responsibility between the Entente and the Central Powers for World War I and between the UK and the European Union for Brexit? After presenting all possible views based on the sources, the historian may side with the one that s/he finds more convincing or most plausible, otherwise his/her presentation will be just the voice of the sources with no analysis or explanation or interpretation why s/he preferred the one against the other(s).

Niebuhr's critical method

In the early 19th century and before the writings of von Ranke, History was a branch of literature but the first one who thought of using the literary critical method on the sources of History was Barthold Georg Niebuhr (1776-1831), a Dane philologist who lived and worked in Germany. He put the foundations of modern historiography in his studies on ancient History and especially on Ancient Rome. He was born in Copenhagen in a German family and he was a polyglot; he had mastered twenty languages. He studied law and philosophy at the University of Kiel, agriculture and physics at the University of Edinburgh and taught at the Universities of Berlin and Bonn. In his studies he employed the principles of historical criticism and challenged the authority of Livy as the main source for the History of Rome. He delivered a series of lectures on Ancient History at the University of Bonn in summer 1826 and again during the academic year 1829-1830. In the introduction and at the beginning of the lecture series, he explained his method. The notes of his students were compiled and published in a three volume work entitled *Lectures on Ancient History*, the English edition of which was issued with additions and corrections.

He begins his first lecture by rejecting the inclusion of the findings of natural sciences in his History. He excludes the history of the Earth and “its relations to the human race” as subjects that do not belong to human History. Therefore, his lectures include only “the actions, the life, and sufferings of man, as man in history.” He thinks that Ancient History could be taught in a synchronistic way, that is, according to the level of civilization of each nation and not by absolute chronology. The “savages of America,” China, Japan, “the Negro tribes” as well as the ancestors of the Germans do have a place in Ancient History next to the Greeks and the Romans but one needs to have the expertise on all of them in order to teach them. Another way is the “theological arrangement” according to which the main body of History consists of the History of the Jews from the Old Testament and the other nations appear only when they come in contact with the Jews but in this way there are nations that “are thrown more and more into the background.” In the philological arrangement, Ancient History is considered as a branch of philology and the nations with classical literature come to the foreground while the other are placed in the background. Niebuhr explains that this is the method he has used in the study of Ancient History and therefore Chinese, Japanese and East Asian History are not to be discussed because the “kernel” of his discussion is going to be Greece and Rome. The History of the Jews and the ancestors of the Germans appear only “where they are connected with classical antiquity.” Also, History can be divided between non-Roman and Roman as eventually Roman History incorporates Greek, Macedonian, Carthaginian as well as the already “absorbed” by the previous nations History of Asia and Egypt and it even incorporates the History of the ancestors of the Germans. The non-Roman History consists of everything that is con-

nected with the Greeks and includes all the peoples “of whom the Greeks acquired any knowledge” (Babylonians, Assyrians, Medes, Egyptians, Scythians). The Gauls or Celts will be discussed when they appear in Macedonia and Greece. Miracles and revelations are not part of Ancient History and History will be discussed “without a direct and minute revelation from God.” In his lectures, Niebuhr follows the arrangement of Pompeius Trogus and discusses in turn the Assyrians and the Medes, Babylon, Scythians, Egyptians, Phoenicians, Cyprus, Asia Minor, Cimmerians, Persians, the Greeks. He discusses the content of the *Histories* of Herodotus and concludes that this is the first work on the History of the Greeks. Thucydides, he explains, is “the first real and true historian” as he uses precise chronology, follows the succession of events, is very cautious in his writing. He is puzzled why Thucydides makes references to the Trojan War as if it really happened. (Lectures XVIII-XIX). Fifty years later, Heinrich Schliemann will discover Troy and Mycenae and will prove that Thucydides was correct. My comment is that Niebuhr puts together for the first time I believe a General History of the Ancient World in the modern sense. He first defines that in his Ancient History he is going to discuss the Ancient Near East, North Africa, Greece and Rome and then he uses Trogus as a blueprint for the literary development of his History. He examines his sources, mainly Trogus/Justin, Herodotus, Thucydides, Diodorus Siculus and Strabo, critically and this sets the pace for the critical evaluation of sources and historical writing of ancient authors since then.

Voltaire's siècles

Although François-Marie Arouet or Voltaire (French, 1694-1778) is well known as a philosopher and literature writer, he has written a number of historical works, the most famous of which is *Le Siècle de Louis XIV* (1751). In the introduction of that work he divides World History into four ages (*siècles*) based on artistic “perfection” and “greatness of the human mind.” The first age is that of Philip and Alexander, Pericles, Demosthenes, Aristotle, Plato, Apelles, Phidias, Praxiteles and it was in ancient Greece when the rest of the world was “in a state of barbarism,” The second age is that of Ceasar, Augustus, Cicero, Titus, Livius, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Varro, Vitruvius. The third is after the sack of Constantinople by the Ottomans and it is the age of Italy's glory when the Medici invited the Byzantine Scholars to Florence. It is the times when Michelangelo, Raphael, Titian, Tasso, Ariosto flourished. The fourth age is the century of the French King Louis XIV, the one that “approaches the nearest to perfection of all the four” and when “human reason” (philosophy, the arts, our genius (*esprits*), manners, government) was improved. This movement has spread to England, Germany, Russia, Italy “and Europe is indebted for its politeness and spirit of society to the court of Louis XIV.” He explains that he is not going to discuss the wars of the period in detail but he leaves this work for the “compilers of annals,” who will collect all the “small facts” (“*les détails immenses*”). The non described details will give space to the “great events which have determined the fates of empires” (“*les grands événements qui ont fixé la destinée des empires*”). Everything is not worthy of being recorded in a writing of History and therefore he will write about those events that are to be remembered in all times. In his History he will restrict himself “to what is deserving of the attention of all ages, what paints the genius and manners of mankind, contributes to instruction, and prompts to the love of virtue, of the arts, and of our country.” Apart from the great military and political events of Louis XIV's reign, Voltaire wrote that he would discuss in detail the king's private life and that of his court. However, he would also discuss religious affairs because they are connected to politics, the arts and the science as well as the intellectual History of that Age. My comment is that Voltaire's intention was to give a well rounded image of the Age as

defined by him when Louis XIV was the main History figure in Europe. He states in this introduction that he is going to be selective and will focus on the big events only and not on the details of the battles that were fought. Most important of all though is that he uses a periodization of History according to human achievements, the tangible ones and spiritual ones.

In an essay about History, Voltaire explains why the writing of modern History (“l’histoire moderne”) of his times is real History that can be examined with all the sources which are available in contrast to ancient and medieval History that are basically a mixture of thousands of myths with a few truths. In modern History, he writes, there are “no dolls embracing courtiers, no bishops devoured by rats.” Some made detailed notes and recorded the exact date battles took place, recorded every single article of treaties, described minute details of a coronation ceremony, the entry of an ambassador, life in court and many more and it is good that all this is contained in public and published records to be consulted at any time. The reading of all these, though, did not make Voltaire any wiser because writers should pay attention to the strength of nations before wars, on the effect of wars on nations regarding their strength, on the wealth and population changes of nations. He wanted more on demographic information as well as the “most accurate method of determining” differences in population in ancient, medieval, and modern times. But this is not enough for anyone who reads History. He would also like to know the “virtue and vice of a nation” (“le vice radical et la vertu dominante d’une nation”), its power or weakness at sea, how wealthy it had become during an Age (“siècle”) based on export figures. Also, he would like to know how the arts and manufacturers were established and progressed from one country to the other. Manners of people and laws should be the emphasis of his attention and study. This way, instead of a partial knowledge of reigns of rulers and the affairs in their courts, he would acquire a knowledge of the History of mankind (“On saurait ainsi l’histoire des hommes”). Unfortunately, Voltaire continues, no French historian is dealing with these matters in his History. We must incorporate them in our writings because this is the only method of writing modern History as a “true politician and a true philosopher,” he writes. Also, he insists that History works must be stripped of myths and unapproved exaggerations, even falsifications. A method based on rationality must be used for the writing of History.

My comment is that Voltaire, a major figure of the Enlightenment, shows interest in the wide spectrum of History matters, not just politics and democracy. For a complete knowledge of human History, the changes in the population of nations, developments in the economy, the arts and the comparison among nations should be part of History with moral emphasis (virtue and vice) of course. Above all, he recognizes that we must not rely without any investigation on ancient authors or modern eye-witness accounts before examining them critically. Voltaire was the first to coin the term “philosophy of history” and this is the title of his 1765 introduction to World History. What he meant with “philosophy of history” is “rational history of civilization independent of divine intervention.” (Encycl. of Historians, 2:1271).

Vico's new science

Giambattista Vico (Italian, 1668-1744) never used the term “philosophy of history” as such but he was the first to write about a history of philosophy and inaugurate the study of the philosophy of History and intellectual History. Due to his fragile health, he basically taught himself with the guidance of his father, a poor bookseller. He mastered Latin and rhetoric that helped him become a tutor. In salons and private academies he discussed the philosophical issues of his days. Eventually, he was called

to teach rhetoric at the University of Naples. His major work is *Scienza Nuova* (1725, 3rd ed. 1744), in which he tries to formulate procedures of inquiry for the humanities.

In *Scienza Nuova* (*New Science*) Vico explains that in his work philosophy will undertake to discuss philology, that is, “for example, all histories of the languages, customs and deeds of peoples in war and peace”. It will discover in it “an ideal eternal history traversed in time by the histories of all nations.” (paragraph 7). A new study of mythology will show that the fables “were true and trustworthy histories of the customs of the most ancient peoples of Greece.” The theogony, the generation of gods can give us a “poetic history” (“*storia poetica*”) of the gods. The fable with heroes were true stories of the heroes and their customs and Homer's poems contain “the natural law of nations among the still barbarous Greeks.” The barbarous period of the Greeks lasted until Herodotus, the father of Greek History, whose books are full of myths. (par. 7). Among all peoples, “the civil world began with religion.” (par. 8). The new Science or metaphysic examines the common nature of nations after it has found the origins of divine and human things among the nations. It establishes a system of natural law of nations which proceeds with stability through the three ages of the Egyptians: (a) the age of the gods when the non-Hebrew people believed they lived under divine governments and their lives were determined by “auspices and oracles”; (b) the age of the heroes when heroes governed the world as superior figures to the people; (c) the age of humans when everybody was equal and little by little the people's commonwealths and eventually the monarchies (both as forms of human government) were created. There were also three kinds of languages: (a) when the non-Hebrews became part of humanity and this was “a mute language of signs and physical objects having natural relations to the ideas they wished to express.” (par. 32); the language spoken at the times of the heroes by similarities (heroic emblems, comparisons, images, metaphors, natural descriptions); (c) the human language with words that were used to create laws that governed the relations between the people and the nobles (“*la plebe anco i nobili*.”) (p. 26). This categorization of languages is the same as the one that the Egyptians claimed that existed in their own world before them. Then came the letters and writing. This is so because the early non-Hebrews were poets and spoke in poetic characters (“*per caratteri poetici*.”) (p. 27). These poetic characters were images of animated beings, gods, heroes formed by their imagination and were persons of the comedies. Then History begins and Vico makes reference to the Egyptians, the Chaldeans, the Chinese and their ancient History collected from various ancient authors but the “first people of the world were the Jews” led by Adam, who was created by God. Therefore, “the first science to be learned should be mythology or the interpretation of fables.” The first histories of the non-Hebrew nations begin with myths, which were their first histories. This is where universal history begins. (par. 51). Following the Egyptian conception, Vico explains, Roman polymath scholar Varro (Marcus Terentius Varro, 116-27 BC) divided the times of the world into a dark age (Egyptian age of the gods), a fabulous age (age of heroes), historic age (age of men). However, we now know, Vico writes, that only the Hebrews were the oldest nation in World History and he explains the origins of the nations in the Ancient Near East, of the Greeks, and the Romans with their laws. Thucydides wrote the History of the Peloponnesian war “in order to write of true things” because the Greeks “knew nothing of their own antiquities” until then. (par. 101).

Then, Vico sets the principles of his writing on History (as of par. 119). In his work, he will try to find the truth in the “vulgar traditions” (XVI, par. 149) (“*tradizioni volgari*”), (p. 86), which it has come down to his days covered with “falsehood.” Using the Greek origin he concludes that “all the gentile [non-Hebrew] nations, [...], were poetic in their beginnings; and that divine poetry was born first among them, and

later heroic poetry.” (XLIV, par. 200). Then, he discusses the beginnings of Rome, the laws of the Twelve Tablets and the Roman political traditions along with references to Aristotle's *Politics*. After the conclusion of the axioms for his work that state and discuss opinions of ancient authors, Vico explains his method for his *New Science*. He will search for the truth about the beginning in the philological tradition of Greek myths and philosophical works as well as in the information that travelers or missionaries transmit about for example Patagonian giants near the strait of Magellan. (par. 338) or about plain people and nobles in Japan (par. 1091). Also, he writes, “we must start from some notion of God such as even the most savage, wild and monstrous men do not lack” as human beings need something superior (God) to save them when in despair. (par. 339). But because of corruption, human beings are “under the tyranny of self-love” (“dall’amor proprio”) (p. 135) and generally “man desires principally his own utility.” Therefore, only “divine providence” (“provvedenza divina”) (p. 139) can make him “practice justice as a member of the society of the family, the state, and finally of mankind.” (par. 341). And he concludes that “this *Science* must therefore be a rational civil theology of divine providence” as the Stoics and the Epicureans were ignorant of theology and believed that human affairs are troubled by a collection of atoms and a chain of cause and effect. All of those as well as God were to them metaphysics. But “our new Science must therefore be a demonstration, so to speak, of the historical fact of providence, for it must be a history of the forms of order which, without human discernment or intent, and often against the designs of men, providence has given to this great city of the human race. For though this world has been created in time and particular, the orders established therein by providence are universal and eternal.” (par. 342). “Our Science is therefore a history of human ideas, on which it seems the metaphysics of the human mind must proceed.” (par. 347). His Science therefore will describe “an ideal eternal history traversed in time by the history of every nation in its rise, progress, maturity, decline and fall.” He will base History on the descriptions of his creators as this world was made by human beings and the proofs will be divine as “in God knowledge and creation are one and the same thing.” (par. 349). He concludes his ideas by writing that in the comparisons “between the first and last times of the ancient and modern nations [...] the ideal of the eternal laws in accordance with which the affairs of all nations proceed in their rise, progress, mature state, decline and fall,” will be fully unfolded (par. 1096).

My comment is that the “Elements” and “Principles” stated in the introduction of Vico's *Scienza Nuova* culminate constitute his cyclical theory of History: “le storie di tutte le nazioni ne’ loro sorgimenti, progressi, stati, decadenze e fini.” (p. 139). Nations are born, live and die. Also, he believed that the creator (poet, in the classical Greek meaning of the word) or literature writer (poet, in the classical Greek meaning of the word) understands and describes what it has been created by himself/herself and as God understands nature, human beings understand and describe the History of nations: “ove avvenga che chi fa le cose esso stesso le narri, ivi non può essere più certa l’istoria” (“history cannot be more certain than when he who creates the things also describes them”) but always guided by divine providence. “But the Romans, [...], proceeded with even steps, being ruled by providence through the medium of vulgar wisdom.” (par. 1088). The philologists (“all the grammarians, historians, critics, who have occupied themselves with the study of the languages and deeds of peoples,” par. 139) are the ones who will discuss History. In his 1710 work *De antiquissima Italorum sapientia, ex linguae latinae originibus eruenda* (*On the Most Ancient Wisdom of the Italians Unearthed from the Origins of the Latin Language*) Vico described his principle of *verum factum* about the true: *verum et factum convertuntur* (“the true and the made are...convertible”) or that “the true is precisely what is made” (*verum esse*

ipsum factum)” (quoted in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*) which returns in his *New Science* as History can be understood by its creators. For two hundred years, *Scienza Nuova* was left in obscurity until it was rediscovered by the French Historian Jules Michelet who translated it and pointed out that “it called attention to the need for historical research into the full social context of human development.” (Encycl. of Historians, 2:1261).

Machiavelli's historical machiavellianism

Niccolò di Bernardo dei Machiavelli (Florentine Italian, 1469–1527) is well known for his *Il principe* (*The Prince*) but the work that dealt with the History of Rome as a model for the 16th century Italian cities was his *Discorsi sopra la prima Deca di Tito Livio*, 1531 (*Discourses on The First Decade of Titus Livius*). The Roman Titus Livius or Livy in English (64/59 BC-AD 12/17) wrote a monumental history of Rome and the Roman people, *Ab Urbe Condita* (*From the Founding of the City*), which covered the period from the earliest mythical History of Rome through the reign of emperor Augustus. Machiavelli discussed Livy's work in order to show that History must be read in such a way so that its true meaning is revealed and to be proven that it is not impossible to be imitated. Therefore, by reading his discourses his readers would be able to understand both ancient and modern affairs (Book I. Preface). He begins with the founding of cities and he compares Classical Athens and Venice as two cities that were established by local people. On the other hand, he continues, a lot of Roman cities or Roman colonies belong to the category of those cities that were founded in foreign lands. Some were founded by princes just for their glory as Alexander the Great built Alexandria. Those cities that have not been founded on the principles of freedom, they seldom progress to become chief towns of kingdoms. Florence was founded by Rome and at the beginning could not grow as this was not allowed by the empire. Independent cities are founded when because of local problems (famine, pestilence, war) people abandon their original place and migrate either to existing cities or to places where they build new ones. Cities should be founded in fertile soil for the subsistence of their inhabitants. Rome was founded according to the principle of freedom and with strict laws so that the fertility of its soil, the proximity of the sea or its military successes could not corrupt it. Cities may benefit from laws given to them by a legislator as to the nature of their government (Monarchy but not Tyranny, Aristocracy but not Oligarchy, Democracy but not Anarchy) so that events such as those in Florence in 1502 and 1512 can be avoided. When legislators do empower kings, nobles, and commons, the result is a balanced political system. Lycurgus in Sparta devised a political system in which monarchy, aristocracy, democracy coexisted and each one served as a check upon the other. The Spartan system lasted for centuries in contrast to the Athenian one by Solon which was based on pure democracy. The democratic system was short lived because it was difficult to suppress the ambitions of the nobles and the reaction of the people. Rome, just by good Fortune, managed to drive the kings out of office but to maintain their supreme authority in the office of the two consuls. The stability of its government increased with the formation of the tribunes of the people. The sharing of power among the consuls, the senate and the people resulted by good Fortune in its successful governing system. Constitutions of cities depend on whether they wish to expand their dominion as Rome did or just to maintain their territory as Venice and Sparta did, which although at some point they controlled Greece and Italy respectively they failed when their strength was put to the test. In the first book of his work and generally throughout that work Machiavelli uses History and specifically the early Roman times as an example in order to draw conclu-

sions for the then political situation, organization, and development of the government in Florence.

In the preface of the second book he states that human beings always “commend the past and condemn the present” (“Laudano sempre gli uomini [...] gli antichi tempi, e gli presenti accusano,” sometimes with no reason but by doing so they become enthusiastic supporters of what has been done. We do not perceive the whole truth for events that happened in the distant past because we disregard those with which we may not agree although we accept those that make the past shine. Writers usually attribute the glorious moments of the past to the good fortune of conquerors whom they glorify so that they are adorned by those who lived after them. The events of the past and human beings after all cannot hurt us or cause envy compared to what happens in the present and in the events that we participate. As nothing is hidden from us we can recognize what we like and what we dislike. (Book II. Preface). Regarding the causes of the war between the Romans and the Samnites and the first Carthaginian War, he emphasizes the fact that although they came about by chance the Romans were interested in “glory and empire and not peace” (“lo imperio e la gloria, e non la quiete”) and therefore they were ready to act as protectors of other peoples against their enemies. Then, he uses an example from his times. (Book II.IX). This second book is one example of the way Machiavelli uses History in order to teach his contemporaries on how to run a city-republic.

Machiavelli is a realist. Christian principles as a basis of a government or divine intervention are absent from this and other of his works (Encycl. of Historians, 1:342&507). It must be noted that the Italian Renaissance humanists studied the classical authors and mainly Livy and Sallust (Roman historian, Gaius Sallustius Crispus, 86-35 BC) whose works were written in Latin, in order to find models for the government and other practical aspects of public life in Italian cities. Machiavelli, who had read Livy at an early age, was inspired by the fact that the initial tribal society under the kings of Rome “evolved to the zenith of civilization” as seen in the then independent Renaissance Italian cities. However, regarding government, those cities developed from kingship to a republic. “Drawing on Livy and his knowledge of Florentine history, Machiavelli believed he could identify the factors that produced [this] evolutionary process.” According to Cecil H. Clough, this is not in contradiction to what Machiavelli wrote in his *The Prince* because that work tried “to teach a prince how to retard the process of a state’s inevitable evolution to a republic. This could be done only if the prince ruled as a ‘civil’ prince in the best interest of most of his subjects; a tyrant would accelerate the evolution.” (Encycl. of Historians, 1:749). My comment is that in terms of the theory of History, we keep the idea of Machiavelli and Italian historians of the era that History is to teach for the present and the future.

Renaissance & the Middle Ages

Renaissance historiography marks the beginning of modern History writing. Humanism of the epoch rejected the medieval idea of just describing events (the chronicles) as a result of God's will. The two historians that stand out in Humanist History are Niccolò Machiavelli (see above) and Francesco Guicciardini (Florentine Italian, 1483-1540) with his *History of Italy* (1561). Renaissance History was secular, it had a practical purpose and it was a description and discussion of human deeds. Its purpose was to teach the lessons of the past –those that could be imitated and those that could be avoided– to the readers of the History works. The means was secular political history. It used ancient Latin authors (the sources of History) in order to show the “virtues of the classical past” that were to be applied to the present affairs. Humanist History was not chronological but thematic and it viewed the Middle Ages as a

period of decline, which was the reason why it needed to show the glory of the ancient past. Depending on the historian, Renaissance History focused on peoples and the capacities of individuals such as Vasari's *Lives of the Most Eminent Painters, Sculptors and Architects* (2nd ed., 1568) but it rejected the “great men” conception. During this period, some individuals wrote their own memoirs (“recordi”). (Encycl. of Historians, 1:495-496 & 2:992-993).

In the Middle Ages (Western Europe), monks were the scribes of History and literature in general. Most of it was about religious themes and “biblical imagery.” The writings were to be read aloud to a generally illiterate audience that liked verses and rhythm. Although the study at the universities refined the texts, “folk history and myth” were common chapters in the History of countries. Generally, History meant a list of chronological events per year which was provided by every Church and followed Christian religious feasts such as Easter and saints' days. The events were described according to the annual calendar (moon cycles) and the calculation of the days when feasts and saints were celebrated. The described events included lives and deeds of rulers as well as of those ladies who were the patrons of clergymen. Until the 11th century, those documents were kept in monasteries and were/are eventually published in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (since 1826). Other annals include the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and the *Grandes Chroniques de France*. The historical and biographical works of the antiquity were just used as models for the lives of saints and martyrs. The only narrative History was Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* (*An Ecclesiastical History of the English People*) compiled in 731 that begins with some geographical information and Caesar's invasion of England. The almost 800 copies that have survived show how widely it was read and admired. Later, authors wrote some political biographies on French rulers: Louis VI (1081-1137) and (St.) Louis IX (1215-1270).

After about the year 1000, the growth of western European population, the need of rulers for written accounts about past events in their estates, the surrounding areas and Europe, and the ability of the clergymen who lived among the people to draw information and write them down, led to the compilation of chronicles written in monasteries. From the 12th century though rulers and governments used their own clerks to write chronicles about their current times. In general, chronicles dealt with universal History that began with the creation of the world by God and general geography and the work of God on Earth. The monks used the Bible as a guide to the beginning of History, Roman History and how Europe was Christianized and ended with the papacy and the German empire. The most popular was the chronicle of Martin von Troppau or Martinus Polonus (died 1278) which was read in both its original Latin and in vernacular translations. A similar one was the *Polycbronicon* of Ralf Higden of Chester (died 1364) in England. As time passed by, other writers added information including local events. The Italians mainly described events in their own cities but the chronicle of the Franciscan friar known as Salimbene (1221-1290) includes information that is related to both French and German History. (Encycl. of Historians, 1:793-794).

Byzantium

On the contrary, the Eastern part of the Roman Empire, which became known by the historians as Byzantium or Byzantine Empire, had had a long historiographical tradition. From 330, when the ancient city of Byzantium on the Bosphoros (modern Turkey) was named the new capital, until the early 7th century the empire went into a period of transformation and eventually became fully Christian. After the 7th century, it lost peripheral territories to the Arabs and the Slavs and the Greek population and its

language became dominant in the administration and the culture. Between the 7th and the 12th centuries it extended from the Danube, to the north of the Balkans, to the island of Crete in the south and from southern Italy to the eastern part of modern Turkey. Between the 9th and the 11th century it reached a glorious era, which was followed by decline until 1453 when it was conquered by the Ottoman Turks. Nevertheless, throughout the greater part of the one thousand years of its existence the arts, theology, the sciences and learning in general flourished. Historians hold a prominent position in the Byzantine literature. The Eastern Church histories by Eusebius of Caesarea and by Socrates Scholasticus written in the 4th century as well as the secular *New History* written by Zosimus in the 5th century, all written in Greek, show the great spirituality of the scholars in the empire as well as the interest they had expressed in preserving the History of Christianity and the Roman imperial administration. *Suidae Lexicon* or encyclopedia which was compiled in the 10th century by a number of Byzantine scholars includes short articles on themes and personalities of History. There is a great number of Histories written between the 7th and the 15th centuries, some of which were written by Historians and others by chroniclers (*Chronographoi*) and who write about their own times, all of them in the Greek language. Few wrote Universal History and began their work with the creation of the world. Some of them held high rank positions in the administration of the empire. The most well known works were written by Procopius, Theophylact Simocatta, Theophanes the Confessor, John Skylitses, John Zonaras, Michael Psellos, Anna Komnene, Niketas Choniates, Doukas, George Sphrantzes. Some of these works include valuable information on the “cultural, religious, prosopographical, and artistic history of the 9th to the 12th centuries.” Most of authors used as their writing models the ancient Greek historians Herodotus, Thucydides, Polybius and Plutarch. They had all lived in an ever changing Byzantine empire throughout its existence, whose *lingua franca* was Greek among the majority of its population and in the administration. (Encycl. of Historians, 1:159-164).

Finley's view on ancient historiography

A step back in time will take us to the Histories written by the Roman and the Greek history writers and historians but let us begin with some critique on late 20th century historiography trends on Ancient European History. M. I. Finley (Moses Israel Finley, born Finkelstein, British-American, 1912-1986) was a classical scholar who was born and educated in the USA but had a career in Britain. He held degrees in psychology (BA), public law (MA) and History (Ph.D Columbia University) but his published works focused on Ancient History. In his *Ancient History. Evidence and Models* (1985), among other topics, he also discusses von Ranke's ideas and the scientific aspect of History and makes the interesting comment that “accuracy and truth are not synonymous.” (p.51). He recognizes that von Ranke's phrase for the presentation of events as they really happened stemmed from Humboldt. Also, he understands that the meaning of the French *science*, the German *Wissenschaft*, and perhaps the English *science* maybe or are actually different when they are used by the respective national historians and mean more than just a field of study pursued in a systematic and rigorous way. History maybe categorized among the sciences but this does not lead us anywhere. As it happens with sociology and anthropology, History is just a consumer of scientific laws not a producer. On the other hand, Finley claims that Thucydides believed that due to human nature there are possibly repetitive patterns of behavior under the same circumstances and therefore in his History he stated the patterns and offered a “prognosis” of what was going to happen. Finley mentions in a note that Thucydides writes that he will present the plague in Athens as it really happened (“οἷόν τε

ἐγίγνετο λέξω” Thuc. II.48.3, Loeb) and therefore the Humboldt-von Ranke conception could already be found in ancient Greek historiography. Quantitative or cliometric History provides probabilities and trends but no information about individual cases and no specific or generalized explanation about human behavior. In Finley's view, “the study of the human past is a single subject with varied techniques depending on the kinds of questions being asked, the kinds of evidence that are available, and the methods of presentation that are appropriate.” (p. 59). Historians practicing any form of History writing “constantly classify, conceptualize, generalize” (p. 59) as they collect data, put them in order, apply judgment on them and therefore there is no difference in the “scientific” or “traditional” method of historical discourse. Moreover, historians of Ancient Times cannot apply methods of quantitative History as the necessary series of data is missing or definitely incomplete. On the other hand, they can use ideal models that although are not perfect they may represent some simplified reality. But if one applies information found in ancient texts in order to reconstruct, for example, “city behaviour” by matching artifacts with named “facts” then the model becomes just a guess. Some follow the school method “tell all you know about” and avoid the old problem of “canons of selection” of sources and information among the growing publication of inscriptions, papyri, archaeological reports, studies. So, my comment here is that there are no “facts” unless they can be found in the sources and can be accepted by the historian only after s/he passes some judgment on the validity of the source. On the use of mathematical or other models, Finley concludes that “there is virtually nothing that cannot be conceptualized and analysed by non-mathematical models- religion and ideology, economic institutions and ideas, the state and politics, simple descriptions and developmental sequences.” (p. 66). In the writing of History instead of the search for solid facts there must be hypotheses that can be “modified, adjusted or discarded when necessary.”

My comment is that Finley's whole argument in the essay entitled “How it really was” is that at least in Ancient History writing a historian cannot use scientific/statistical data and methods or models but guided by the sources s/he must use working hypotheses that may lead him/her to some conclusion on political, social and economic aspects of Antiquity.

Roman historiography

The previous paragraph, a very short introduction to the possible issues in the writing of Ancient History, leads us to the Roman historians and how they perceived, understood and practiced the writing of History in Antiquity. Cicero (107/106-43BC) thought that the knowledge of History (“*memoria rerum veterum*”) is important in the life of men (*Orator*, 120, Loeb) but the Romans included myths, legends, language, buildings and objects, religion, oral tradition, inscriptions, lists of magistrates, written poetry and historiographical writing in their History. The History of Rome has been written in Antiquity in both Latin (mainly by Cicero, Caesar, Sallust, Livy, Tacitus, Suetonius, Ammianus Marcellinus, *Historia Augusta*) and in Greek by Greek writers of the Roman period (mainly by Polybius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Plutarch, and Dio Cassius), by writers who lived long after the events they describe.

Cicero never wrote History as such but he wrote about how and why History should be written and studied. In Cicero's thought all literature, philosophy and History (“*omnes libri*”) guide men to actions of virtue if they are studied and not sink into oblivion. The writings of Roman and Greek authors can be used to teach statesmen. (*Pro A. Licinio Archia Poeta Oratio*, 14, Loeb). Cicero links the present affairs with the past events and suggests that we use them as moral and administrative models.

History works in Rome were not popular as they were not written for the general public but by the senators for the senators.

Greek historiographers were not public officers when they wrote their Histories (some of them were exiles and others lived away from their home cities) but in contrast Roman historiography “was an extension of political life and was primarily aimed at those with political power in the Roman state.” (Mellor, p. 4). For the discussion of moral issues, Romans used History but Greeks philosophy. (Mellor, “Introduction”). The Greeks had a historiographical traditions of centuries before the Roman senator Quintus Fabius Pictor (3rd century BC) began writing about the Roman past and therefore they did have models to follow. However, they did not use Herodotus and Thucydides as their main models but later Hellenistic writers who wrote in a theatrical manner. On the other hand, Polybius, the Greek Historian of the Hellenistic period, believed that History runs in cycles and repeats itself and wished to write his work based on reality rather than emotions so that it becomes useful to politicians. To this respect, his model was Thucydides and he evaluated causes in order “to provide a truly useful explanation of how and why events occurred.” (Mellor, p. 9). He believed that History was not for entertainment but didactic and the historian should search for truth by following a certain method. First of all, an historian should have political experience in order to understand politics and evaluate sources; knowledge of geography preferably from his own travels; examine personally archives and study Histories written by earlier historians. In his view, the Roman constitution was, in Aristotelian terms, a mixed Constitution combining elements from monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy. His analysis of the Roman constitution influenced to a great extent the drafting of the US Constitution and his discussion of Roman affairs influenced the Roman historiographers. But “Rome’s desire to rival the heroic ancestry of the Greeks created a chauvinistic historiography whose ethnocentrism left little sympathy for Rome’s opponents.” (Mellor, p. 11).

Titus Livius or Livy (64/59 BC-AD 12/17) was probably the most important Roman historian although he did not hold a public office to have the relevant experience as Polybius argued. He was born in the Romanized ancient city of Padua where, we believe, he was educated well in History, oratory, and philosophy. He devoted his life though to the writing of the History of Rome but a large part of his massive work has been lost. The form of his History is annalistic (describes events year by year) and moralistic. He spends more time in more modern events rather than in the oldest myths and the History of Rome events so that he makes his writing useful to all Romans. (Mellor, pp. 48-51). In the Preface of the First Book of his History, Livy explains that his first goal is to be able to describe the deeds of the most important people of the world and because he believes that his readers are not interested so much in the “ancient origins” (“*primae origines*”) he will emphasize the modern affairs of the Romans. He is going to state but not discuss legends before the founding of Rome in order to accept them or reject them but he will pay attention to modern times trying not to divert from the truth regardless of the anxiety that this may cause him because he was a witness of the very recent events. On the other hand, he will not place great importance on mythical legends of origin of Roman families. Generally, he will direct the reader to the answers of certain question: “what life and morals were like; through what men and by what policies, in peace and in war, empire was established and enlarged; then let him note how, with the gradual relaxation of discipline, morals first gave way, as it were, then sank lower and lower, and finally began the downward plunge [decay] which has brought us to the present time, when we can endure neither our vices nor their cure.” (Livy, I.9, Loeb). Livy summarizes his philosophy of History by stating that what makes the study of History important and useful is that you can

view the lessons of past experience as if they are a document inscribed on a large piece of stone and from these you may choose “for yourself and for your state what to imitate.” (Livy, I.10, Loeb).

Petrarch (Italian from Arezzo, 14th century) and Boccaccio (Italian from Certaldo, 14th century) rescued much of Livy's History during the Italian Renaissance collecting and translating some of his books so that by the 15th century he had become a stylistic and political model for Renaissance Italy. The greatest example is Machiavelli's study of the Latin historian published in 1531 (see above). In the last few centuries, Livy has been generally seen by scholars as a story teller but not a true historian because of his geographical and chronological errors, topographical and political anachronisms, mistranslations from the Greek, and because he generally followed only one source although there is evidence that he compared works (Encycl. of Historians, 1:730). Generally, the errors in the entire work of his are few, he tried to be impartial and fair compared to his predecessors and we cannot judge his work in terms of modern methods of scholarship. After all, he explained that he wanted to study the past and give moral convictions and pleasure to his contemporaries. “Livy saw the past through contemporary spectacles, and he also saw the present as shaped by the past.” (Mellor, pp. 74 & 72-75). My comment is that truth, the basic idea of the study of History, is one of the goals of Livy in the early years of the 1st century AD along with the moral teachings of the past and the past seen with the eyes of the present.

Thucydides' how it really happened

Thucydides (c.460-400 BC) was born and grew in Athens when the city had acquired and governed a great maritime empire. Athens was a democracy governed by an assembly (*ekklesia*), a council (*boule*) and 10 magistrates (archons) selected annually by lot. The only ones elected were the 10 generals (*strategoí*), who were in charge of the army and the navy. Only adult male citizens, who composed 15% of the total population and which included many slaves and foreigners, were allowed to vote. Thucydides was born in a prominent family which was related to Miltiades family, the Athenian victor against the Persians in the 5th century BC. During the Peloponnesian War between Athens and Sparta and their allies, he was elected general for the year 424 BC and was assigned to Thrace, in the north Aegean, where he possessed property rights in the gold mines. During his service, he was called to save the city of Amphipolis from a Spartan attack but he failed and he was exiled until the end of the war. His History of the Peloponnesian War ends abruptly in the year 411 BC. (Luce, pp. 43-44). His History is about the Peloponnesian War between Athens and her allies and Sparta and her allies. He is interested in the war itself and its politics around it as opposed to Herodotus's History which is universal/general History of the ancient world. At the beginning of his work, Thucydides states that he began writing his History just when the war broke out because he understood that it was going to be a great war. Both Athens and Sparta were very powerful at the time and the other Greek cities took sides with either the first or the second. Moreover, Thucydides continues, the war included some barbarians and, in general, it involved most of the peoples (“ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἀνθρώπων” Thuc., I.1, Loeb). Further down in the description of the events, Thucydides states that one should investigate well in order to understand what happened with the peace treaty (421 BC) that the sides signed during the war. He lived throughout the war and was of an age that allowed him to make judgments, study it and get accurate information (“ὅπως ἀκριβῆς τι εἴσομαι” Thuc., V.26, Loeb). He recognizes that the writers/poets (“ποιηταί”) included in their stories what would make them appear attractive and the writers/story tellers (“λογογράφοι”) composed their histories with legends just to please those who heard them rather than telling the truth. He was

very careful in transferring to his History the speeches he quotes. (Thuc. I.21, Loeb). He also explains that although he could not recall the speeches that are included in his History and he himself heard word to word or be certain for the accuracy of those speeches that others heard and transmitted them to him, he believes he recorded what it was very close to what was said (“ἐγγύτατα τῆς ξυμπάσης γνώμης τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων.”) (I.21). Moreover, for the facts of the war, he did not rely on any information that was transmitted to him or he thought it was probable but he had to investigate for the accuracy (“ἀκριβεία”) in both the events he himself participated and those he received information from others. Nowadays, we can confirm his accuracy at least by the exact numbers that he records. He states that he searched for the truth because he received conflicting information from the eye-witnesses either because they favored one or the other side or because they had different recollections. He did not wish to please the ears of those who would hear the recitation of his writings but those who would like to have a clear view of the facts and learn from them (“ὠφέλιμα κρίνειν αὐτὰ”) when the same or similar events will happen in the future. He wanted his History to be a possession of humanity for ever (“κτῆμά τε ἐξ αἰεί”). (Thuc. I.22, Loeb).

His goal was to write a History according to the conclusions he reached. He does not provide different views on the same subject or explain how he arrived to his conclusions about an event he described. From other sources, we can generally test his accuracy and it is shown that he has erred in very few cases. In the reproduction of the speeches he was selective in the points he included and there is a “Thucydidean” feeling in them. His style of writing and his language is difficult even for the ancients and the use of “antithesis is the most characteristic feature of the writing.” (Luce, pp. 50-51). For many years, historians have battled over the character of his writing and whether it is more artistic than scientific, more intellectual than emotional. Does he discuss events that are predictable or left to chance, is what he describes rational or irrational? It seems that his writing style was influenced by his medical observations on the plague of Athens. He is “austere” and “unsentimental” on how the world works. People's actions can be predicted partly because of man's nature and partly because of culture, government, and society in which a person is born. He does not rely on oracles or natural phenomena or divine intervention in order to explain causes of events. He is a “pragmatist and objective reporter” but at the same time his descriptions are “vivid” so that the reader is drawn into the suffering that the war has caused to the belligerents. (Luce, pp. 57 & 64-65).

My comment is that Thucydides initiated the comparison of information as well as the verification of data so that he achieved a conclusion that satisfied him as a historian. Also, he did not rely on legends or casual reports on events but tried to verify what he was told about events and decisions made in battles and politics. He was writing current History and to some extent self-biography but he tried to be impartial, view all the events from far away and from above for a complete picture and as other ancient sources confirm he was to a very large extent successful. His ground breaking technique for the era he lived was that he wanted to learn and write the true History of the Spartan-Athenian conflict, what were the causes of the war and what happened around the peace of 421 BC. Homer was the poet who wove historical events into a long literary story for the generations to recall the bravery, the victory, and the ingenuity of the Greeks; Herodotus was the father of a continuous story telling History of the ancient world; but Thucydides was the founder of the principles of historical method and History writing that are followed by historians even nowadays, in the 21st century. We should appreciate his brilliant mind and decision to search for the historical truth in the 5th century BC against the methods and writings of the story writers

who preceded him and those who wrote after him in the following century. It is also admiring the fact that he wished to transmit to his audience not his emotions about the war but the feelings of the participants and the tragedy of the conflict mainly in the city-state of Athens. The contrast between Pericles and his successors after his death by the plague in 429 BC and, therefore, the unstable function of democratic institutions during the war is shown by Thucydides in his description of the decision made for and the conduct of the Sicilian expedition (415-413 BC). He is the first one who sought for the truth in History, for what really happened. In this sense, Humboldt and von Ranke come second in the what-really-happened question in History which is as old as the 5th century BC Athenian general and historian.

Lucian said it all 1800 years ago

Thucydides was the first one who wrote History in the sense that we understand the discipline of History today and Lucian was the first one who wrote an essay on the theory of History. Lucian of Samosata (c. 125-180) called himself a Syrian and wrote in Greek. Because he was very sarcastic in his works, the information we derive from them about his life may not be accurate. He says that he came from a low middle class family who lived in Samosata (modern Samsat, southeast Turkey). He abandoned sculpture, traveled to Ionian cities, along the western coast of Asia Minor (modern Turkey), where he learned Greek and became a rhetorician. A rhetorician's typical work was to plead in court, compose pleas for others, and teach his vocation. The most famous rhetoricians showed their speaking skills before their educated listeners and Lucian became one of them but beyond some rhetorical texts the most important part of his work is satirical writing. As a professional of rhetoric, he traveled to Ionia (west central Asia Minor, Turkey) and adjacent islands, Greece, Italy, and Gaul (modern south France). After he became known and acquired some wealth, he settled down in Athens for a number of years. He also traveled a number of times to Olympia where he delivered lectures. Then he moved to Egypt where he most probably died. Among his best known works are the *Dialogues of the Dead*,

In *How to Write History* Lucian attacks historians of his times who confused History with the writing of speeches and rhetoric and praises Thucydides' style and methods. Everybody has become a historian, he writes, and tries to describe the Parthian war (AD 162-165) during which an initial Roman defeat turned into a major victory with the fall of the Parthian capital. They think, Lucian explains, that it is a simple and easy task to write History by just recording what they understand of the information they get but it is known that the writing of History is not an easy task or something that can be written during leisure time. It is something that needs a great deal of thought if the synthesis is to last for ever as Thucydides writes (5, Loeb). However, he explains, he has spotted faults in the histories he has read. Many historians do not record the events but just praise rulers and generals they favor and look down upon those they do not like. They do not realize the great difference between writing History and a praising essay (“ἡ ἱστορία πρὸς τὸ ἐγκώμιον”) (7, Loeb). Also, they may lie in order to achieve their goal but History cannot accept even the tiniest of lies because its goals and aims (“ὑποσχέσεις καὶ κανόνες”) are different from those of poetry and poems (“ποιητικῆς”, “ποιημάτων”). Legends and flattery and their exaggerations are not to be used. (8, Loeb). History has one task and one final goal which are what is useful and what derives from truth. The historian should write History not for those who look for pleasure in a text or in order to please those readers but for those who will check it for bias, for mistakes, like judges. (10, Loeb). He criticizes historians who try to copy Thucydides anachronistically but he praises one, a doctor, an amateur chronicler, who just stated the facts of the war because this could be used

by future historians for their own work. Lucian also mentions the history of a philosopher in Corinth who used one thought after the other in order to prove that only a philosopher could write History, which in Lucian's opinion it was badly written. Another historian spent most of his time in unnecessary detail and he wrote a whole book chapter describing the shield of the emperor. Generally, there are historians who leave out the important and worth noting events and focus on the insignificant. Others claim that they have seen places they describe with their own eyes although they have never left their home town. Still others write about future events like a prophesy (“μαντικῶς”) (31, Loeb) or write a very short text about a whole war. (11-33, Loeb).

The best historians possess two qualities: an understanding of politics and a power of expression in their writings (“σύνεσιν τε πολιτικὴν καὶ δύναμιν ἑρμηνευτικὴν”). (34, Loeb). The first one is a gift of nature for certain humans but the second one can come through practice and imitation of earlier writers. The historian should not fear to describe events because there was a military failure or fear that he will be accused of writing unpleasant happenings or describe them in a way that he will be rewarded for his services. He should have a free opinion, should fear nobody and expect nothing in return for his work (“πρὸ τῶν πάντων ἐλεύθερος ἔστω τὴν γνώμην καὶ μήτε φοβεῖσθω μηδένα μήτε ἐλπίζειτω μηδέν” (38, Loeb). His only task is to tell what happened (“ὡς ἐπράχθη εἰπεῖν”) (39, Loeb) or, my comment is, in German “wie es eigentlich gewesen” by von Ranke (and Humboldt) a thousand five hundred years later. However, he cannot tell the truth as it happened if he fears the wrath of a ruler or expects to be rewarded for his writings. Neither Xenophon nor Thucydides would have done this because they believed that the public interest and truth were worth more than enmity. A historian should not think of his present audience but of those who will read his work in the future. (39, Loeb). The qualities of a historian should be the following: “fearless, incorruptible, free, a friend of free expression and the truth” (“ἄφοβος, ἀδέκαστος, ἐλεύθερος, παρρησίας καὶ ἀληθείας φίλος”) and he should be ready to call a fig a fig and a through a through (“τὰ σῦκα σῦκα τὴν δὲν σκάφην σκάφην ὀνομάσων”) (41, Loeb). He should have no hate or friendship, spare no one, show neither pity nor shame nor obsequiousness, be impartial, a stranger in his books and a man without a country, independent, subject to no sovereign, without considering what men will think about his writings, just tell what happened (“τί πέπρακται λέγων”) (41, Loeb). Apart from free expression and truthfulness, a historian should be able to state the subject of his study accurately and clearly so that ordinary people can understand his points and the well educated ones praise his way of writing. However, his mind should have a touch of poetry (“ποιητικῆς”), a literary mood, especially when he describes land and sea battles though his writing should “keep its feet on the ground” and not go mad and be “swept down into poetry's wild enthusiasm.” (45, Loeb).

A historian should pay great attention to the collection of facts and not just state them at random. He should investigate well and preferably be an eyewitness or listen to those who seem to be impartial in their retelling of what happened so that he puts together the most probable story (“τοῦ πιθανωτέρου ἔστω.”) (47, Loeb). After the collection of the facts, he should create a draft (“ὑπόμνημα”) of the story by putting them together in the form of a series of notes without paying attention to the “beauty” of the text or its structure. Then, he will turn the draft into a beautifully written text with the facts in order. (48, Loeb). He should look at the facts of a battle like Homer's Zeus view from above, that is, from both sides of the belligerents; he will look at the whole battle unless he needs to discuss the strategies and attempts of the generals; he will follow a chronological arrangement whenever possible and discuss all events from Armenia to Iberia. Above all, he should present the facts like a clear

and gleaming-bright mirror avoiding “distortion, false coloring, and misrepresentation.” He should not be interested in what to say but in how to say it. Like a sculptor, a historian never manufactures the gold, silver or ivory or any other material he is going to use but he must be interested in putting his art (“τέχνην”) to work and handle his material properly. He should “give a fine arrangement to events” and present such a vivid picture so that his listeners –writers read their works in public from their original script– of his History will be seeing the scenes described before their eyes. In his preface, he should include what will show to his audience. First, that his work is “important, essential, personal or useful,” then will provide the causes and an outline of the main events. The models are Herodotus and Thucydides. There should be a smooth transition from the short or long preface to the main narrative (“δήγησιν”) as the body of History is nothing else but a long narration (“τὸ λοιπὸν σῶμα τῆς ἱστορίας δῆγησις μακρὰν ἐστίν.”) (55, Loeb). The narration should be progressing smoothly with clarity and without peaks and valleys. One topic should be well linked with the next and their should be common matter and overlap at the end of the first and the beginning of the second. Adequate discussion should be given to the important matters and little attention to the less essential matters. It must be written in a way that catches the attention of the audience. Thucydides is the model on this method of writing. If you need to tell a myth, just tell it without any emphasis so that the audience decide what to do with it. In general, do not write for the present audience so that you are praised and honored by it but “aim at eternity and prefer to write for posterity” (61, Loeb) to be judged by those people of the future for your frankness and truthfulness. That should be your rule and standard for impartial History.

What is History after all?

We began our discussion of the theory of History with the late 20th century ideas and we concluded it with Lucian in the 2nd century. Lucian was the first writer to discuss how History should be written, an idea modeled mainly on Thucydides' History. Considering this course of 1800 years, I could very easily proclaim that Lucian said it all. It seems that he was the model for Humboldt and von Ranke's ideas although this was not explicitly stated in their writings. Let's blame or praise Lucian then not von Ranke for the practice of History writing as well as the discussion on the theory of History that has occupied historians and theorists in the last two hundred years. Although the principles of History theory and practice have been established by Lucian, there has definitely been additional progress.

“What is History?” therefore! Human History is a record of human activity from the time humans recorded their actions until just a fraction of a second ago. It must be distinguished from natural history, which is a record of the activity of nature since the beginning of the cosmos. Human History can be broadly divided into the History of groups of people and the History of persons. Groups of people are defined as two or more human beings who constitute one team and most of the times are guided by a leader. A personal History or biography is the deeds and life of one person. History is one or more events that have happened from just a fraction of a second ago and all the way to the distant past as long as there is a record of it or them. A historical record or historical evidence is anything that can show or narrate human activity: almost perished remnants of human activity such as evidence of human made fire or remains of food consumption, a man-made tool or structure, any written evidence of human activity, human activity recorded on media (sounds, still pictures, movies, software etc), art. Beyond tangible evidence, History includes ideas and more specifically theories, philosophical, literary, scientific and technological courses and developments, human notions and related activity such as religion, sexuality, nutrition, psy-

choanalysis. In the past there was a clear distinction between History and Prehistory. It was thought that History begins only when humans begin narrating their past in written continuities such as a list of rulers, evidence of writing in a human language or a narration of human events and anything that showed human activity before the existence of such evidence was Prehistory. However, since the late 20th century, it has been shown that archaeological evidence (complete or incomplete) of human activity may narrate some human activity or History even in the cases when any written historical evidence is missing. Human remains, human made structures, utensils, tools, wrecks, are some of the evidence that if put together they may narrate some incomplete or uncertain human History, which of course is much better than no History. Therefore, although we may still differentiate between Prehistory and History, the former is more and more used to begin a History of peoples or places.

It is certain that human understanding of History may not be what exactly happened in the past and there must be a distinction between an event (συμβάν) of the past and a fact (γεγονός). An event (συμβάν) is what happened in the past and a fact (γεγονός) is what human beings or amateur/educated historians perceive as a manifestation or representation of the same event or part of it. The event (συμβάν) is independent of later human action on it but the fact (γεγονός) is the outcome of a process applied to the event (συμβάν) by the historian. My definition of the historian is a person who has been trained at a university in the science and art of History. This does not exclude entirely amateur historians, those who were self-educated in History study and writing, but puts great emphasis on those who are historians by profession or better on those whose function is History. The historian will never be able to find or use all the facts (γεγονότα) of a past event (συμβάντος) either because they are not revealed to him/her or because s/he does not need them. From the long course of historical events, the historian will be able to find those which have left their traces in the form of evidence such as fire, food, tools, utensils, structures, means of transportation, written testimony, coins.

The historian will begin with a broad and general idea, a working hypothesis, such as a study of an event in Europe or in Oceania in the 19th century. Then, s/he will narrow it down so that it is manageable in terms of research and writing time and will begin selecting facts about it. Depending on the topic of his research, s/he will select those facts that are important and useful for the writing of his monograph or general History. The selection is the first stage of research where the historian uses the historical method. First s/he will decide on the usefulness of the fact for his study: a major battle or an economic or social phenomenon may be the one that it needs to be discussed against similar minor ones that even if selected and discussed will not change the general picture of his/her study. This is done for reasons of economy of time as the selection and discussion of all related facts may need more than the historian's life to be collected, discussed, and published. Therefore, the historian must be selective in the number of facts that s/he will decide to study and discuss.

Apart from its usefulness, each selected fact must undergo the historian's scrutiny for the validity of the evidence (τεκμήρια) that support it. Sometime in the late 20th century, the “diaries of Hitler” surfaced suddenly and became a major historical event that needed to be discussed in the context of totalitarianism, Nazism, German, European, and World History, Hitler's biography. However, it was eventually proven that they were just fake evidence, forged by a minor antiquities seller. The historian will need to ask questions to himself/herself about the evidence of a fact and be convinced that they are valid. Is the discussion of an archaeologist about evidence of fire, food remains and tools in a specific place or area at a specific or broader period of time (=evidence) convincing that one or more human beings passed by or lived there

and that they can be compared to other people in a different place (=fact or possible fact)? Does an inscription, a reference by an ancient historian and archaeological remains (=evidence) prove that the Greeks or the Romans had built a city on that coast or that inland place (=fact or possible fact)? Does the medieval chronicle (=evidence) refer to possible or impossible deeds (=fact or possible fact) of the ruler discussed? Do the records of the US Army, those of the Japanese Army, those of both American and Japanese political entities (=evidence) prove that the former were informed in advance of the latter's attack on Pearl Harbor (=fact or possible fact)? Do Heidegger's writings (=evidence) support Nazism (=fact or possible fact)? Do literary, artistic, political, economic, social, military manifestations of life (=evidence) prove a violent transition from the 19th to the 20th century (=fact or possible fact)?

The collection of facts that will be considered by the historian as appropriate and the evidence that accompany them and that will be considered as valid will be followed by a holistic consideration of both. The historian will decide how s/he will interpret the evidence that lead to a discussion of the facts. Interpretation does not mean that s/he will be biased and take sides disregarding the evidence and the facts that do not support his/her original hypothesis. In most of the cases, History can be read from at least two sides, that of the winners and that of the loser, and the statement does not only refer to battles but to any historical fact. Ideally, the historian will refer to both sides and then will state his/her interpretation as facts must be clearly separated from interpretations. The meaning of describing the events or perceived facts as they really happened refers in today's historiography as the historian's search for the collection of facts and their accompanying evidence without any bias. The evidence will guide the historian to the facts and the connected events, the evidence will define his/her final hypothesis and s/he will need to base his/her interpretations on those evidence without applying any personal, religious, political or ideological predetermined ideas. This process is what makes History so difficult a task to be successfully completed because it requires personal qualities that must be acquired after university level studies.

Usually, evidence are not complete in order to lead to a continuity of facts and the historian is left with gaps in his History. In those cases, the historian has two roads to select, s/he either leaves the facts unconnected explaining the reason for that or if the preceding and the following facts allow for a suspicion of what is missing, s/he offers a possible but imaginary completion, that is, his/her own theory of it. The following examples illustrate both cases of disconnection or possible connection between major archaeological or historical facts. Are the Minoans Greeks or non Greeks based on their Linear A script and the archaeological evidence? The current prevailing opinion is that they are non Greeks although a lot of attempts have been made to read Linear A using methods that led to the decipherment of Linear B (a Greek language script) and the gap before and after the Minoans remains. Did the scholars who left Byzantium in the 13th century and afterwards contribute to the Italian and Western European Renaissance? Although some scholars have expressed doubts on the degree of their influence in Italy and France most Byzantines who arrived in Europe probably did play an important role by teaching Classical Greek and making some texts in Greek known to the western Europeans. This fact possibly along with other related

facts will trigger the Renaissance in Western Europe. Was the Armenian genocide conducted by the Turks in the early 20th century of the same magnitude as the Jewish genocide and if yes why it has not been widely recognized as such? It seems that the Armenians have not been as politically and widely influential as the Jews in making their genocide known to the world as a crime upon civilians because of their Christian beliefs but there is evidence to be considered and more and more countries officially recognize the Armenian genocide.

The final step is History writing. The historian has completed the collection of evidence, has studied them critically, has questioned them and has received answers (positive or negative), and s/he is ready to write the historical narrative or analysis. A historian's writing should last in time and therefore it should be written in a clear language. The conclusions must be fully supported by the evidence discussed. After the historian presents the facts and the interpretations, it is left to other historians or the readers to decide whether they agree with his/her statements. In conclusion and taking into consideration all of the above, in my view, this is what History is all about and how the historian must exercise his/her craft.

Κεφάλαιο 4

Αρχαιολογία, Ανθρωπολογία, Εθνολογία και Προϊστορία

Αφού συζητήσαμε τι είναι Ιστορία, είναι πλέον χρήσιμο να παραθέσουμε ορισμένες διευκρινήσεις ως προς την θεωρία και την μεθοδολογία της επιστήμης της αρχαιολογίας και ιδίως της προϊστορικής αρχαιολογίας αλλά και ορισμένες παρατηρήσεις ως προς την πρακτική της στο τέλος του 20ου και στην αρχή του 21ου μ.Χ. αιώνα στην Ελλάδα.

Η αρχαιολογία είναι επιστήμη της οποίας οι θεράποντες επιδιώκουν την ακρίβεια στην αποτύπωση της ανασκαφής και των ευρημάτων, την οποία θα χαρακτήριζα ως όμοια με την τελειομανία της μουσικής γραφής των έργων που συνέθετε ο Γιάννης Χρήστου, και όντως αυτό είναι που πράττουν κατά το μάλλον ή ήττον οι ανασκαφείς αρχαιολόγοι. Στην ανασκαφική αρχαιολογία δεν έχει μόνο σημασία τι βρίσκει ο αρχαιολόγος αλλά και πώς το βρίσκει, πώς το καταγράφει και πώς το συντηρεί. Επιπλέον, ανασκαφείς αρχαιολόγοι αλλά και μελετητές αρχαιολόγοι συνθέτουν αρχαιολογικές συνόψεις περιόδων στις οποίες αναγκαστικά καταφεύγουν σε υποθέσεις εργασίας, θεωρίες και διαφορετικές επιστημονικές απόψεις για να αποδώσουν μια συνεχή αρχαιολογική και αρκετές φορές και ιστορική εικόνα ενός ή περισσοτέρων αιώνων σε μια γεωγραφική περιοχή του κόσμου.¹⁵ Η αρχαιολογία είναι από την μία πλευρά ανακάλυψη και αποκάλυψη του παρελθόντος και από την άλλη προσπάθεια ανασυνθέσεως του, ιδίως με την βοήθεια του υλικού πολιτισμού. Υπάρχουν, όμως, και αρχαιολόγοι οι οποίοι προσπαθούν να δώσουν στα ευρήματά τους κοινωνικές προεκτάσεις, δηλαδή να εξαγάγουν συμπεράσματα και να διατυπώσουν ρήσεις σε ό,τι αφορά στην κοινωνία στην οποία ζούσαν οι άνθρωποι του υλικού πολιτισμού που έχουν ανασκάψει. Στις περισσότερες περιπτώσεις στις ανασκαφές που αφορούν στην ελληνική και ρωμαϊκή Αρχαιότητα, το πλήθος, το εύρος, η ποικιλία των πληροφοριών αλλά και ο συνδυασμός τους με γραπτά τεκμήρια, όλα αυτά που έχουν συγκεντρωθεί τους τελευταίους δύο αιώνες ανασκαφών, επιτρέπουν την εξαγωγή συμπερασμάτων που αφορούν σε απτές (λ.χ. κεραμική) αλλά και σε μη απτές (λ.χ. κοινωνία) αποδείξεις για τους πολιτισμούς αυτούς. Το ίδιο συμβαίνει και για όσους πολιτισμούς στην Αρχαία Εγγύς Ανατολή αλλά και αλλού στον κόσμο διαθέτουμε και γραπτά μνημεία.¹⁶ Σε ό,τι, όμως, αφορά στην Προϊστορία, δηλαδή γενικώς σε υλικούς πολιτισμούς όπου δεν υπάρχουν γραπτές φραστικές μαρτυρίες, οι πληροφορίες που διαθέτουμε είναι στην συντριπτική τους πλειοψηφία τόσο περιορισμένες ώστε τα συμπεράσματα για την κοινωνική οργάνωση των κοινωνιών αυτών πρέπει να είναι είτε πολύ προσεκτικά και ολιγόλογα είτε να λείπουν εντελώς. Με άλλα λόγια, πώς μπορεί ένας αρχαιολόγος να αποδείξει, για παράδειγμα, ότι ο τρόπος με τον οποίο είναι τοποθετημένες οι καλύβες σε έναν προϊστορικό οικισμό δείχνει ότι υπήρχαν σαφείς κοινωνικοί κανόνες, οι οποίοι λειτουργούσαν ως κυματοθραύστης στην εκδήλωση κοινωνικών ανισοτήτων. Σε μια Γενική Ιστορία, όμως, ο αναγνώστης πρέπει να σχηματίσει μία κατά το δυνατόν σφαιρική εικόνα για τους πνευματικούς και υλικούς πολιτισμούς στην ευρωπαϊκή

¹⁵ Για μια γενικώς πολύ χρήσιμη σύνοψη της/των αρχαιολογικών θεωριών, σε διάφορα σημεία της οποίας μπορεί να υπάρχουν διαφωνίες από αρχαιολόγους, δες Matthew Johnson, *Archaeological Theory. An Introduction*, 3rd Ed. (Oxford: Willey Blackwell, 2020).

¹⁶ Για τον ρόλο της αρχαιολογίας ως κοινωνικής επιστήμης δες Michael E. Smith and Gary M. Feinman and Robert D. Drennan and Timothy Earle and Ian Morris, «Archaeology as a Social Science,» *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS)* [USA], vol. 109, no 20 (15 May 2012): 7617-7621.

ήπειρο. Γι' αυτόν τον λόγο σε αυτές τις συγγραφές συμπεριλαμβάνονται κριτικά και απόψεις οι οποίες δίνουν μία διέξοδο σε ορισμένα ζητήματα αν και δεν είναι απολύτως αποδεκτές, πάντα ενημερώνοντας τον αναγνώστη ότι πρόκειται για συγκεκριμένη γνώμη. Εν τούτοις, ο αρχαιολόγος και ο ιστορικός οφείλουν να τονίσουν και τις επιστημονικές τους αντιρρήσεις για απόψεις οι οποίες είναι μεν ενδιαφέρουσες ως θέσεις αλλά γενικά αόριστες ή αστήρικτες.

Για έναν ιστορικό, βέβαια, τέτοιου είδους ανάλογα αστήρικτα συμπεράσματα στην Ιστορία αποτελούν σκόπιμες ή αθέλητες παραβάσεις ακαδημαϊκής ακεραιότητας (breaches of academic integrity) αλλά και της επιστημονικής ηθικής του συγγραφέα για την εξυπηρέτηση διαφόρων σκοπών. Οι σκοποί αυτοί μπορεί να έχουν σαφή προσανατολισμό (πολιτικό, θρησκευτικό, εθνικό, προσωπικό) αλλά μπορεί και να έχουν ως στόχο απλώς την εξύψωση της ιστορικής ή αρχαιολογικής επιστήμης της ίδιας. Παλαιότερα, η χρήση οικονομικών δεδομένων και στατιστικών αποτελεσμάτων θεωρούνταν ότι μετέτρεπε την Ιστορία από ανθρωπιστική σε κοινωνική επιστήμη ακριβείας ακόμη και εάν κάποια στοιχεία παραβλέπονταν ή παραποιούνταν για να εξυπηρετηθεί το γενικό συμπέρασμα (π.χ. η οικονομία και οι σκλάβοι στις πολιτείες της Βόρειας Αμερικής). Η ίδια τάση έχει/είχε καταλάβει πλέον και την επιστήμη της αρχαιολογίας. Κάποιοι αρχαιολόγοι, για να ικανοποιήσουν την δίψα τους – αλλά και του κοινού –, να εξυψώσουν την επιστήμη τους και να υπηρετήσουν την διεπιστημονικότητα σε ό,τι αφορά στην κοινωνική οργάνωση των πολιτισμών που μελετούν, παίρνουν παραδείγματα και εφαρμόζουν ή αποδέχονται μεθόδους της Ανθρωπολογίας. Οι ανθρωπολόγοι μελετούν πρωτόγονες κοινωνίες που έχουν επιβιώσει μέχρι σήμερα και ορισμένοι αρχαιολόγοι εφαρμόζουν τα συμπεράσματά τους σε προϊστορικές κοινωνίες έτσι ώστε δια της μεθόδου των αναλόγων (analogies) να εξάγουν συμπεράσματα. Όμως τα συμπεράσματα αυτά μπορεί να είναι τελείως αίολα¹⁷ και πολλές φορές χωρίς καμία αρχαιολογική επιστημονική βάση σε ό,τι αφορά στην εφαρμογή τους στις προϊστορικές κοινωνίες που μελετούν οι αρχαιολόγοι. Τίθεται, λοιπόν, το ερώτημα του κατά πόσον κοινωνική μπορεί να είναι η αρχαιολογία και εάν η κοινωνική αρχαιολογία είναι μια άλλη όψη της κοινωνικής ανθρωπολογίας αλλά όχι αρχαιολογία με την κλασσική έννοια αυτής της επιστήμης. Φυσικά και είναι συναρπαστικό για τον αρχαιολόγο και τον ιστορικό να μπορεί να αντιληφθεί την ζωή στο νεολιθικό χωριό και τις κοινωνίες της Εποχής του Ορειχάλκου και του Σιδήρου αλλά μήπως η εικόνα που θα σχεδιασθεί είναι τελικά ιδιαίτερα απατηλή; Ποια είναι τα αδιάσειστα στοιχεία εκείνα που βεβαιώνουν ότι τα συμπεράσματα των αρχαιολόγων αλλά και των ιστορικών που βασίζονται σε αυτά εμπεριέχουν όντως μεγάλο ποσοστό αλήθειας; Εκλαμβάνουμε βέβαια ως δεδομένο ότι αρχαιολόγοι και ιστορικοί επιδιώκουν να ανακαλύψουν και να αποκαλύψουν, όσο αυτό είναι δυνατόν, την αρχαία κοινωνία στις πραγματικές της διαστάσεις. Ευτυχώς, σε ανάλογες περιπτώσεις, πολλοί αρχαιολόγοι προειδοποιούν τον αναγνώστη όταν πρόκειται για υπόθεση εργασίας και όχι για σε-νάριο αρχαιολογικής φαντασίας που παρουσιάζεται ως γεγονός.

Όχι! Δεν θέλουμε οι επιστήμες να είναι σε σιλό, απομονωμένες από τις υπόλοιπες, όταν πρόκειται για την μελέτη και κατανόηση αρχαίων κόσμων και πολιτισμών. Αντιθέτως, πιστεύουμε στην διεπιστημονικότητα ως την μοναδική επιστημονική μέθοδο για την αποκάλυψη του παρελθόντος και του παρόντος – ίσως και του μέλλοντος – της ανθρώπινης Ιστορίας και του πολιτισμού. Αλλά, όχι εις βάρος της προσπάθειας για την αποκάλυψη τους επί τη βάση τεκμηρίων και μόνο, ακόμη και εάν η ερμηνεία τους διαφέρει από επιστήμονα σε επιστήμονα. Βέβαια, στην μεγαλύτερη

¹⁷ Προσοχή! Άλλο το «αίολος = αρχ. αιώλος (δες και Λεξικό Δημητράκος, λμ. «αίολος» αρ. 3) = μη αξιόπιστος, αστήρικτος, αθεμελίωτος» και άλλο το «έωλος (δες και Λεξικό Δημητράκος, λμ. «έωλος» αρ. 1-2) = μη φρέσκος, μαγατιάτικος ή (επί πράξεων) ο απηρχαιωμένος». Δες και λμ. «αίολος» και «αίολος ή έωλος», Μπαμπινιώτης, *Λεξικό της Νέας Ελληνικής Γλώσσας*.

διάρκεια του 20ου μ.Χ. αιώνα, η αρχαιολογία δεν θεωρούνταν παρά μια από τις βοηθητικές επιστήμες της Ιστορίας και τίποτα άλλο.¹⁸ Από την δεκαετία του 1960 τονίζονταν για την Κλασική αρχαιολογία ότι «είναι αυτονόητο ότι η Αρχαιολογία είναι ελλιπής πηγή πληροφόρησης, αν αποκοπεί από τις γραπτές μαρτυρίες», δηλαδή από την Ιστορία. «Ελλιπής είναι και αυτή καθεαυτή, αφού μας παραδίδει ένα μέρος μόνο από τα υλικά ίχνη του παρελθόντος [...] Πρέπει λοιπόν κάθε φορά να αποκαθιστούμε τα πράγματα με φαντασία και υποθέσεις, και βέβαια μια τέτοια αποκατάσταση συνοδεύεται από την απαραίτητη δόση αβεβαιότητας. [...] Σχεδόν πάντα [...] μας χρειάζεται η συνδρομή των γραπτών μαρτυριών». Και καταλήγει ο Paul-Marie Duval, «Για να βεβαιωθεί σήμερα η αξία μιας αρχαιολογικής μαρτυρίας χρειάζονται επαληθεύσεις [...] Τότε μόνο μπορεί να χρησιμοποιήσει ο ιστορικός την αρχαιολογική μαρτυρία».¹⁹ Την ίδια αντίληψη με τους Γάλλους συναδέλφους του είχε και ο Βρετανός ιστορικός Έρικ Χόμπσπαουμ (Eric Hobsbawm), ο οποίος σε συνέδριο στο Καίμπριτζ το 1978²⁰ μίλησε υποτιμητικά (ή με αυτό που ονομάζεται βρετανικό φλέγμα) για τους αρχαιολόγους λέγοντας: «η κύρια αδυναμία των αρχαιολόγων, η οποία μου φαίνεται ότι περιορίζει την χρήση τους [την χρήση των αρχαιολόγων] για τον ιστορικό είναι, και συγχωρέστε μου την λέξη, μια κάποια δόση 'αναζητήσεως υποστάσεως' (status-seeking), τονίζοντας την ιδιαίτερη και επιστημονική φύση της επιστήμης [τους, της αρχαιολογίας]». Και συνεχίζει σε άλλο σημείο της παρεμβάσεώς του: «Φοβάμαι ότι παραμένω, σαν ιστορικός μαζί με τον Καθηγητή Clark, στην παλιομοδίτικη αντίληψη ότι το μόνο νόημα που έχει η αρχαιολογία είναι ως μέρος της ιστορίας. Εάν δεν είναι μέρος της ιστορίας και δεν διευκρινίζει τι συνέβη στην ιστορία και γιατί, όπου δεν υπάρχουν άλλες πηγές, δεν μπορώ να καταλάβω τον σκοπό της εξασκήσεώς [της]».²¹ Ο Χόμπσπαουμ, βέβαια, ασχολούνταν με την νεώτερη Ιστορία και για αυτόν αρχαιολογία ήταν μάλλον μόνο η βιομηχανική αρχαιολογία αλλά, παρ' όλα αυτά, εξέφραζε την γενική αντίληψη κατά τον 20ο μ.Χ. αιώνα για την θέση της αρχαιολογίας ως επιστήμης, τουλάχιστον στην Ευρώπη. Αντιλήψεις αυτής της φύσεως για την αρχαιολογία ως επιστήμη είχαν και ορισμένοι, αν όχι όλοι, οι καθηγητές αρχαιολογίας στα ελληνικά πανεπιστήμια. Την δεκαετία του 1980, καθηγητής αρχαιολογίας στο Πανεπιστήμιο Ιωαννίνων και σπουδασμένος στην Γερμανία επέστρεψε σε γνωστή μου την διδακτορική της διατριβή για αγγείο της Μινωικής Εποχής με την οδηγία να αφαιρέσει όλα τα ερμηνευτικά σχόλια περί μινωικής κοινωνίας και να επικεντρωθεί μόνο στα αρχαιολογικά στοιχεία περί του συγκεκριμένου αγγείου από τις ανασκαφές. Σύμφωνα με τις αντιλήψεις του, η αρχαιολογία ήταν επιστήμη περιγραφική και όχι ερμηνευτική. Όμως, οι απόψεις αυτές είχαν αρχίσει να αλλάζουν στην διεθνή κοινότητα των αρχαιολόγων ήδη από την δεκαετία του 1990 και δειλά-δειλά λίγο νωρίτερα ενώ στην Ελλάδα τουλάχιστον από την πρώτη δεκαετία του 21ου μ.Χ. αιώνα.

Η αρχαιολογία, όμως, είναι αυτόνομη επιστήμη και σε συνδυασμό με την Ιστορία μπορεί να δώσει απαντήσεις και σε αρχαιολογικά και σε ιστορικά ερωτήματα. Ζήτημα προκύπτει συνήθως όταν οι αρχαιολόγοι της Προϊστορικής Εποχής (ανάλογα με την γεωγραφική περιοχή) καταφεύγουν σε μεθόδους της Ανθρωπολογίας και ιδίως στην Εθνολογία²² και σε ό,τι αφορά στην κοινωνική οργάνωση των προϊστορικών κοινωνιών. Εν τούτοις, τουλάχιστον το 1979, ούτε ο εκπρόσωπος των ανθρωπολόγων

¹⁸ Δες για την γαλλική αντίληψη από την δεκαετία του 1960, Charles Samaran, επιμ. *Ιστορία και μέθοδοί της* (μετ. του *L'Histoire et ses méthodes*, 1961), 4 τομ. (Αθήνα: ΜΙΕΤ, 1981), Β1:11-41 & 87-120.

¹⁹ Οι παραθέσεις από το Charles Samaran, επιμ., *Ιστορία και μέθοδοί της*, Δ:37-41.

²⁰ *Interdisciplinary Studies in Social Area Analysis* (Burnham & Kingsbury editions, 1979).

²¹ Παρατίθεται στο Fredrik Fahlander and Terje Oestigaard, «Introduction. Material Culture and Post-Disciplinary Sciences,» in *Material Culture and Other Things. Post-disciplinary studies in the 21st Century*, eds Fredrik Fahlander and Terje Oestigaard (Lindome, Sweden: Bricoleur Press, 2004), p. 2.

στο ίδιο συνέδριο (δες παραπάνω) Edmund Leach ήταν ευχαριστημένος με την δουλειά των αρχαιολόγων. Τόνιζε ότι οι έννοιες του ατόμου και της ομάδας εφαρμόζονται από τους αρχαιολόγους αόριστα και με απρόσεκτο τρόπο, όπως και οι έννοιες πολιτισμός και κοινωνία.²³ Πολύ φυσικό, βέβαια, ο ανθρωπολόγος να αντιδρά στον τρόπο με τον οποίο εργάζονται και σκέφτονται οι αρχαιολόγοι διότι αλλιώς απλώς η αρχαιολογία θα ήταν ανθρωπολογία και εθνολογία, όπως ήταν κατά τον 19ο μ.Χ. αιώνα. Μάλιστα, για κάποια περίοδο μετά τον Β' Παγκόσμιο Πόλεμο η αρχαιολογία της Αμερικανικής ηπείρου είχε γίνει ο «μικρούλης αδελφός» της ανθρωπολογίας.²⁴ Η αρχαιολογία δεν μπορεί να είναι αποκομμένη από άλλες επιστήμες αλλά σε ό,τι αφορά στην σχέση της με τις προϊστορικές κοινωνίες πόσο κοντά μπορεί να βρεθεί επιστημονικά με την ανθρωπολογία;

Αναμφισβήτητα, στον 21ο αιώνα των μετεπιστημονικών επιστημών («post-disciplinary sciences») η συνδυαστική ύλη ανάμεσα στους ερευνητές δεν είναι οι επιστήμες οι ίδιες αλλά τα ερωτήματα που θέτουν και τα ζητήματα που μελετούν.²⁵ Αλλά η σημασία που δίνεται από τους αρχαιολόγους στα τεχνουργήματα, στον υλικό πολιτισμό των ανασκαφών, χαρακτηρίζεται ως φετίχ εάν δεν συμπληρώνεται από κάτι άλλο.²⁶ Επιτρέπεται, όμως, επιστημονικά αυτό το κάτι άλλο να είναι μια αβάσιμη θεωρία που απλώς δημιουργεί έναν προϊστορικό κόσμο όπως τον θέλει ο κάθε μελετητής, χωρίς να βασίζεται σε απτά τεκμήρια; Οι αρχαιολόγοι δεν πρέπει να βασίζονται τα συμπεράσματα στις μελέτες τους αποκλειστικά ή κυρίως σε σημερινά στοιχεία από την σύγκριση με πρωτόγονες κοινωνίες, όπως πράττουν οι ανθρωπολόγοι, αλλά να χρησιμοποιούν όσο το δυνατόν περισσότερο τις ενσωματωμένες για την προϊστορική κοινωνία που μελετούν πληροφορίες στον υλικό πολιτισμό που ανασκάπτουν.²⁷

Η αρχαιολογία πρέπει να γίνεται κοινωνική επιστήμη εκεί όπου τα αρχαιολογικά δεδομένα, συχνά συνδυαζόμενα με ιστορικά τεκμήρια, επιτρέπουν την εξαγωγή συμπερασμάτων για την κοινωνική οργάνωση της ζωής των αρχαίων κοινωνιών. Σε ό,τι αφορά στην Προϊστορία, τέτοια συμπεράσματα πρέπει να μην βασίζονται σε απλές εικασίες και θεωρίες εκτός εάν αυτός είναι ο αρχικός σκοπός του μελετητή, δηλαδή να παρουσιάσει και να εξηγήσει μία/την θεωρία του ή υπόθεση εργασίας του, και αυτό εξηγείται στον αναγνώστη εξ αρχής. Η αρχαιολογία στον 21ο αιώνα πρέπει να ανεξαρτητοποιηθεί και να έχει την δυνατότητα να παρέχει πληροφορίες για την κοινωνία στους προϊστορικούς πολιτισμούς, αυτές που καμία άλλη επιστήμη δεν είναι σε θέση να μας δώσει.

²² Η Εθνολογία μπορεί να έχει ίδιο επιστημονικό αντικείμενο με την Αρχαιολογία σε ό,τι αφορά στην Προϊστορία αλλά οι μέθοδοί των δύο επιστημών είναι διαφορετικές. Δες Charles Samaran, επιμ., *Ιστορία και μέθοδοί της*, Β1:43-86.

²³ Fredrik Fahlander and Terje Oestigaard, p. 2.

²⁴ *Ιδιο*, p. 3.

²⁵ *Ιδιο*, p. 7.

²⁶ *Ιδιο*, p. 8.

²⁷ Fredrik Fahlander, «Archaeology and Anthropology – Brothers in Arms? On Analogies in 21st-century Archaeology,» in *Material Culture and Other Things. Post-disciplinary studies in the 21st Century*, eds Fredrik Fahlander and Terje Oestigaard (Lindome, Sweden: Bricoleur Press, 2004), pp. 157-158 & 173-176.

λόγων για να τεκμηριώσουν τις απόψεις τους πάντα βασιζόμενοι μόνο σε όσα αποδεικνύουν την θεωρία τους. Συλλέγουν τεκμήρια και απόψεις από πληθώρα επιστημών, επιχειρηματολογία «νεροχύτη», όλα μαζί στο ίδιο καζάνι να βράσουν, και τα οποία δεν σχετίζονται αμέσως με το προς απόδειξη θέμα τους αλλά δημιουργούν στον απλό αναγνώστη την εντύπωση της επιστημοσύνης. Πολλές φορές οι παραπομπές σε πηγές και απόψεις λείπουν, έτσι ώστε ο αναγνώστης να μην μπορεί να εντοπίσει πού έχουν δημοσιευθεί (εάν τελικά έχουν δημοσιευθεί) ό,τι ισχυρίζονται ότι αποδεικνύει την θεωρία τους. Χρησιμοποιούν αρχαιολογικούς και ιστορικούς αναχρονισμούς συγκρίνοντας τα ανόμοια, βασίζονται σε μύθους και θρησκευτικές δοξασίες διαφόρων πολιτισμών, φυλών, εθνών. Έχουν ψύχωση με το μυστηριώδες και το θεϊκό με στόχο να διαμορφώσουν μια αποκαλυπτική αρχαιολογική πραγματικότητα.

Δεν πρέπει να συγχέονται, φυσικά, οι ψευδοαρχαιολόγοι με τους ερασιτέχνες αρχαιολόγους, οι οποίοι έχουν πλέον εκλείψει εφόσον τα περισσότερα κράτη στον κόσμο απαιτούν την έκδοση ειδικών αδειών για ανασκαφές. Ούτε αναφερόμαστε βέβαια σε αυτούς που διενεργούν λαθρανασκαφές και στους τυμβωρύχους. Λαμπρά παραδείγματα ερασιτεχνών αναδείχθηκαν στο παρελθόν ο Γερμανός Ερρίκος Σλήμαν (Heinrich Schliemann, 1822-1890) και ο Βρετανός Άρθουρ Έβανς (Arthur Evans, 1851-1941). Ο πρώτος ανέσκαψε στα τέλη του 19ου μ.Χ. αιώνα, όταν επιτυχία και προβολή σήμαινε η εύρεση αρχαίων χρυσών αντικειμένων, και ο δεύτερος στις αρχές του 20ου μ.Χ. αιώνα, όταν οι χρηματοδότες ήθελαν να δουν απτά αποτελέσματα των ανασκαφών και να θαυμάσουν αναπαραστάσεις ανακτόρων. Παρ' όλα αυτά, δεν πρέπει να αγνοήσουμε ότι ο Σλήμαν ανακάλυψε πρώτος και έστρεψε το αρχαιολογικό επιστημονικό ενδιαφέρον στον νέο για την εποχή του Μυκηναϊκό Πολιτισμό και ο Έβανς στον νέο για την εποχή του Μινωικό Πολιτισμό. Εν τούτοις, αγαπημένα θέματα των ψευδοαρχαιολόγων είναι οι χαμένοι πολιτισμοί, οι πυραμίδες, οι μυστηριακές ανατολικές θρησκείες και οι πολιτισμοί που συνδέονται με αυτές, οι εξωγήινοι που υποτίθεται ότι κάποτε επισκέφθηκαν την Γη μας.²⁸

Στην Ελλάδα το πιο δημοφιλές θέμα των ψευδοαρχαιολόγων, εκτός βέβαια από την χαμένη Ατλαντίδα που, κατά την άποψη διαφόρων, μπορεί να βρίσκεται οπουδήποτε στην Υδρόγειο, είναι οι πυραμίδες του ελλαδικού χώρου. Σε αυτή την περίπτωση, η ψευδοαρχαιολογία βασίζεται στις αμφιβολίες που πάντα υφίστανται στην αρχαιολογική έρευνα και ερμηνεία αλλά και στις απόψεις μη αρχαιολόγων. Αμφιβολία υπάρχει πολλές φορές και στην χρονολόγηση ενός απλού αγγείου, η οποία μπορεί να οδηγήσει σε αναθεώρηση ολόκληρης της χρονολογήσεως αρχαιολογικών στρωμάτων, αλλά οι ψευδοαρχαιολόγοι έλκονται από το μεγάλο και το μυστηριώδες, αυτό που είναι εύκολα ορατό δια γυμνού οφθαλμού. Κύριος σκοπός τους είναι να «επιβεβαιώσουν, αντί να θέσουν υπό [επιστημονική] δοκιμασία, μία υπόθεση (εργασίας). Δεν επιδιώκουν να λάβουν υπόψιν τους όλα τα διαθέσιμα δεδομένα αλλά μάλλον να ψάξουν για τεκμήρια που υποστηρίζουν τις αρχικές τους υποθέσεις».²⁹

Ήδη από την Αρχαιότητα, οι λαοί προσπαθούσαν να αποδείξουν ποιος ήταν ο πρώτος πολιτισμός που αναπτύχθηκε στον κόσμο. Στην δοκιμασία μάλιστα που χρησιμοποιήθηκε από τους Αρχαίους Αιγυπτίους τον Ζ' αιώνα π.Χ. κατ' εντολήν του Ψαμμήτιχου Α' (664-610 π.Χ.) απεδείχθη ότι ο αρχαιότερος λαός ήταν οι Φρύγες, όπως εξηγεί ο Ηρόδοτος.³⁰ Η μέθοδος αποδείξεως δεν ήταν φυσικά καθόλου επιστημονική αλλά μπορεί να θεωρηθεί ως η πρώτη καταγεγραμμένη στην Ιστορία πράξη

²⁸ Για την ψευδοαρχαιολογία δεξ με λεπτομέρειες Garret G. Fagan, «Diagnosing pseudoarchaeology,» in *Archaeological Fantasies*, ed. Garret G. Fagan (New York: Routledge, 2006), pp. 23-46 αλλά και όλα τα κεφάλαια στο ίδιο βιβλίο.

²⁹ Mary Lefkowitz, «Archaeology and the politics of origins. The Search for pyramids in Greece,» in *Archaeological Fantasies*, ed. Garret G. Fagan (New York: Routledge, 2006), p. 180.

³⁰ Ηρόδ., II.2.

ψευδοαρχαιολογίας. Η αντίληψη ότι ένα σύνθετο αρχαιολογικό και ιστορικό ερώτημα μπορούσε να απαντηθεί με ένα απλό και απλοϊκό πείραμα, το οποίο μάλιστα δεν επανελήφθη για να επιβεβαιωθεί το αποτέλεσμα του, υπήρξε η βασική αρχή της ψευδοαρχαιολογίας. Η άκριτη καταγραφή αυτού του πειράματος αλλά και άλλων πληροφοριών τις οποίες άντλησε ο Ηρόδοτος στην Αίγυπτο και αποδέχθηκε ως αληθινές μόνο και μόνο διότι τις έμαθε από τον αρχαιότερο των Ελλήνων λαό, τους Αιγύπτιους, είναι πράξη ψευδοϊστορίας. Ο Ηρόδοτος σε πολλά σημεία της καταγραφής των *Ιστοριών* του ενεργεί ως λαογράφος και όχι ως ιστορικός. Άλλωστε, η αρχαιολογία αναπτύχθηκε ως επιστήμη κυρίως στον 20ο μ.Χ. αιώνα ακριβώς για να αποφευχθούν και να αποκλειστούν ψευδοεπιστημονικά συμπεράσματα.

Στο ίδιο κλίμα κινήθηκε κατά τον 20ο μ.Χ. αιώνα και η θεωρία της μαύρης Αθηνάς, δηλαδή ότι οι αρχαιολόγοι και οι ιστορικοί από «ρατσιστική προκατάληψη και πολιτισμική αλαζονεία» στις μελέτες τους τον 19ο και 20ο μ.Χ. αιώνα παρέβλεψαν την μεγάλη επιρροή της Αιγύπτου και της Αρχαίας Εγγύς Ανατολής στον ελληνικό πολιτισμό διότι δεν ήθελαν να αποδεχθούν ότι αυτός υπήρξε αποτέλεσμα των δικών τους επιτευγμάτων και κατά συνέπειαν οι μελαψοί ή οι μαύροι ήταν ουσιαστικά οι ιδρυτές του αρχαιοελληνικού πολιτισμού. Ιδίως στις Η.Π.Α. αλλά και στον γαλλόφωνο κόσμο, η αντίληψη της «κλεμμένης παράδοσης», δηλαδή ότι η λευκή φυλή έκλεψε από τις άλλες φυλές και ιδίως την μαύρη φυλή την πρωτοπορία στον πολιτισμό (ειδικά την ελληνική φιλοσοφία), είναι βαθιά ριζωμένη σε μεγάλο μέρος του πληθυσμού αλλά και ανάμεσα σε ορισμένους ακαδημαϊκούς κύκλους αρχαιολόγων, ιστορικών, επιστημόνων των κλασσικών σπουδών. Στις πρώτες δεκαετίες του 21ου μ.Χ. αιώνα, η διαμάχη αυτή έγινε στις Η.Π.Α. πολιτική σύγκρουση Αφροαμερικανών και λατινογενών Αμερικανών (ανθρώπων με λατινοαμερικανικές ρίζες, *latinos*) με τους λευκούς. Ο πρώτος υποστηρικτής της θεωρίας αυτής, Martin Bernal (1937-2013, Βρετανός ειδικός στην σύγχρονη κινεζική πολιτική Ιστορία, καθηγητής Government and Near Eastern Studies στο Cornell University, Η.Π.Α.), υπήρξε απλά επιλεκτικός στις πηγές του και μονομερής στις θέσεις του, μην αφήνοντας κανένα περιθώριο επιστημονικής αμφιβολίας ως προς τις απόψεις του. Η θεωρία αυτή αντικρούστηκε και απορρίφθηκε απολύτως πειστικά από πληθώρα αρχαιολόγων και ιστορικών³¹ αλλά δεν παύει να είναι ένα σύγχρονο παράδειγμα ψευδοαρχαιολογίας και ψευδοϊστορίας.

Ένα από τα επιχειρήματα του Bernal για την καταλυτική επίδραση του αιγυπτιακού πολιτισμού στην δημιουργία του ελληνικού πολιτισμού ήταν οι πυραμίδες (πυραμιδοειδείς κατασκευές) που έχουν παρατηρηθεί στον ελλαδικό χώρο. Το πρώτο έναυσμα δόθηκε στις αρχές της δεκαετίας του 1970 όταν ο τότε έφορος αρχαιοτήτων Θεόδωρος Σπυρόπουλος ανέσκαψε στην Θήβα τον λόφο του Αμφείου και αποκάλυψε, κατά την εκτίμησή του, τον τύμβο και τον τάφο του Ζήθου και του Αμφίονος, μυθικών ιδρυτών των Θηβών,³² όπως περιγράφεται από τον Πausανία.³³ Θεώρησε ότι το σχήμα του λόφου «αποβαίνει σχήμα β α θ μ η δ ω τ ή ς π υ ρ α μ ί δ ο ς», αντίγραφο των αιγυπτιακών μνημείων, και ότι τα αρχαιότερα ευρήματα τα οποία χρονολόγησαν με επιφύλαξη τον τύμβο από οπτόπλινθους και την επιχωμάτωσή του «περιλαμβάνουν πλήθος οστράκων [αγγείων] και ευάριθμα σκεύη των ΠΕ II χρόνων»,³⁴ δηλαδή περ. 2650-2150 π.Χ. Το «μνημείον τύπου μασταμπά»³⁵ (βαθμιδωτή πυραμίδα) κα-

³¹ Περισσότερα δεξ στο Δημήτρης Ι. Λοΐζος, *Η Αρχαία Ελλάδα και οι Ανατολικοί Λαοί*, 3η έκδ., σ. 137, υποσ. 228 αλλά και στο Lefkowitz, «Archaeology and the politics of origins,» pp. 182-186.

³² Για τον μύθο δεξ Απολλόδωρος, III.5.5 και Ευστάθιος Θεσσαλονικεύς, *Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*, 1682 (432) (Οδύσσεια, Ραψωδία Λ, Vers. 259-264).

³³ Πausανίας, IX.17.4 & 7.

³⁴ Θ. Σπυρόπουλος, «Αιγυπτιακός εποικισμός εν Βοιωτία,» *Αρχαιολογικά Ανάλεκτα εξ Αθηνών* 5 (1972): 20.

³⁵ *Τδιο*, σ. 21.

τασκευάστηκε, συνεχίζει ο Σπυρόπουλος, με τεχνητή λάξευση του φυσικού λόφου εκτός από τον υψηλότερο κώνο του και όχι με εξ αρχής κατασκευή, όπως στις όμοιες αιγυπτιακές πυραμίδες. Οικοδόμους του μνημείου αλλά και της αποξηράνσεως της λίμνης Κωπαΐδας θεωρούσε τους Μινύες, οι οποίοι είτε είχαν φθάσει στον ελλαδικό χώρο ως ολόκληρος λαός από τον βορειοδυτική Αφρική είτε τα έργα είχαν κατασκευασθεί από «ικανόν αριθμόν ανθρώπων εκ της χώρας αυτής [Αίγυπτος]». ³⁶ Συνεπέρανε, λοιπόν, ότι επρόκειτο «περί ολοκλήρου εποικισμού ή μετακινήσεως ομάδας ή ομάδων ανθρώπων εξ Αιγύπτου προς την Ελλάδα» ³⁷ και παρέθεσε ως αποδεικτικά στοιχεία αναφορές σε λατρεία αιγυπτιακών θεών στην Θήβα, την υπαιτισσόμενη στην μυθολογική παράδοση αιγυπτιακή καταγωγή του Κάδμου, και χρονολογική αναθεώρηση μυκηναϊκών ευρημάτων. Σε νεώτερη έρευνα του, ³⁸ ο Σπυρόπουλος ανακάλυψε φρέατα και σήραγγες ³⁹ εντός του λόφου, απέρριψε την υπόθεση μυκηναϊκού νεκροταφείου εντός του λόφου και χαρακτήρισε «το Αμφείον ως μνημείον αιγυπτιακόν [με την έννοια] της μορφολογίας [και] της κατασκευής του» ενώ διασαφήνισε ότι η πρώτη φάση χρήσεως του λόφου του Αμφείου ανάγεται στην ΠΕ Ι περίοδο, δηλαδή περ. 3100-2650 π.Χ. Διαφώνησε μάλιστα με παλαιά έρευνα του Αντ. Κεραμόπουλου ⁴⁰ που υπέθεσε βασιζόμενος σε μαρτυρίες περιηγητών από τον 17ο μ.Χ. μέχρι και τον 19ο μ.Χ. αιώνα ότι οι σήραγγες ήταν για την εξόρυξη σηπίου ⁴¹ (σηπιόλιθου, seriolite ⁴²) και επέμεινε ότι όλα αυτά «ενθυμίζουν αμέσως τους αιγυπτιακούς τάφους». ⁴³ Ο Σπυρόπουλος διατύπωσε, αρχικά με αρκετή επιφύλαξη, τις ανωτέρω υποθέσεις βασιζόμενος στην ανασκαφή στον ονομαζόμενο λόφο του Αμφείου και χρονολόγησε τον λόφο περί το 2300 π.Χ. βασιζόμενος στην κεραμική που βρήκε στην επίχωσή του. Την εποχή εκείνη δεν υπήρχε η πληθώρα των ευρημάτων που αφενός δείχνουν τις επαφές των λαών της Ανατολικής Μεσογείου με την Κύπρο, την Κρήτη, και τον ηπειρωτικό χώρο και αφετέρου αποκλείουν μία μαζική είσοδο λαού ή και πολυάριθμης ομάδας ατόμων από την Αίγυπτο και/ή την Αρχαία Εγγύς Ανατολή προς την Νοτιοανατολική Ευρώπη, εξαιρουμένων βέβαια όσων είναι γνωστών στην Κύπρο. Σε τελική ανάλυση, η θεωρία του Σπυρόπουλου για τον τύμβο στο Αμφείο είναι ένα παράδειγμα ελλιπούς αρχαιολογίας. Δεν έχει γίνει αποδεκτή από τους περισσότερους Έλληνες και ξένους αρχαιολόγους περισσότερο διότι υπάρχουν άλλες πειστικές εξηγήσεις για τον πυραμιδωτό τύμβο στην Θήβα. Ο λόφος έχει υποστεί μέσα στους αιώνες, όπως περιγράφει και ο Σπυρόπουλος και ο Κεραμόπουλος, διάφορες μεταβολές (μεταφορές χωμάτων από το εξωτερικό και το εσωτερικό του τμήμα, αποκοπές στους πρόποδες του λόγω οδικών έργων, άλλες ταφές στο εξωτερικό του τμήμα) που έχουν μετατρέψει το σχήμα του σε πιο πυραμιδωτό από ό,τι ήταν στην Αρχαιότητα. Ακόμη και εάν δεχθούμε ότι το σχήμα του λόφου θυμίζει στερεομετρικά βαθμιδωτή πυραμίδα (μασταμπά), το μέγεθός του είναι τόσο μικρό που δεν συγκρίνεται με καμία αιγυπτιακή πυραμίδα ενώ η ταφή που βρέθηκε στην κορυφή του και οι στοές και τα σκαμμένα πηγάδια στο εσωτερικό του δεν θυμίζουν σε τίποτα τις ταφές μέσα ή κάτω από τις πυραμίδες στην Αίγυπτο. ⁴⁴ Τέλος, ο Σπυρόπουλος ισχυρίζεται μεν ότι είχε κο-

³⁶ *Ιδιο*, σ. 24.

³⁷ *Ιδιο*, σ. 25.

³⁸ Θεόδωρος Σπυρόπουλος, «Αμφείον», *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον*, Χρονικά Β1, 28 (1973): 248-252.

³⁹ «σύριγγας», στην ορολογία του ανασκαφέα.

⁴⁰ Αντώνιος Δ. Κεραμόπουλος, «Θηβαϊκά», *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον* 3 (1917): 384 & 388 & 101 υποσ. 1.

⁴¹ Λεξικό Δημητράκος, λμ. «σήπιον», αρ. 2.

⁴² *Wikipedia* λμ. «Serpilite» at <<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Serpilite>>.

⁴³ Σπυρόπουλος, «Αμφείον», σ. 252.

⁴⁴ Lawrence A. Tritle, «Black Athena: Vision or Dream of Greek Origin?» in *Black Athena Revisited*, eds Mary A. Lefkowitz and Guy MacLean Rogers (Chapel Hill: The Univ. of North Carolina

πεί ο βράχος κάτω από την ταφή που ανέσκαψε στην κορυφή του σε σχήμα βαθμιδωτής πυραμίδας αλλά δεν αποδεικνύει (εάν είναι αδύνατον να αποδειχθεί) ότι αυτό συνέβη στην Αρχαιότητα. Με τις αναφορές των περιηγητών για εξορύξεις στην περιοχή δεν μπορεί να αποκλειστεί και η διενέργεια πρόσφατων χρονολογικά τεχνικών έργων και σε αυτόν τον λόφο. Επίσης, την περίοδο στην οποία αναφέρεται ο Σπυρόπουλος, δεν υφίστατο κανένας λόγος εισβολής ή ερχομού κάποιου σημαντικού αριθμού Αιγυπτίων στον ελλαδικό χώρο ούτε υπάρχει κάποια γραπτή μαρτυρία για αυτό. Τα νησιά και η ηπειρωτική χώρα στο άκρο της νοτιοανατολικής Ευρώπης δεν διέθεταν γνωστούς την περίοδο εκείνη σημαντικούς φυσικούς πόρους. Όμως, είναι γνωστό και αποδεδειγμένο το συνεχές εμπόριο από και προς τις δύο περιοχές της ανατολικής Μεσογείου Θαλάσσης, μέσω του οποίου πραγματοποιήθηκαν οι επαφές των διαφορετικών πολιτισμών της περιοχής. Ακόμη και εάν δεχθούμε ότι υπήρξαν αιγυπτιακές επιρροές στην κατασκευή ορισμένων μυκηναϊκών κτισμάτων σε Μυκήνες και Τίρυνθα (πολύ νεώτερον της χρονολογήσεως του τύμβου του Αμφείου στην Θήβα), όπως οι θολωτοί τάφοι, «υπάρχει αξιοσημείωτη διαφορά αρχιτεκτονικού ρυθμού και μεγέθους, η οποία μπορεί να δικαιολογήσει τις διαφορές στις θρησκευτικές δοξασίες ανάμεσα στους δύο πολιτισμούς».⁴⁵

Εκτός όμως από την υποτιθέμενη αιγυπτιακή πυραμίδα των Θηβών υπάρχουν στον ελλαδικό χώρο και πραγματικές μικρογραφίες πυραμίδων, όπως φαίνονται εξωτερικά, και μάλιστα αυτές είχαν παρατηρηθεί και από τον Πανσανία τον 2ο μ.Χ. αιώνα όταν περιηγήθηκε την Αργολίδα. Όταν ρώτησε του είπαν ότι επρόκειτο για «πολυάνδρια», δηλαδή ομαδικούς τάφων ανδρών που είχαν πέσει σε μάχες. Από χρονολογικής απόψεως, οι μελετητές νομίζουν ότι αυτή η αναφορά πρέπει να σχετίζεται με μάχες που διεξήχθησαν είτε τον ΙΔ' αιώνα π.Χ. είτε τον Ζ' αιώνα π.Χ.⁴⁶ Η τοπογραφική αναζήτηση των πυραμίδων που αναφέρει ο Πανσανίας έχει αποβεί άκαρπη αλλά υπάρχουν δύο πυραμίδες που υφίστανται στην Αργολίδα, η μία κοντά στο χωριό Ελληνικό, και η άλλη στο Λυγουριό, αλλά και μια ορθογώνια λιθοδομή κοντά στο Φίχτιο, οι οποίες όμως δεν έχουν ομοιότητες με αυτές στην Αίγυπτο. Κατ' αρχάς, πέρα από την κατασκευή τους στο στερεομετρικό σχήμα της πυραμίδας δεν θα μπορούσαν να χρησιμοποιηθούν ως τάφοι. Επιπλέον, η αρχαιότερη κεραμική που βρέθηκε εντός των κτισμάτων χρονολογήθηκε στον Ε' αιώνα π.Χ. ενώ δεν βρέθηκε καμία ένδειξη ταφής.⁴⁷

Στο ζήτημα των ελληνικών πυραμίδων εμπλέκονται αρχαιολόγοι, επιστήμονες των φυσικών επιστημών, ψευδοαρχαιολόγοι και ελληνοκεντριστές. Όπως οι αφοκεντριστές, επιθυμούν να αποδείξουν ότι ο ευρωπαϊκός πολιτισμός προήλθε από την Αίγυπτο, από την Αφρική, έτσι και οι ελληνοκεντριστές επιδιώκουν να αποδείξουν ότι ο πρώτος γενικά πολιτισμός⁴⁸ παγκοσμίως ήταν ο ελληνικός, αυτόν που αντέγραψαν όλοι οι άλλοι στην Αίγυπτο και στην Μεσοποταμία. Με αυτήν την εθνικιστική σημαία υφαίνουν και σενάρια συνωμοσίας που δημοσιεύονται στον τύπο, έντυπο και ηλεκτρονικό, ότι δήθεν η επίσημη πολιτεία αποφεύγει ή εμποδίζει την τουριστική προβολή των πυραμίδων για να μην έρθει σε διπλωματική σύγκρουση με την Αίγυπτο αλλά και να μην αναδείξει την ελληνική πρωτιά ακόμη και στην οικοδόμηση πυραμίδων.⁴⁹

Press, 1996), pp. 321-323.

⁴⁵ Lefkowitz, «Archaeology and the politics of origins,» p. 186.

⁴⁶ Πανσανίας, II.25.7 & 24.7 και Lefkowitz, «Archaeology and the politics of origins,» p. 187.


⁴⁷ Lefkowitz, «Archaeology and the politics of origins,» pp. 187-194.

⁴⁸ Δες τον αρχαιολογικό και ιστορικό ορισμό του πολιτισμού σε Δημήτρης Ι. Λοΐζος, *Η Αρχαία Ελλάδα και οι Ανατολικοί Λαοί*, 3η έκδ., σ. 35. Φυσικά, οι πρώτοι που ανέπτυξαν φιλοσοφία υπήρξαν οι Έλληνες.

⁴⁹ Δες π.χ. στις *Αργολικές Ειδήσεις* (2012) στην <https://www.argolikeseidhseis.gr/2012/02/blog-post_5408.html> αλλά και συνέντευξη του Θ. Σπυ-

Είκοσι τέσσερις κατασκευές που είτε έχουν το σχήμα ή μοιάζουν με σχήμα πυραμίδας ή είναι ορθογώνιες (οχυρωματικοί πύργοι;) αλλά μοιάζουν στο τρόπο οικοδομήσεως με τις προηγούμενες έχουν βρεθεί και ανασκαφεί κυρίως στην Πελοπόννησο αλλά και σε άλλα σημεία στην ηπειρωτική Ελλάδα και στα νησιά ενώ έχουν ανασκαφεί και τέσσερις παρόμοιες κατασκευές στην χερσόνησο της Κριμαίας, στον βόρειο Εύξεινο Πόντο.⁵⁰ Η πιο καλά διατηρημένη είναι η ονομαζόμενη πυραμίδα του Ελληνικού (αναφέρεται από διάφορους συγγραφείς ως πυραμίδα Elliniko ή Cephalaria ή Kenchrai), κοντά και ανάμεσα στα χωριά Ελληνικό και Κεφαλάρι της Αργολίδας, περί τα 8 χλμ. νοτιοδυτικά του Άργους. Ο πρώτος που την κατέγραψε με κάποιες λεπτομέρειες ήταν ο περιηγητής William Leake στις 13 Μαρτίου 1806, ο οποίος την παρατήρησε κοντά στο χωριό Κεφαλάρι και θεώρησε ότι περιείχε κάποιο μνήμα. Μέτρησε το μήκος της βάσεως στην βόρεια της πλευρά 11,79 μ. και στην άλλη (ανατολική) μαζί με την είσοδο και το τοίχωμα (ογκόλιθους) της πλευράς της σε 14,86 μ. (μήκος πλευράς = 10,85 μ. + πλάτος εισόδου = 1,18 μ. + τοίχωμα = 2,83 μ.). Ακριβείς μετρήσεις των διαστάσεων του κτίσματος και των χώρων του πραγματοποιήθηκαν στις αρχές του 20ου αιώνα από την Αμερικανική αρχαιολογική αποστολή (δες παρακάτω). Στην ανατολική της πλευρά (νοτιοανατολική γωνία) είχε δημιουργηθεί κατασκευαστικά μία εσοχή βάθους περ. 2 μ., όπου υφίσταται ακόμη και σήμερα η είσοδος (περιοχή Α στο σχέδιο του Leake) της πυραμίδας (ή οχυρωματικού πύργου). Με άλλα λόγια, το κτίσμα δεν έχει σχήμα κανονικής πυραμίδας διότι στην νοτιοανατολική του γωνία η νότια πλευρά (9,81 μ.) της βάσεως της πυραμίδας είναι μικρότερη και έτσι δημιουργείται μία εσοχή ορθογωνίου σχήματος με μήκος περ. 4 μ. (τοίχωμα και είσοδος) επί 2 μ. βάθος προς το άνοιγμα της εισόδου, η οποία περιλαμβάνει την είσοδο της πυραμίδας (ή του πύργου).⁵¹

(Plan by Leake, 2:339, σε πόδια και ίντσες)



Ο Leake θεώρησε ότι η πυραμίδα περιέκλειε κάποιον τάφο και μάλιστα αργότερα αμφισβήτησε⁵² την άποψη ότι επρόκειτο για φρυκτώριο⁵³ ή οχυρωματικό πύργο/παρατηρητήριο.⁵⁴ Η πυραμίδα συνέχισε να αναφέρεται στις αρχαιολογικές εκδόσεις που σχετίζονταν με την Αργολίδα, άλλοτε ως υπερκατασκευή κάποιου μνήματος και άλλοτε ως πύργος. Ενδεικτικά, ο αρχαιολόγος Λουδοβίκος Ρος (1806-1859) την περιέγραψε λεπτομερώς σε έκδοση του 1841⁵⁵ και μάλιστα διαπίστωσε (όπως και ο Leake) ότι εσωτερικά ήταν

ρόπουλου (2015) στην <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?app=desktop&v=uHBG1es3hQc>> και «Κι όμως! Η αρχαιότερη πυραμίδα του κόσμου βρίσκεται στην Αργολίδα!» στο *Korinthia.net.gr* (2022) στην <<https://www.korinthia.net.gr/2022/03/22/65624/>>.

⁵⁰ Δες συνοπτικά David J Windell, «The So-Called Pyramids of the Peloponnese. A Compilation and Reconsideration of the Evidence, 2019,» at <https://www.academia.edu/40044206/The_So_Called_Pyramids_of_the_Peloponnese_A_Compilation_and_Reconsideration_of_the_Evidence_by> και μετάφραση του με συμπληρωματικά στοιχεία από την Αναστασία Αναγνωστοπούλου στην <https://www.academia.edu/40044143/Οι_Αποκαλούμενες_Πυραμίδες_της_Πελοποννήσου_Μια_συλλογή_και_αναθεώρηση_των_στοιχείων_Των_D_J_Windell_και_R_Webb_2019_Μετάφραση_Αναστασία_Αναγνωστοπούλου>.

⁵¹ William Martin Leake, *Travels in the Morea*, 3 vols (London: Murray, 1830), 2:338-339 & plan on p. 339. Οι μετατροπές από πόδια και ίντσες σε μέτρα και εκατοστά έγιναν με το λογισμικό μετατροπών μονάδων *Convert* (by Joshua F. Madison at <<https://joshmadison.com/convert-for-windows/>>).

⁵² William Martin Leake, *Peloponnesiaca. Supplement to Travels in the Morea* (London: Rodwell, 1846), pp. 251-252.

αρχικά χωρισμένη σε δύο τμήματα και η οροφή της ήταν επίπεδη και λίθινη. Ακολουθώντας τον Πausανία⁵⁶ θεώρησε ότι ήταν πολυάνδριο (στα αρχαία ελληνικά, πολυανδρείον), πιθανώς αναγειρμένο στην μνήμη των πεσόντων στην μάχη των Υσιών μεταξύ Αργείων και Λακεδαιμονίων περί το 669 π.Χ. Επίσης, ήταν ο πρώτος που θεώρησε ότι η παρουσία των πυραμιδοειδών κατασκευών στην Αργολίδα υποδήλωνε κάποια πρόωμη επαφή (δηλαδή του Ζ' αιώνα π.Χ.⁵⁷) με την Αίγυπτο που δεν έπρεπε να αγνοηθεί.⁵⁸ Αργότερα, στην αρχαιολογική έκδοση του 1897 για την μυκηναϊκή εποχή, οι Τσουντας και Manatt δεν αποδέχθηκαν την ερμηνεία του πολυανδρίου αλλά αναγνώρισαν την πυραμίδα (αναφέρεται ως Pyramid of Kenchreae) ως πύργο/παρατηρητήριο και την χρονολόγησαν μαζί με άλλες παρόμοιες κατασκευές στην περιοχή της Αργολίδας λίγο πριν τον ΣΤ' αιώνα π.Χ.⁵⁹ Το 1896 και το 1901, ο Γερμανός αρχαιολόγος Theodor Wiegand (ήδη μέλος της ανασκαφικής ομάδας της Ακροπόλεως στην Αθήνα και μετέπειτα ανασκαφέας της Πριήνης, της Μιλήτου και της Σάμου) ανέσκαψε και εξέτασε προσεκτικά το κτίσμα και κατέληξε στο συμπέρασμα ότι απέναντι από την εσωτερική του είσοδο (εκεί όπου κατέληγε ο διάδρομος από την εξωτερική του είσοδο) υπήρχαν θεμέλια κλειστών χώρων ενώ στην παρατήρηση του Ρος ότι υπήρχε επίπεδη στέγη πρόσθεσε ότι υπήρχε όροφος και μάλιστα υψωνόταν σε ορθογώνιο σχήμα επάνω από το ισόγειο με τους επικλινείς σαν πυραμίδα τοίχους. Δηλαδή, δεν επρόκειτο για ταφικό μνημείο αλλά για πύργο του Α' αιώνα π.Χ. ή αρχαιότερο αλλά όχι της Αρχαϊκής Εποχής.⁶⁰ Όσοι υποστήριζαν την χρήση του πύργου, θεωρούσαν ότι μάλλον χρησιμοποιούνταν για την στρατιωτική επιτήρηση της περιοχής της Αργολίδας.

Η πλήρης ανασκαφή της πυραμίδας στο Ελληνικό αλλά και δύο άλλων παρομοίων κατασκευών στην Αργολίδα πραγματοποιήθηκε τον Δεκέμβριο του 1936 και το καλοκαίρι του 1937 υπό την αιγίδα της Αμερικανικής Σχολής Κλασικών Σπουδών στην Αθήνα (American School of Classical Studies at Athens). Οι δύο πλευρές της βάσεως της πυραμίδας/πύργου που δεν διακόπτονται από την είσοδό της (βόρεια και δυτική) έχουν μήκος 14,70 μ. και 12,58 μ. ενώ οι άλλες δύο που καταλήγουν στην εσοχή της εξωτερικής της εισόδου 8,62 μ. και 8,61 μ. Το πλάτος της εξωτερικής εισόδου και του διαδρόμου της μετρήθηκε 1,35 μ. ενώ το άνοιγμα στην κατάληξη του διαδρόμου προς το εσωτερικό της πυραμίδας 0,80 μ. Το δάπεδο στο εσωτερικό της πυραμίδας, τετράγωνο πλευράς 7,10 μ., ήταν στρωμένο με μικρούς λίθους και πατημένο χώμα. Από αρχιτεκτονικής απόψεως και γενικά στατικότητας του κτίσματος με την χρήση των συγκεκριμένων ογκολίθων με τους οποίους έχει κατασκευασθεί, η πυ-

⁵³ Η λέξη προέρχεται από το φρυκτός = δαυλός φλεγόμενος (Λεξικό Δημητράκος, λμ. «φρυκτός», αρ. 2). Η μετάδοση μηνυμάτων σε μεγάλες αποστάσεις κατά την νύκτα γινόταν με φρυκτωρίες (Λεξικό Δημητράκος, λμ. «φρυκτωρία» και Λεξικόν Σούδα, λμ. «φρυκτωρία»), δηλαδή με αναμμένους δαυλούς. Το φρυκτώριο ήταν πύργος για την λήψη και μετάδοση τέτοιων μηνυμάτων ή και φάρος για τα πλοία (Λεξικό Δημητράκος, λμ. «φρυκτώριον»).

⁵⁴ C. R. Cockerell and W. Kinnard and T. L. Donaldson and W. Jenkins and W. Railton, *Antiquities of Athens and other places in Greece, Sicily etc. Supplement to the Antiquities of Athens by James Stuart and Nicholas Revett* (London: Priestley & Weale, 1830), p. 23 & Plate II (Tower Near Argos).

⁵⁵ Ludwig Ross, *Reisen und Reiserouten durch Griechenland* (Berlin: Reimer, 1841), pp. 142-145 & κάτοψη χωρίς μετρήσεις.

⁵⁶ Πausανίας, II.24.7.

⁵⁷ Δες κατοπινές επαφές Ελλήνων με Αιγυπτίους φαραώ διάσπαρτα στο Δημήτρης Ι. Λοΐζος, *Η Αρχαία Ευρώπη, οι Ρωμαίοι και οι Έλληνες. II. Η Ελληνιστική Εποχή* (υπό έκδοση).

⁵⁸ «Das häufige Vorkommen von Pyramiden in Argolis' gewährt einen nicht zu verachtenden frühen Zusammenhang mit Ägypten», Ross, *Reisen und Reiserouten durch Griechenland*, p. 145.

⁵⁹ Chrestos Tsountas and J. Irving Manatt, *The Mycenaean Age* (London: Macmillan, 1897), p. 38 & n. 1 & fig. 10.

⁶⁰ Theodor Wiegand, «Die «Pyramide» von Kenchreai,» *Mittheilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts. Athenische Abteilung* 26 (1901) : 241-246 & Figure 1-3.

ραμίδα στο Ελληνικό δεν μπορεί παρά να είχε πάντα το σχήμα κόλουρου πυραμίδας, δηλαδή με πεπλατυσμένη οροφή. Υποδοχές για δοκούς στον βορινό τοίχο υποδεικνύουν την παρουσία στέγης ή δαπέδου ορόφου αλλά η προστασία των στρατιωτών στον επάνω όροφο απαιτούσε την ανύψωση κάθετου πλίνθινου τοίχου. Ο χαρακτήρας τέτοιας λιθοδομής με πολυγωνικούς λίθους ανήκει στον Δ' αιώνα π.Χ.⁶¹ Η ανασκαφή στο δάπεδο της πυραμίδας έφθασε σε βάθος σε πολλά σημεία μέχρι το στερεό (τον φυσικό βράχο), όπου σε ορισμένες κοιλότητες βρέθηκαν μερικά όστρακα αγγείων της ύστερης Πρώιμης Ελλαδικής Εποχής (περ. 2200-2000 π.Χ.).⁶² Η μελέτη του κτίσματος δείχνει τελικά ότι δεν ήταν οπωσδήποτε τάφος, πολυάνδριο ή τέτοιου είδους μνημείο αλλά ούτε και φρούριο διότι δεν έχει πολεμίστρες ούτε είναι εύκολο στρατιώτες να αμυνθούν μέσα από αυτό. Η ανασκαφή έδειξε ότι δεν υπάρχει καμία σύνδεση του κτίσματος με την Αίγυπτο παρά τις μυθολογικές αναφορές για την δυναστεία του Αργού και παρά τα διάφορα μικρά πυραμιδοειδή ευρήματα σε διάφορες ανασκαφές στην Ελλάδα. Επίσης, δεν έχει σχέση με παρόμοια σχήματα που αναπαριστούν θεούς (;), τα οποία κατά μία άποψη δεν είναι παρά η αναπαράσταση του βουνού όπου μένουν οι θεοί. Η κατασκευή της πυραμίδας στο Ελληνικό πρέπει να συνδεθεί από οικοδομικής απόψεως με άλλα παρόμοια κτίσματα στην Αργολίδα, τα οποία είναι τετράγωνα ή ορθογώνια ή κυκλικά και προφανώς είχαν την ίδια στρατιωτική χρήση. Όλα τα κτίσματα βρίσκονται σε αρχαίες οδούς αλλά όχι σε σημεία από τα οποία θα ήταν δυνατόν να ελέγχεται οπτικά η ευρύτερη περιοχή προς όλες τις κατευθύνσεις. Αντιθέτως, ήταν δυνατόν να ελέγχεται η διέλευση από τις συγκεκριμένες αρχαίες οδούς. Επίσης, σε ορισμένα από αυτά αλλά και μέσα στην πυραμίδα στο Ελληνικό βρέθηκαν τμήματα από μύλοπετρα, γεγονός που οδηγεί στο συμπέρασμα ότι γινόταν τοπική άλεση δημητριακών. Μάλιστα σε κάποια από αυτά τα οικοδομήματα υπήρχε και πρόβλεψη για παροχή νερού. Συμπεραίνεται, λοιπόν, ότι επρόκειτο για στρατιωτικούς πύργους ελέγχου διελύσεως των αρχαίων οδών, στους οποίους διέμενε μικρή φρουρά. Συγκεκριμένα, είναι πιθανόν να αποτελούσαν «καταλύματα για στρατιωτικά αποσπάσματα τα οποία περιπολούσαν στην περιοχή και ίσως εισέπρατταν διόδια από τους διερχόμενους την οδό την οποίαν ήλεγχαν».⁶³ Επίσης, ορισμένα από αυτά αποτελούσαν φρούρια που ανάγονται στην Μυκηναϊκή Εποχή και αποτελούσαν τμήμα του ήδη γνωστού δικτύου φρουρίων των Μυκηναίων, τα οποία όμως αξιοποιήθηκαν και σε κατοπινές εποχές όπως δείχνουν οι ανασκαφές σε αυτά. Η οικοδομική τεχνική της πυραμίδας στο Ελληνικό την κατέτασσε, σύμφωνα με τους Αμερικανούς ανασκαφείς, στα κτίσματα του Δ' αιώνα π.Χ., όπως και άλλα στην Αργολίδα με βάση την κεραμική που είχε βρεθεί σε εκείνα και την λιθοδομή τους.⁶⁴

Σαράντα πέντε χρόνια μετά την τελευταία ανασκαφή εντός της πυραμίδας στο Ελληνικό, δύο Αμερικανοί αρχαιολόγοι πραγματοποίησαν επιφανειακή έρευνα και στην περιοχή των δύο πυραμίδων της Αργολίδας. Γύρω από αυτήν του Ελληνικού βρήκαν πολλά μικρά όστρακα αγγείων του Δ' αιώνα π.Χ. (350-300 π.Χ.), μέσα σε λάκκο κεραμίδια οροφής κτηρίου, θραύσματα λιθοδομής, θραύσματα χονδροειδούς κεραμικής, και λίγο πιο πέρα από την πυραμίδα ίχνη θεμελίων τοίχου. Στα συμπεράσματα της επιτόπιας έρευνας απορρίφθηκαν οι θεωρίες για ταφικά μνημεία και πύργους/παρατηρητήρια διότι θεωρήθηκε ότι οι πυραμίδες δεν είχαν απέραντη θέα προς όλες τις πλευρές του ορίζοντα. Αντιθέτως, συζητήθηκε η πιθανότητα πύργου μιας αγροικίας κυρίως εξαιτίας των ιχνών υπάρξεων παροχής νερού. Όμως, αυτό ακριβώς το στοιχείο δεν απέκλειε και στρατιωτική χρήση του κτίσματος. Μάλιστα, η

⁶¹ Louis E. Lord, «The 'Pyramids' of Argolis.» *Hesperia* 7 (1938): 496-510.

⁶² Robert L. Scranton, «The Pottery from the Pyramids,» *Hesperia* 7 (1938): 538

⁶³ Louis E. Lord, «Watchtowers and Fortresses in Argolis,» *American Journal of Archaeology* 43 (January-March 1939): 83.

⁶⁴ *Τδιο*, pp. 78-84.

ανασκαφή πυραμίδας (μία από τέσσερις) με παροχή νερού (ανάμεσα σε άλλα κτίσματα) στην «χώρα» της πόλεως Χερσόνησος στην Κριμαία και με ευρήματα οστράκων αγγείων του Δ'-Γ' αιώνα π.Χ. οδήγησε τον ανασκαφέα της να καταλήξει στο συμπέρασμα ότι επρόκειτο για πύργο αγροικίας που είχε και αγροτική και αμυντική χρήση. Την ίδια χρήση θεωρήθηκε ότι είχαν και οι πυραμίδες στην Αργολίδα, δηλαδή όσων εργάζονταν στους αγρούς της περιοχής και χρειάζονταν καταφύγιο κατά την διάρκεια πολεμικών επιχειρήσεων τον Δ' αιώνα π.Χ., λόγου χάριν από τον Επαμεινώνδα και τον Φίλιππο Β' της Μακεδονίας.⁶⁵ Βέβαια, ο αμέσως περιβάλλον χώρος της πυραμίδας στο Ελληνικό δεν μπορεί να θεωρηθεί ως χαρακτηριστικά αγροτικός, όπως συμβαίνει στις αγροικίες στην Κριμαία, ενώ και η πυραμίδα/πύργος δεν είναι τμήμα κάποιου αγροτικού συγκροτήματος, μιας μεγάλης αγροικίας, όπως έδειξαν οι ανασκαφές, και άρα δεν συνάδει με αγροτική χρήση.

Το ζήτημα της χρήσεως και ιδίως της χρονολογήσεως της πυραμίδας στο Ελληνικό φαινόταν ότι είχε αρχαιολογικά λυθεί μέχρι που δεκατρία χρόνια μετά την τελευταία αρχαιολογική έρευνα έγινε μία νέα προσπάθεια χρονολογήσεως της. Το 1995, ομάδα φυσικών επιστημόνων αλλά όχι αρχαιολόγων δημοσίευσε τα αποτελέσματα πειραματικής χρονολογήσεως λίθου («νέα μέθοδος χρονολογήσεως λαξευμένων μεγαλίθων»⁶⁶ που «πρώτη φορά εφαρμόστηκε στην χρονολόγηση του λίθου»⁶⁷ στην οποία υποβλήθηκε η πυραμίδα και συνεπέρανε ότι κατασκευάστηκε το «2720 (±580, ±1050) π.Χ.», δηλαδή την Γ' χιλιετία π.Χ. με «κατώτατον όριον κατασκευής [...] εις την αρχήν της 2ας χιλιετίας π.Χ.» αλλά και με απόκλιση των μετρήσεων κατά 30 τοις εκατό. Εξ αιτίας των μεγάλων αποκλίσεων, συζητούνται στις δημοσίευσεις σειρά από πιθανά ζητήματα κατά την εφαρμογή της μεθόδου σε λίθους.⁶⁸ Βέβαια, οι ίδιοι επιστήμονες, στην ίδια δημοσίευση αποτελεσμάτων αλλά στην αγγλική γλώσσα κατέληξαν σε ελαφρώς διαφορετικά αποτελέσματα μετρήσεων και διαφορετική μέση ηλικία και αποκλίσεις, δηλαδή «2730±630±720»,⁶⁹ αλλά στο ίδιο συμπέρασμα. Με τις ανακοινώσεις αυτές οι συγγραφείς θεώρησαν ότι ανέτρεψαν την προηγούμενη αρχαιολογική χρονολόγηση στον Δ' αιώνα π.Χ. Για την χρονολόγηση του κτίσματος χρησιμοποιήθηκε η μέθοδος της θερμοφωταύγειας (thermoluminescence ή TL) κατά την οποίαν μετράται ο χρόνος στον οποίο έχει εκτεθεί στο ηλιακό φως λαξευμένη επιφάνεια από την στιγμή της εξορύξεώς της μέχρι την τοποθέτησή της στο κτίσμα. Υπολογίστηκε ότι «οι λαξευθέντες μεγάλιθοι ετοποθετήθησαν μετά την παρέλευση τουλάχιστον 10 ωρών» ή «τουλάχιστον μίας ημέρας, ήτοι εις 15-25 ώρας ηλιοφανείας» από την ώρα της εξορύξεώς τους. Όπως εξηγείται, όμως, στις παρατηρήσεις των μετρήσεων «η ηλικία που λαμβάνεται [από τις μετρήσεις] δια χρόνο μεγαλύτερον των 25 ωρών είναι πολύ υψηλή και κρίνεται ως απαράδεκτος, εκτός εάν ο χρόνος λαξεύσεως και παραμονής εις το ηλιακόν φως μέχρι τοποθέτησεως του μεγαλίθου εις τον τοίχον της κατασκευής ήτο μικρότερος».⁷⁰ Δηλαδή, σύμφωνα με τις μετρήσεις με την μέθοδο

⁶⁵ Helena M. Fracchia, «The Peloponnesian Pyramids Reconsidered,» *American Journal of Archaeology* 89 (October 1985): 683-689.

⁶⁶ Περικλής Θεοχάρης και Ιωάννης Λυριτζής και R. B. Galloway, «Χρονολόγησις δύο ελληνικών πυραμιδοειδών κτισμάτων [Ελληνικό, Λυγουργιό και τείχος Μυκηνών] εκ λαξευμένων μεγαλίθων δια της μεθόδου της θερμοφωταύγειας,» *Πρακτικά Ακαδημίας Αθηνών*, 9η Φεβρουαρίου 1995, σ. 120-121

⁶⁷ Αδαμάντιος Σάμψων, «Οι πυραμίδες της Αργολίδας και η πραγματική σημασία τους,» *Αρχαιολογία και Τέχνες*, τευχ. 57 (Δεκέμβριος 1995): 61.

⁶⁸ Περικλής Θεοχάρης και Γεώργιος Βέης, «Αι πυραμίδες της Αργολίδος, η χρονολόγησις και η σημασία των,» *Πρακτικά Ακαδημίας Αθηνών*, 1η Ιουνίου 1995, σ. 212. Δες και αποτελέσματα μετρήσεων σε Θεοχάρης και Λυριτζής και Galloway, «Χρονολόγησις δύο ελληνικών πυραμιδοειδών κτισμάτων,» σ. 110 & 117-119.

⁶⁹ P. S. Theocaris and I. Liritzis and R. B. Galloway, «Dating of Two Hellenic Pyramids by a Novel Application of Thermoluminescence,» *Journal of Archaeological Science* 24 (1997): 404.

⁷⁰ Θεοχάρης και Λυριτζής και Galloway, σ. 110-111 & 113-114 & 118.

της θερμοφωταύγειας, η πυραμίδα στο Ελληνικό κτίστηκε μέσα σε μία η το πολύ δύο ημέρες από την στιγμή εξορύξεως των λίθων της από το κοντινό λατομείο και εκθέσεως τους στο φως. Επίσης, σύμφωνα με αυτούς τους μη αρχαιολόγους φυσικούς επιστήμονες «τα αποτελέσματα χρονολόγησεως των δύο πυραμιδοειδών κτηρίων της Αργολίδος, ήτοι του Ελληνικού εις την περιοχίν του Άργους και του Λυγουριού, αποτελούν την πρώτη ασφαλή μέτρηση της ηλικίας των κτηρίων». ⁷¹ Η μέση τιμή της ηλικίας της πυραμίδας στο Ελληνικό υπολογίστηκε από επτά δείγματα που ελήφθησαν από διάφορους λίθους του κτίσματος με μικρότερη απόκλιση τα 580 έτη και μεγαλύτερη τα 1050 έτη, δηλαδή ηλικία μεταξύ του 3337 και του 2097 π.Χ., ή στην δημοσίευση στην αγγλική γλώσσα 3670 και 2100 π.Χ. με αποκλίσεις 630 και 720 έτη. ⁷² Μία μέτρηση (6000±3600 π.Χ. ή 8000±2240 στην αγγλική δημοσίευση) θεωρήθηκε από τους επιστήμονες ότι απέδωσε «απαράδεκτως υψηλήν ηλικίαν» και «υψηλόν σφάλμα εις την ηλικίαν». ⁷³ Παρά την διατυπωμένη στην ανακοίνωση βεβαιότητα ότι η πυραμίδα κτίστηκε κατά την Γ' χιλιετία π.Χ. διατυπώνονται και επιφυλάξεις για την αποτελεσματικότητα της μεθόδου και των μετρήσεων ως προς την μεγάλη χρονολογική απόκλιση (σφάλμα) στις μετρήσεις των δειγμάτων. Μάλιστα εάν ληφθεί «εκ του λίθου στρώμα [κόνεως] βάθους μεγαλύτερου από το 0.5mm [...] η προκύπτουσα υψηλή ΘΦ [θερμοφωταύγεια] επηρεάζει κατά πολύ, αυξάνουσα την ηλικίαν του κτηρίου». ⁷⁴ Όντως, η μέθοδος της θερμοφωταύγειας, η οποία εφαρμόζεται από την δεκαετία του 1960 για τον υπολογισμό της ηλικίας κεραμικής που έχει υποστεί όπτηση αλλά αργότερα και για τον υπολογισμό του πότε εκτέθηκαν στο φως για τελευταία φορά ιζηματογενή πετρώματα πολλών χιλιάδων ετών μπορεί να μην είναι ακριβής εάν δεν υπάρξει μεγάλη επιστημονική προσοχή κατά την διαδικασία λήψεως των δειγμάτων και της εκθέσεώς τους σε ακτινοβολία στο εργαστήριο, όπως δείχνει η διεθνής βιβλιογραφία επί του θέματος. ⁷⁵ Παρ' όλα αυτά και με βάση τα αποτελέσματα των παραπάνω μετρήσεων συμπεραίνεται από τους φυσικούς επιστήμονες αλλά όχι αρχαιολόγους ότι, όπως και οι μεγάλες πυραμίδες της Αιγύπτου, οι σύγχρονες τους (σύμφωνα με τους φυσικούς επιστήμονες) της Αργολίδας «δύνатаι να θεωρηθούν ως αντίστοιχα ταφικά μνημεία ηρώων, βασιλέων και λοιπών σημαινόντων προσώπων», και ότι η πυραμίδα στο Ελληνικό «ήτο μάλλον κενοτάφειον, ή αποθετήριο των λειψάνων των πεσόντων», ⁷⁶ παρότι η ανασκαφή από τους Αμερικανούς αρχαιολόγους στο εσωτερικό της μέχρι τον φυσικό βράχο δεν τα αποκάλυψε. Επίσης, υποστηρίζεται ότι το πυραμοειδές οικοδόμημα στο οποίο αναφέρεται ο Πausanias είναι αυτό της πυραμίδας στο Ελληνικό, ⁷⁷ πράγμα όμως που έχει απορριφθεί με επιχειρήματα από τους ξένους αρχαιολόγους και κυρίως αυτό ότι δεν υπάρχουν πουθενά στην επιφάνεια της πυραμίδας στο Ελληνικό σκαλισμένες ασπίδες ⁷⁸ ούτε καν οπές για να στηριχθούν ένθετες ασπίδες. Οι οπές που παρατήρησαν μόνο δύο μη αρχαιολόγοι φυσικοί επιστήμονες βρίσκονται στην συντριπτική τους πλειοψηφία ανάμεσα στα κενά μεταξύ των λίθων με μόνο πέντε να φαίνονται επάνω στους λίθους ενώ το κυκλικό τμήμα λίθου

⁷¹ Θεοχάρης και Λυριτζής και Galloway, σ. 120-121

⁷² Theocaris and Liritzis and Galloway, «Dating of Two Hellenic Pyramids by a Novel Application of Thermoluminescence,» p. 404.

⁷³ Θεοχάρης και Λυριτζής και Galloway, «Χρονολόγησις δύο ελληνικών πυραμιδοειδών κτιμάτων,» σ. 112.

⁷⁴ *Ιδιο*, σ. 118-119 και γενικά σ. 117-120.

⁷⁵ «Luminescence Dating. Thermoluminescence» in Scott. A. Elias and Cary J. Mock, eds, *Encyclopedia of Quaternary Science*, 2nd ed. 4 vols (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2013), 2:643-652 or PDF 1697-1706 & ιδίως 649-650 or PDF 1703-1704 με εκτενή βιβλιογραφία.

⁷⁶ Θεοχάρης και Βέης, «Αι πυραμίδες της Αργολίδος, η χρονολόγησις και η σημασία των,» σ. 215 & 221.

⁷⁷ *Ιδιο*, σ. 218-219.

⁷⁸ «ἔχει δὲ ἀσπίδας σχῆμα Ἀργολικὰς ἐπειργασμένης», Πausanias, II.25.7.

που βρέθηκε μέσα στην πυραμίδα στο Ελληνικό αναγνωρίστηκε από τους αρχαιολόγους ως μυλόλιθος και όχι ως ασπίδα.⁷⁹

Το 1996 δημοσιεύθηκε γεωφυσική μελέτη του χώρου που περιέβαλε τις πυραμίδες κοντά στο Λυγουριό και στο Ελληνικό μαζί με τα αποτελέσματα νέας αρχαιολογικής ανασκαφής στον ίδιο χώρο. Όμως η έρευνα και η ανασκαφή είχαν πραγματοποιηθεί το 1993 και πριν από την παραπάνω πειραματική μελέτη χρονολογήσεως των πυραμίδων που όμως λόγω του ότι η νέα ανασκαφή δημοσιεύθηκε αργότερα γινόταν αναφορά και στην χρονολόγηση με την πειραματική μέθοδο της θερμοφωταύγειας. Στην δημοσίευση του 1996 είναι τελειώς εμφανές ότι υφίσταται σύγκρουση των αποτελεσμάτων της ανασκαφής που διεξήχθη από αρχαιολόγους με τις απόψεις των μη αρχαιολόγων φυσικών επιστημόνων ως προς την χρονολόγηση των πυραμίδων. Ο υπεύθυνος αρχαιολόγος που είχε κληθεί να συμμετάσχει στην έρευνα αυτή αναγκάστηκε να δεχθεί την παρείσφρηση στην δημοσίευση μη αρχαιολογικά αποδεκτών απόψεων αλλά και τα αποτελέσματα της πειραματικής χρονολογήσεως παρότι εξέφρασε και τότε και αμέσως μετά (δες παρακάτω) ευθαρσώς την επιστημονική αρχαιολογική του άποψη. Με μαγνητόμετρα και ηλεκτρομαγνητόμετρα, λοιπόν, διεξήχθησαν λεπτομερείς διασκοπήσεις γύρω από τα δύο μνημεία⁸⁰ για να υποδειχθούν θέσεις για την νέα αρχαιολογική ανασκαφή, η οποία πραγματοποιήθηκε (το 1993) αμέσως μετά. Γύρω από την πυραμίδα στο Ελληνικό η γεωφυσική έρευνα κάλυψε επιφάνεια μέχρι απόσταση 12 μ. και 18 μ. από τις τρεις πλευρές και 28 μ. από την τέταρτη αλλά και τον εσωτερικό χώρο της πυραμίδας.⁸¹ Σύμφωνα με τις υποδείξεις των μετρήσεων, πραγματοποιήθηκαν σε συγκεκριμένα σημεία έξι αρχαιολογικές τομές γύρω από την πυραμίδα. Σε μία από τις τομές αρχικά ανασύρθηκαν μερικά όστρακα αγγείων της Κλασσικής/Ελληνιστικής Εποχής ενώ σε βαθύτερο στρώμα πληθώρα οστράκων της Πρώιμης Ελλαδικής II Εποχής (κατά τους συγγραφείς, περ. 3000-2500 π.Χ.), παρόμοια με αυτή που έχει βρεθεί και σε άλλες θέσεις της ίδιας Εποχής στην Αργολίδα. Μαζί με παρόμοια όστρακα που είχαν ανασυρθεί και σε προηγούμενες ανασκαφές στο εσωτερικό της πυραμίδας (δες παραπάνω) τα ευρήματα υποδεικνύουν την ύπαρξη προϊστορικού οικισμού επάνω στον χαμηλό λόφο που είναι κτισμένη η πυραμίδα. Στην τομή ανατολικά της πυραμίδας εντοπίστηκαν θεμέλια μικρού κτίσματος εντός του οποίου βρέθηκε κεραμική του 5ου-6ου μ.Χ. αιώνα. Η κατασκευή αυτή φαίνεται ότι συνδέεται με πιθανή δεξαμενή ύδατος σε κατοπινή από την αρχική χρήση της πυραμίδας.⁸² Σε αυτή την δημοσίευση, τα συμπεράσματα των φυσικών επιστημόνων και μη αρχαιολόγων από αυτήν την ανασκαφή ήταν ότι τα όστρακα της Πρώιμης Ελλαδικής Εποχής προσδιορίζουν και την περίοδο κτίσεως της πυραμίδας ενώ ως επιπλέον απόδειξη χρησιμοποιήθηκαν τα αποτελέσματα των μετρήσεων της πειραματικής μεθόδου χρονολογήσεως της θερμοφωταύγειας (του 1995) αν και ο αρχαιολόγος, μέλος της ομάδας, κατάφερε να δώσει έναν τόνο αμφιβολίας για αυτές τις απόψεις. Στο συμπέρασμα τονίστηκε ότι ο τρόπος λιθοδομής των πυραμίδων στο Ελληνικό και στο Λυγουριό είναι παρόμοιος με άλλες κατασκευές στην ηπειρωτική Ελλάδα και ανήκει στην Κλασσική Εποχή, όπως και η κεραμική που βρέθηκε στα ανώτερα στρώματα γύρω από αυτές αν και το σχήμα κατασκευής δεν είναι καθόλου συνηθισμένο στην Ελλάδα.⁸³

⁷⁹ Θεοχάρης και Βέης, «Αι πυραμίδες της Αργολίδος, η χρονολόγησις και η σημασία των,» σ. 221-224 & Σχ. 3. Δες κριτική αυτών των απόψεων στο Lefkowitz, «Archaeology and the politics of origins,» pp. 194-197.

⁸⁰ P S. Theocaris and I. Liritzis and E. Lagios and A. Sampson, «Geophysical Prospection, Archaeological Excavation, and Dating in two Hellenic Pyramids,» *Surveys in Geophysics* 17 (1996): 596-597.

⁸¹ *Τδιο*, pp. 597-604.

⁸² *Τδιο*, pp. 606-610.

⁸³ *Τδιο*, pp. 616-617.

Ο αρχαιολόγος υπεύθυνος της ανασκαφής στις δύο πυραμίδες φρόντισε να δημοσιεύσει τα αποτελέσματα της και ξεχωριστά από τους μη αρχαιολόγους. Αναφέρει, λοιπόν, ότι η πυραμίδα στο Ελληνικό σώζεται μέχρι ύψος 3,50 μ. και κτίστηκε από σταχτιού χρώματος ασβεστόλιθο που βρισκόταν στην ίδια με αυτήν περιοχή. Γενικώς, η κεραμική που βρέθηκε «μέσα και γύρω από το κτήριο έδειξε μια χρονολόγηση στον 5ο-6ο μ.Χ. αιώνα» αλλά η ανασκαφή του 1993, όπως και οι προηγούμενες, έφεραν στο φως κυρίως κεραμική πολύ παλαιότερης Εποχής. Κατά την ανασκαφή διαπιστώθηκε ότι ο ανατολικός τοίχος της πυραμίδας κάλυπτε εν μέρει στρογγυλό βόθρο διαμέτρου 0,90 μ. και βάθους 0,50 μ. ο οποίος περιείχε κεραμική της Πρωτοελλαδικής Εποχής. Εξ αυτού του δεδομένου συνάγεται ότι η πυραμίδα κτίστηκε μετά την Πρωτοελλαδική Εποχή, δηλαδή μετά το 2000 π.Χ., ενώ η κυρτή επιφάνεια των εσωτερικών επιφανειών των λίθων θυμίζουν περίοδο πριν την Κλασική Εποχή (5ος αιώνας π.Χ.). Με την αρχαιολογική τομή που πραγματοποιήθηκε σε επαφή με τον εξωτερικό βόρειο τοίχο της πυραμίδας βρέθηκε μεγάλη ποσότητα κεραμικής της Πρωτοελλαδικής II Εποχής (κατά τον ανασκαφέα, περ. 3000-2500 π.Χ.) ενώ παρατηρήθηκε ότι «το θεμέλιο του κτηρίου [πυραμίδας] είχε κόψει το ΠΕ [πρωτοελλαδικό] στρώμα και είχε εδρασθεί επάνω σε μαλακό οφιολιθικό πέτρωμα». Πρωτοελλαδική κεραμική βρέθηκε και σε άλλα σημεία στην επιφάνεια του λόφου. Ενδιαφέρον παρουσιάζει το γεγονός ότι μαζί με τα πρωτοελλαδικά όστρακα αγγείων βρέθηκαν και οστά ζώων που «σημαίνει ότι πρόκειται για μια απόθεση που συνδέεται με οικιστική χρήση». Εν κατακλείδι, επάνω στον λόφο και πριν από την κατασκευή της πυραμίδας υπήρχε πρωτοελλαδικός οικισμός, τα ευρήματα του οποίου όμως «δεν φαίνονται να έχουν άμεση σχέση με το κτήριο και [απλώς] δηλώνουν ότι στον ίδιο χώρο υπήρχε ένας μικρός οικισμός της εποχής, που κατελάμβανε την κορυφή του λόφου και ασφαλώς προϋπήρχε της πυραμίδας, όπως απέδειξε και η ύπαρξη ΠΕ [πρωτοελλαδικού] βόθρου κάτω από το θεμέλιο του κτηρίου». Το κονίαμα που βρέθηκε στους εσωτερικούς τοίχους και στα θεμέλια της πυραμίδας, όπου αυτά εξετάστηκαν από την ανασκαφή, δεν είναι συνδετικό των λίθων αλλά μπορεί να δηλώνει ότι το εσωτερικό του κτηρίου, αφού είχε καλυφθεί με υδραυλικό κονίαμα, είχε σε μεταγενέστερο χρόνο χρησιμοποιηθεί ως δεξαμενή νερού σε συνδυασμό μάλιστα με το μικρό κτίσμα έξω από την ανατολική πλευρά της πυραμίδας. Το πρόβλημα της ακριβούς χρονολόγησης της πυραμίδας δεν διαφωτίζεται από την ευρεθείσα κεραμική, η οποία είναι είτε της Πρωτοελλαδικής Εποχής είτε των αιώνων μετά Χριστόν, ενώ εντύπωση προκαλεί «η παντελής απουσία μυκηναϊκής κεραμικής». Αυτή ακριβώς η ανυπαρξία αποκλείει και την κατασκευή του μνημείου κατά την Μυκηναϊκή Εποχή ενώ τα «λίγα κεραμικά ευρήματα των κλασικών ή ελληνοιστικών χρόνων [...] θα μπορούσαν να στηρίζουν την κατασκευή του μνημείου στην περίοδο αυτή, αφού άλλωστε συμφωνεί και η τοιχοδομία του». Η αρχαιομετρική μέθοδος της θερμοφωταύγειας που εφαρμόστηκε για πρώτη φορά το 1995 στην χρονολόγηση του λίθου των πυραμίδων, καταλήγει στην δημοσίευσή του ο Έλληνας αρχαιολόγος, «έδωσε εξαιρετικά [υ]ψηλές χρονολογίες [...] οι οποίες βασίζονται σε υποκειμενικά κριτήρια. Η τελειοποίηση της μεθόδου και η εφαρμογή της σε μια σειρά [ήδη] καλά χρονολογημένων κτηρίων θα ήταν απαραίτητη, για να μπορέσει να γίνει αποδεκτή από τους αρχαιολόγους». Οι χρονολογίες που προέκυψαν με αυτή την μέθοδο και για τις δύο πυραμίδες της Αργολίδας «προς το παρόν, δεν μπορούν να γίνουν δεκτές. Τα ανασκαφικά στοιχεία αλλά και οι γνώσεις μας που προκύπτουν από την έρευνα της Πρωτοελλαδικής περιόδου σε όλο

τον ελληνικό χώρο αποκλείουν την κατασκευή παρόμοιων κτηρίων στους χρόνους εκείνους».⁸⁴

Η διαμάχη φυσικών επιστημόνων και αρχαιολόγων για το ζήτημα της χρονολόγησης των πυραμίδων δεν καταλάγιασε στον 20ο αιώνα. Ο υπεύθυνος για τις μετρήσεις φυσικός επιστήμονας και αρχαιομέτρης επανήλθε στο θέμα με δημοσίευσή του το 2011. Στην δημοσίευση εκείνη εξετάζει την χρονολόγηση επιφανειών με θερμοφωταύγεια και οπτική διέγερση φωταύγεια (optical stimulated luminescence). Αναφέρεται και πάλι στην χρονολόγηση των πυραμίδων αλλά αυτή την φορά δίνει χρονολογικό εύρος και μόνο: «δύο ασβεστολιθικές πυραμίδες στο Ελληνικό και στο Λυγουριό [...] θεωρούνταν των Ελληνιστικών χρόνων αλλά με την θερμοφωταύγεια χρονολογήθηκαν 2500-2000 π.Χ. με αποκλίσεις».⁸⁵ Με αφορμή τις παρατηρήσεις της Αμερικανίδας καθηγήτριας κλασικών σπουδών Mary Lefkowitz, μεταξύ άλλων και για την υψηλή χρονολόγηση,⁸⁶ ο αρχαιομέτρης φυσικός επιστήμονας κατηγορεί τους καθηγητές Ιστορίας στα πανεπιστήμια ότι συχνά δεν διαθέτουν επιστημονική επάρκεια στις μεθόδους των φυσικών επιστημών και ότι η νέα μέθοδος της θερμοφωταύγεια έχει παρανοηθεί. Επίσης, αναφέρει την κατά την άποψή του επιτυχή μέτρηση της ηλικίας των τμημάτων μαρμάρου του αρχαϊκού ναού του Απόλλωνα στους Δελφούς το 1997, τον οποίο οι αρχαιολόγοι υπολογίζουν ότι κτίστηκε περί το 550 π.Χ. (Αρχαϊκή Εποχή) και η μέτρηση με την μέθοδο της θερμοφωταύγεια έδειξε 470±200 π.Χ. Βέβαια, για τον φυσικό επιστήμονα η μικρή αυτή διαφορά (550 με 470 αλλά και απόκλιση 670-270 π.Χ.) μπορεί να είναι αμελητέα για τις μετρήσεις του αλλά για τον αρχαιολόγο η διαφορά είναι τεράστιας σημασίας, δηλαδή άλλη είναι αρχιτεκτονικά η Αρχαϊκή Εποχή, άλλη η Κλασική Εποχή, και άλλη η Ελληνιστική Εποχή. Παρόμοιες αρχαιολογικά μεγάλες και απαράδεκτες αποκλίσεις έδωσαν και οι μετρήσεις με την ίδια μέθοδο σε τρία άλλα αρχαία ελληνικά έργα και μνημεία (570±300, 1100±340, 480±350 π.Χ. σε δημοσίευση του 2005) ενώ κατά προσέγγιση είναι οι μετρήσεις στον προϊστορικό οικισμό της Φτελιάς στην Μύκονο (5800±700 και 5450±610 π.Χ. όταν η πιο ακριβής ραδιοχρονολόγηση με άνθρακα σε συνδυασμό με την παρουσία κεραμικής έδωσαν χρονολογίες μεταξύ 5100 και 4500 π.Χ.). Τονίζει, επίσης, ότι η μέθοδος μετρήσεως αρχαίων επιφανειών έχει τελειοποιηθεί από το 2002 με υψηλής αναλύσεως τεχνικές διαπιστώσεως την φωταύγεια στην προσπάθειά του να αντικρούσει την κριτική της Αμερικανίδας επιστήμονος για τον πειραματικό χαρακτήρα των μετρήσεων του 1995,⁸⁷ όπως άλλωστε αυτός αποδεικνύεται από τις δημοσιεύσεις διαφορετικών κάθε φορά ετών και εύρους ετών και χρονολογικών αποκλίσεων, αλλά δεν προσκομίζει νέες μετρήσεις των λίθων των πυραμίδων με την βελτιωμένη μέθοδο.

Σε αντίθεση με τις απόψεις μη αρχαιολόγων που παρεισέφρησαν σε καθαρά αρχαιολογικά ζητήματα, οι Έλληνες αρχαιολόγοι διατήρησαν και διατηρούν την μέθοδο αποδείξεως δια της αρχαιολογικής επιστήμης και δεν λαμβάνουν υπόψιν τους «δημοσιεύματα μη ειδικών». Σύμφωνα με την θεώρηση της βιβλιογραφίας και ειδική μελέτη από αρχαιολόγο που έχει ασχοληθεί και με το ζήτημα των φρουρίων, οχυρωματικών πύργων, φυλακίων στην Πελοπόννησο, η πυραμίδα στο Ελληνικό πρέπει να χρονολογηθεί προς το τέλος του Δ' αιώνα π.Χ. Το κτίσμα έχει μορφή κόλουρης πυραμίδας και όχι πλήρους πυραμίδας ή πυραμιδοειδούς σχήματος ενώ «εδράζεται σε στιβαρή ορθογώνια κρηπίδα», δηλαδή σε ισχυρά θεμέλια. Όλα τα στοιχεία συνηγορούν στο γεγονός ότι δεν είχε ποτέ σχεδιασθεί ως κανονική πυραμίδα και μάλιστα ότι μετά

⁸⁴ Αδαμάντιος Σάμψων, «Οι πυραμίδες της Αργολίδας και η πραγματική σημασία τους,» *Αρχαιολογία και Τέχνες*, τευχ. 57 (Δεκέμβριος 1995): 56-61.

⁸⁵ Ioannis Liritzis, «Surface Dating by Luminescence: An Overview,» *Geochronometria* 38 (September 2011): 294.

⁸⁶ Lefkowitz, «Archaeology and the politics of origins,» pp. 194-197.

⁸⁷ Liritzis, «Surface Dating by Luminescence,» p. 294.

το ξύλινο δάπεδο/οροφή ισογείου το κτίσμα συνεχιζόταν προς τα επάνω κατακόρυφα με πλίνθινους τοίχους μέχρι ίσως και τα 10 μ. (πύργος). Δεν σχετίζεται με τις αναφορές του Πausανία για πολυάνδρια στην περιοχή. Φαίνεται ότι το κτήριο είχε αλλάξει χρήσεις μέσα στους αιώνες αλλά είχε υποστεί και διάφορες μεταβολές/προσθήκες, όπως το κονίαμα στην τοιχοδομία του. Επίσης, το τμήμα της μυλόπετρας που βρέθηκε μπορεί να ανήκει σε ύστερη φάση, κατά την Ρωμαϊκή Εποχή, όταν το κτίσμα είχε πιθανόν μετατραπεί σε οικία. Πάντως η πρώτη χρήση του κτηρίου ήταν στρατιωτικό φυλάκιο, όπως βεβαιώνουν όλα τα αρχαιολογικά δεδομένα, ενώ έχει αποδειχθεί ότι από εκεί ακριβώς διερχόταν η κύρια αρχαία οδός από το Άργος προς Τεγέα. Παρόμοια χρονολόγηση αλλά και την ίδια χρήση είχε και η άλλη πυραμίδα της Αργολίδας, κοντά στο χωριό Λυγουριό.⁸⁸

Λαμβάνοντας, λοιπόν, υπόψιν τις δημοσιεύσεις για την πυραμίδες στην Αργολίδα, ο νηφάλιος μελετητής μπορεί να καταλήξει σε ορισμένα συμπεράσματα, τα οποία όπως και στις περισσότερες αρχαιολογικές και ιστορικές μελέτες δεν είναι ποτέ απολύτως οριστικά στις λεπτομέρειές τους, πράγμα που αποτελεί και την γοητεία των δύο επιστημών. Η πειραματική μέθοδος χρονολόγησης της θερμοφωταύγειας που εφαρμόστηκε το 1995 και είναι γνωστή για τις μεγάλες αποκλείσεις στην χρονολόγηση τουλάχιστον αρχαίων κτισμάτων, είναι η μόνη που παραπέμπει στην Γ' χιλιετία π.Χ. για την κατασκευή των πυραμίδων και ιδίως για την πυραμίδα στο Ελληνικό. Η λιθοδομία της πυραμίδας αυτής μαζί με κάποια λίγα ευρήματα κλασσικής ή ελληνιστικής κεραμικής, όμως, παραπέμπουν στον Ε'-Δ' αιώνα π.Χ. για την κατασκευή της. Η άφθονη πρωτοελλαδική κεραμική στα θεμέλιά της και στον λόφο μαζί με τα υπολείμματα από οστά ζώων επιβεβαιώνουν ότι κάποτε υπήρξε εκεί πρωτοελλαδικός οικισμός, πολύ πριν την κατασκευή της πυραμίδας. Από τον Ε' αιώνα π.Χ. και μετά, οι εμπορικές, στρατιωτικές, πολιτικές επαφές των Ελλήνων με την Αίγυπτο μπορούν κάλλιστα να εξηγήσουν την κατασκευή ενός τέτοιου φυλακίου (αρχ. φυλακείου) δια της μμήσεως όχι όμως ως ταφικό μνημείο ή κενοτάφιο αλλά ως το κάτω τμήμα στρατιωτικού πύργου. Η λιθοδομική μίμηση εξωτερικά και εσωτερικά μπορεί να προέρχεται και από τα γειτονικά μυκηναϊκά έργα των Μυκηνών και της Τίρυνθας, όπως επισημαίνει ο Έλληνας ανασκαφέας. Τα αρχαιολογικά στοιχεία, λοιπόν, συνηγορούν στην άποψη ότι η πυραμίδα στο Ελληνικό, η οποία πρέπει να κτίστηκε κάποια στιγμή από τον Ε' μέχρι και το τέλος του Δ' αιώνα π.Χ., είχε το σχήμα κολουρου πυραμίδας (χωρίς κορυφή) με ξύλινη στέγη/δάπεδο ορόφου και στην πρώτη της χρήση ήταν το πιθανότερο στρατιωτικό φυλάκιο για το έλεγχο της οδού από Άργος προς Τεγέα. Οι φυσικοί επιστήμονες υπολόγισαν από τα αποτελέσματα των μετρήσεών τους και χρησιμοποιήσαν ως καθοριστικό παράγοντα των συμπερασμάτων τους ότι από την εξόρυξη των λίθων μέχρι την οικοδόμηση του κτηρίου δεν πέρασε περισσότερο από μία ή δύο ημέρες. Αλλά, όπως διατύπωσε την αμφιβολία της η Mary Lefkowitz⁸⁹ (λίγο άκομψα όπως θεώρησαν οι φυσικοί επιστήμονες), εκ των πραγμάτων, δεν μπορεί κανείς να γνωρίζει πόσος ακριβώς χρόνος παρήλθε από την στιγμή που έγινε η εξόρυξη των λίθων μέχρι την τοποθέτησή τους στην πυραμίδα, έτσι ώστε να διασταυρωθεί η υπόθεση των ολίγων ωρών ή δύο ημερών. Μάλιστα, νομίζουμε εμείς, ότι απαιτούνταν αρκετός χρόνος για την κατάλληλη λάξευση των λίθων για να ταιριάξουν μεταξύ τους στην οικοδομή από τους λίγους εξειδικευμένους λιθοξόους, αρκετός χρόνος για την μεταφορά των ογκολίθων μέχρι το σημείο κατασκευής είτε σέρνοντάς τους είτε μεταφέροντάς τους επάνω σε κυλιόμενους κορμούς δένδρων και επι-

⁸⁸ Γιάννης Α. Πίκουλας, «Οι 'πυραμίδες' της Αργολίδας,» *Αρχαιολογία και Τέχνες*, τευχ. 59 (Ιούνιος 1996): 60-63. Ας διευκρινισθεί ότι οι σχετικές με τις πυραμίδες της Αργολίδας δημοσιεύσεις στο ελληνικό περιοδικό *Δαυλός* έχουν ληφθεί υπόψιν από τους αρχαιολόγους. Δες κριτική σε Lefkowitz, «Archaeology and the politics of origins,» pp. 197-199.

⁸⁹ Lefkowitz, «Archaeology and the politics of origins,» p. 196.

πλέον χρόνος για την τοποθέτησή τους στην κατάλληλη θέση στην πυραμίδα. Δηλαδή, εργασία εξειδικευμένων λιθοξόνων, μεταφορέων και ανυψωτών των μεγαλίθων (προφανώς με την βοήθεια ξύλινων γερανών και σκαλωσιάς) στην κατάλληλη θέση επί του κτίσματος. Επειδή η κάθε εξωτερική πλευρά της πυραμίδας έχει περί του 100 λίθους και ολόκληρη η εξωτερική της δομή περί τους 500 μαζί με τα θεμέλια, ο χρόνος κατασκευής της πυραμίδας δεν μπορεί να ήταν 1-2 ημέρες, εκτός εάν δεχθούμε πως χιλιάδες εργάτες και/ή στρατιώτες εργάζονταν ταυτοχρόνως για την ολοκλήρωση της κατασκευής της σε ελάχιστο χρόνο, εικασία υπέρ της οποίας δεν υπάρχει γνωστό παράδειγμα από την ελληνική Αρχαιότητα. Οι φυσικοί επιστήμονες βασίζονται στα πειράματά τους τα οποία και πρέπει να επαναλαμβάνουν για να επαληθεύουν τις μετρήσεις τους αλλά οι αρχαιολόγοι χρησιμοποιούν συνδυασμό δεδομένων και καταλήγουν σε εκείνο το συμπέρασμα που υποδεικνύει η πληθώρα των στοιχείων που διαθέτουν. Συνεπώς, μπορεί ο υπολογισμός της ηλικίας των λίθων της πυραμίδας στο Ελληνικό μεταξύ 2500-2000 π.Χ. να είναι σύμφωνος με τις μετρήσεις με την μέθοδο της θερμοφωταύγειας αλλά η αρχαιολογική θεώρηση των τεκμηρίων δείχνει ότι η κατασκευή της πραγματοποιήθηκε τον Δ' αιώνα π.Χ. και πολύ πιθανόν στο δεύτερο μισό του, κατά άλλη αρχαιολογική άποψη. Δηλαδή, τα αποτελέσματα των μετρήσεων αλλά και οι μεγάλες χρονολογικές αποκλίσεις (σφάλμα) σε αυτά δεν συμβαδίζουν με την αρχαιολογική τεκμηρίωση και λογική. Επίσης, τα περί αστρονομικών θεωριών σε ό,τι αφορά στις πυραμίδες στην Αργολίδα δεν σχετίζονται ούτε με τις φυσικές επιστήμες, ούτε με την αρχαιολογία, ούτε και με την Ιστορία και συνεπώς δεν υπάρχει λόγος να αναφερθούν και να συζητηθούν.

Στην περίπτωση λοιπόν της μελέτης των ελληνικών πυραμίδων και κυρίως της πυραμίδας στο Ελληνικό διακρίνονται από τις δημοσιεύσεις μεταξύ 1995 και 2011 τρεις ερμηνευτικοί άξονες: η ψευδοαρχαιολογία, η ελλιπής αρχαιολογία και η αρχαιολογική επιστήμη. Η ψευδοαρχαιολογία εμφανίζεται κυρίως στον έντυπο και ηλεκτρονικό τύπο και διατείνεται για την ύπαρξη πυραμίδων στον ελλαδικό χώρο την ίδια εποχή ή και προγενέστερων των αιγυπτιακών τονίζοντας το εθνικιστικό δέος για τις πρωτοπορίες των Αρχαίων Ελλήνων. Η ψευδοαρχαιολογία βασίζεται στην ελλιπή αρχαιολογία, η οποία από πέννες μη αρχαιολόγων υποστηρίζει την ελληνική πρωτιά και το αρχαιοελληνικό μεγαλείο βασιζόμενη σε μονομερή και επισφαλής επιστημονικά δεδομένα πειραματικών μεθόδων (μετρήσεις θερμοφωταύγειας) αλλά και σε συγκεκριμένα, παρερμηνευμένα και πολλές φορές άσχετα με το ζητούμενο φιλολογικά στοιχεία, όλα δημοσιευμένα από μη αρχαιολόγους, μη ειδικούς επί του ζητουμένου. Η ελλιπής αρχαιολογία, διατυπωμένη συνήθως και κυρίως από μη αρχαιολόγους, βασίζεται σε μονομερή επιστημονικά στοιχεία και αρχαιολογικά δεδομένα και όχι σε ολόκληρη την δημοσιευμένη βιβλιογραφία επί του ζητουμένου, αποφεύγει οποιαδήποτε συζήτηση επί της υπάρχουσας βιβλιογραφίας (αγγλ. literature review), και προσπαθεί να απομονώσει εκείνα τα επιστημονικά στοιχεία, φιλολογικές μαρτυρίες, αρχαιολογικά ευρήματα που εξυπηρετούν συγκεκριμένη ερμηνεία και απόψεις. Αντιθέτως, η αρχαιολογική μελέτη λαμβάνει υπόψιν της και συνδυάζει όλα τα αρχαιολογικά δεδομένα και τις σχετικές δημοσιεύσεις μαζί με τα σχετιζόμενα από τις φιλολογικές πηγές στοιχεία αλλά και στοιχεία από ασφαλείς επιστημονικές μετρήσεις (λ.χ. ραδιοχρονολογήσεις άνθρακα σε κάποιες περιπτώσεις) για να εξάγει συμπεράσματα τα οποία αντέχουν στην επιστημονική κριτική.

Προσωρινά συμπεράσματα: Graecopithecus, η Ευρώπη λίκνο του Ανθρώπου;

Στην παλαιοαρχαιολογία και στην παλαιοντολογία είναι σύνηθες το φαινόμενο να εξάγονται συμπεράσματα ή, πολύ συχνά, προσωρινά συμπεράσματα μια που στις περισσότερες περιπτώσεις τα ευρήματα είναι μόνο πολύ λίγα θραύσματα οστών

ανθρωπιδών⁹⁰ (προανθρώπων και πρωτοανθρώπων). Επίσης, οι νέες θεωρίες επί συμπερασμάτων που προτείνουν οι παλαιοανθρωπολόγοι και άλλοι σχετικοί με το αντικείμενο επιστήμονες για την εξέλιξη του ανθρώπου χρειάζονται πολύ χρόνο είτε για να απορριφθούν τελείως είτε για να γίνουν αποδεκτές σε μεγάλο βαθμό από την επιστημονική κοινότητα. Μάλιστα, σε μερικές περιπτώσεις αφού πρώτα απορριφθούν, σε ύστερο χρόνο γίνονται αποδεκτές και ίσως με βάση νέα στοιχεία στο απώτερο μέλλον να απορριφθούν πάλι. Ολόκληρη αυτή η διαδικασία δεν είναι μέρος της ψευδοαρχαιολογίας αλλά της γόνιμης συζητήσεως ανάμεσα στους επιστήμονες.

Μία τέτοια περίπτωση είναι και ο *Graecoripithecus*, μέλος των ανθρωπιδών, που διαπιστώθηκε ότι έζησε στην Αττική και στην Θράκη στην Βουλγαρία, δηλαδή στην νοτιοανατολική Ευρώπη, πριν από 7 εκατ. χρόνια. Πρέπει να περπατούσε σε σχεδόν όρθια στάση και πρέπει να ήταν αρχαιότερος από οποιονδήποτε από τους ανθρωπίδες που έζησαν στην Αφρική και περπατούσαν στην ίδια σχεδόν όρθια στάση. Θεωρείται ότι υπήρξε ο πρώτος ή από τους πρώτους κρίκους στην εξέλιξη του ανθρωπίνου είδους, δηλαδή μετά τον πίθηκο που μετακινούνταν χρησιμοποιώντας τα χέρια του από δένδρο σε δένδρο, και από τα πρώτα μέλη των ανθρωπιδών που περπάτησε στην γη χρησιμοποιώντας μόνο τα πόδια του. Τα ευρήματα αυτά αλλά και απολιθώματα προϊστορικών ζώων ιδίως στην Αττική προτάσσουν ένα εξαιρετικά κρίσιμο ερώτημα ως προς την καταγωγή του ανθρώπου: μήπως ο πρώτος άνθρωπος, το πρώτο μέλος των ανθρωπιδών που περπατούσε σχεδόν όρθιο, γεννήθηκε στην Αττική, στα Βαλκάνια, στην Ευρώπη και όχι στην Αφρική; Μήπως το πρώτο ανθρωπινό αυτό είδος μετανάστευσε από την Ευρώπη στην Αφρική και στην Ασία και όχι από την Αφρική στην Ασία και στην Ευρώπη, όπως είναι μέχρι σήμερα γενικά αποδεκτό στην επιστημονική κοινότητα; Φυσικά και δεν πρόκειται για οποιοδήποτε ζήτημα φυλετικής ή άλλης ανωτερότητας των Ευρωπαίων ή ψευδοαρχαιολογίας αλλά για προσωρινά συμπεράσματα από ευρήματα των τελευταίων 200 ετών στην Αττική, στην Κρήτη, στην Βουλγαρία.

Σε πολλά ευρωπαϊκά παλαιοντολογικά και παλαιοανθρωπολογικά μουσεία υπάρχουν πινακίδες που αναφέρονται σε απολιθωμένα ευρήματα της εποχής του Μεσοπίθηκου (*Mesopithecus*) μαζί με απολιθώματα από καμηλοπαρδάλεις, αντιλόπες, ρινόκερους, ύαινες, και αιλουροειδή που προέρχονται από το Πικέρμι της Αττικής. Τα ευρήματα αυτά συνελέγησαν στις πρώτες δεκαετίες του 19ου αιώνα από επιστημονικές αποστολές δυτικοευρωπαϊκών πανεπιστημίων και μουσείων και μεταφέρθηκαν στις έδρες τους σε διάφορες πόλεις στην Ευρώπη για να μελετηθούν και να εκτεθούν. Η ιστορία των απολιθωμάτων αυτών ξεκίνησε από ένα τυχαίο εύρημα το 1836 από τον George Finlay στις πλαγιές της Πεντέλης αλλά και με την επιστημονική συνδρομή του Anton Lindermayer. Ο Βρετανός μετέπειτα ιστορικός George Finlay είχε ήδη φθάσει στην Αθήνα το 1827 και είχε συμμετάσχει σε μάχη του ελληνικού Απελευθερωτικού Αγώνα (Ελληνική Επανάσταση 1821) και τελικά έμεινε στην Ελλάδα, στην Αττική, και μετά την ίδρυση του ελληνικού κράτους. Το 1833, αμέσως μετά την ίδρυση του Βασιλείου της Ελλάδος με βασιλιά τον Όθωνα, κατέφθασε στην Αθήνα και ο Βαυαρός στρατιωτικός γιατρός Anton Lindermayer. Σε κάποιον από τους αρχαιολογικούς περιπάτους του στην Πεντέλη, ο Finlay συνέλεξε απολιθωμένα οστά τα οποία έδειξε στον Lindermayer και εκείνος αμέσως αντιλήφθηκε ότι επρόκειτο για απολιθώματα θηλαστικών. Η περαιτέρω έρευνα με την βοήθεια μερικών από τους Βαυαρούς στρατιώτες που είχε φέρει ο Όθωνας μαζί του απέδειξε ότι υπήρχαν πολλά προϊστορικά απολιθώματα σε ρέμα στο Πικέρμι, στην Αττική. Κατά την ανασκαφή, ένας Βαυαρός υπέθεσε ότι τα ευρήματα είχαν χρηματική αξία και έκλεψε μερικά.

⁹⁰ Δες πρόχειρα *Wikipedia*, λμ. «Hominidae» at <<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hominidae>> και κυρίως Ian Tattersall, et. al., eds, *Encyclopedia of Human Evolution and Prehistory* (Chicago: St. James Press, 1988), λμ. «Hominidae», «Homininae», «Hominoidea».

Όταν γύρισε στην πατρίδα του το 1838, παρουσιάστηκε σε αντιπροσώπους της Βαυαρικής Ζωολογικής Συλλογής στο Μόναχο για να πουλήσει τα κλοπιμαία νομίζοντας ότι τα γυαλάκια που περιείχαν και άστραφταν στο φως ήταν διαμάντια. Ο σπουδαίος ζωολόγος της εποχής Johann Andreas Wagner αμέσως αντιλήφθηκε ότι ανάμεσα στα οστά ζώων υπήρχε και η άνω σιαγόνα μέλους ανθρωπιδών, το οποίο ονόμασε *Mesopithecus pentelicus* από το Πικέρμι της Αττικής. Τα οστά από το Πικέρμι συνιστούσαν δηλαδή αρχαίο οικοσύστημα στην Αττική, στην Ελλάδα, την χαμένη σαβάνα⁹¹ της Ευρώπης, και υπήρξαν τον 19ο αιώνα το έναυσμα για την εκκίνηση μιας νέας επιστήμης, της παλαιοντολογίας των σπονδυλωτών, δηλαδή των ζώων και του ανθρώπου με σκελετό. Τελικά μετά από πολλές αποστολές, οι επιστήμονες έπαψαν να σκάβουν στο ρέμα στο Πικέρμι διότι δεν υπήρχε τίποτα άλλο για να βρεθεί.

Τον Απρίλιο του 1941, η Αθήνα παραδόθηκε στα γερμανικά στρατεύματα κατοχής και γέμισε με γερμανόφωνους και Γερμανούς αξιωματικούς και στρατιώτες. Μαζί τους βρέθηκε και ο Γερμανός καθηγητής γεωλογία Bruno von Freyberg, ο οποίος είχε επιστρατευτεί ως πολιτικό προσωπικό στον γερμανικό στρατό. Ως γεωλόγος, ο ρόλος του από το 1943 ήταν να εντοπίσει στα βόρεια της Αθήνας περιοχές με αποθέσεις άνθρακα για την διάνοιξη ανθρακωρυχείων αλλά και θέσεις για αντιαεροπορικά πολυβολεία. Ο von Freyberg εντόπισε την κατάλληλη θέση το καλοκαίρι του 1944 στα κτήματα της βασίλισσας Αμαλίας, στην σημερινή θέση Πύργος Βασιλίσσης (Αμαλίας) και στο σημερινό Μητροπολιτικό Πάρκο Αντώνης Τρίτσης (ανάμεσα στις περιοχές Καματερό και Ίλιον) και οι στρατιώτες άρχισαν την εκσκαφή για το πολυβολείο. Τότε ήταν που ανακάλυψαν μέσα στο πέτρωμα δόντια ανθρώπου και τα έδειξαν στον von Freyberg, ο οποίος γρήγορα αντελήφθη ότι επρόκειτο για απολιθώμα κάτω σιαγόνας από μέλος των ανθρωπιδών. Τότε, παρότι είχε χάσει το δεξί του χέρι στον Α΄ Παγκόσμιο Πόλεμο, ανέσκαψε ο ίδιος και άλλα μικρά απολιθώματα από σκελετούς. Ο ειδικός παλαιοντολόγος στον οποίο έστειλε στο Βερολίνο τα ευρήματά του ο von Freyberg, του απάντησε ότι αυτά ανήκαν στην ίδια πανίδα με τα ευρήματα του 19ου αιώνα στο Πικέρμι και μάλιστα είχε αναγνωρίσει οστά από διάφορα ζώα καθώς και την σιαγόνα μέλους των ανθρωπιδών. Όμως τα συμμαχικά αεροπλάνα που βομβάρδισαν το 1945 το Μουσείο Φυσικής Ιστορίας του Βερολίνου προξένησαν ζημιές και στα ευρήματα από τον Πύργο Βασιλίσσης. Ό,τι απέμεινε από τα απολιθώματα και μαζί με την σιαγόνα, από την οποία είχαν καταστραφεί ορισμένα δόντια, φυλάχθηκε από τον von Freyberg όταν αυτός επέστρεψε στο πανεπιστήμιο το 1950. Το 1969 επανεξετάστηκε η σιαγόνα από εξειδικευμένο Γερμανό παλαιοανθρωπολόγο, ο οποίος διαπίστωσε ότι ανήκε σε μέλος των ανθρωπιδών που είχε ζήσει λίγο πριν από την εμφάνιση του *Mesopithecus pentelicus* και έτσι το ονόμασε *Graecopithecus freybergi*. Αλλά αυτή η διαπίστωση δεν προξένησε την προσοχή άλλων επιστημόνων διότι το ενδιαφέρον όλων ήταν τότε στραμμένο στην Ασία και στην Αφρική όπου γίνονταν εντατικές παλαιοανθρωπολογικές έρευνες και έτσι ξεχάστηκε. Όταν πολύ αργότερα έγινε προσπάθεια από άλλους επιστήμονες να ξαναβρεθούν τα απολιθώματα, αυτά είχαν χαθεί. Αλλά, όπως είναι και δική μου ακράδαντη πεποίθηση, τίποτα στην αρχαιολογία και στην Ιστορία που θεωρείται χαμένο δεν έχει τελείως χαθεί, και οι επίμονες έρευνες των επιστημόνων απέδωσαν τελικά καρπούς το 2014. Τα διάφορα απολιθωμένα οστά ζώων είχαν παραδοθεί και φυλάσσονταν από την Εταιρεία Φυσικής Ιστορί-

⁹¹ Σαβάνα ονομάζεται στην διεθνή ορολογία κάθε μεγάλη πεδινή έκταση στην τροπική ή υποτροπική ζώνη, που χαρακτηρίζεται από διάσπαρτα δένδρα ή θάμνους και στην οποία επικρατεί παρατεταμένη ξηρασία με περιστασιακές τοπικές βροχές. Δες Wikipedia, λμ. «Σαβάνα» στην <<https://el.wikipedia.org/wiki/Σαβάνα>>.

ας της Νυρεμβέργης ενώ η σιαγόνα είχε ξεχασθεί στο χρηματοκιβώτιο του γερμανικού Πανεπιστημίου του Erlangen. Την δεκαετία του 1980, όταν ο von Freyberg επρόκειτο να αποχωρήσει από το πανεπιστήμιο εμπιστεύθηκε την σιαγόνα στο Γεωλογικό Μουσείο του πανεπιστημίου με την σημείωση ότι ήταν «το πιο πολύτιμο κομμάτι της συλλογής» και έτσι το εύρημα κατέληξε στο χρηματοκιβώτιο, όπου ξεχάστηκε για πάνω από τριάντα χρόνια.

Κατά την διάρκεια των τελευταίων δεκαετιών του 20ου αιώνα είχε έντονα αμφισβητηθεί ότι η σιαγόνα είχε χρονολογική σχέση με τα ευρήματα στο Πικέρμι και η διεθνής επιστημονική ζωολογική κοινότητα σκεφτόταν να διαγράψει τον *Graecorithecus* από το ζωικό γενεαλογικό δένδρο μια που το απολίθωμα είχε χαθεί. Όμως, το 2014 υπήρχαν δύο απολιθώματα που μπορούσαν να εξετασθούν και να χρονολογηθούν με σύγχρονες μεθόδους και μηχανήματα έτσι ώστε να μην καταστραφούν και για να διαπιστωθεί η ηλικία τους: το ένα ήταν η σιαγόνα από τον Πύργο Βασιλίσσης στην Αττική και το άλλο το δόντι του μέλους των ανθρωπιδών από την νότια Βουλγαρία. Η εξέταση των δοντιών είναι πολύ σημαντική διότι στους πιθήκους οι προγόνιοι έχουν ρίζες ξεχωριστές που εισέρχονται στα ούλα ενώ στον άνθρωπο η ρίζα είναι μία διότι και η χρήση των δοντιών αυτών είναι διαφορετική. Έτσι, κατά την εξέλιξη του ανθρώπου, οι πολλές ρίζες των προγομφίων των πιθήκων συνενώθηκαν σε μία ανθρώπινη ρίζα σε κάθε προγόμφιο δόντι. Όταν έγινε ειδική ακτινογραφία στην σιαγόνα, αποδείχθηκε ότι οι ρίζες και στους κυνόδοντες και στους προγόμφιους του *Graecorithecus* ήταν σε μεγάλο βαθμό συνενωμένες αλλά όχι τελείως ενώ οι άκρες τους στρέφονταν προς τα μέσα για να συνενωθούν. Τα ίδια χαρακτηριστικά είχε και ο προγόμφιος από την Βουλγαρία. Συνεπώς, δεν επρόκειτο για πίθηκο αλλά για κάποιο είδος που θα μπορούσε να καταταγεί στην πολύ αρχή της εξέλιξης του ανθρώπινου είδους. Τα αρχαιότερα μέλη των ανθρωπιδών από τα Αφρική⁹² έχουν χρονολογηθεί ανάμεσα στα 5,8 και στα 2 εκατ. έτη και επομένως έμενε τώρα η χρονολόγηση των δοντιών από την Αττική και την Θράκη στην Βουλγαρία. Χρησιμοποιώντας ειδικές μεθόδους για την χρονολόγηση των απολιθωμάτων και από το Πικέρμι και από τον Πύργο Βασιλίσσης και από την Βουλγαρία, υπολογίστηκε ότι ο *Graecorithecus* είχε ζήσει πριν από 7,175 εκατ. χρόνια, το μέλος των ανθρωπιδών στο οποίο ανήκε το δόντι στην Βουλγαρία 7,235 εκατ. χρόνια πριν, και τα ζώα μαζί με το μέλος των ανθρωπιδών από το Πικέρμι πριν από περίπου 7,3 εκατ. χρόνια. Μια που η μέγιστη διαφορά μεταξύ τους ήταν 40.000 χρόνια θεωρείται ότι δεν έζησαν όλα μαζί. Με απλά λόγια, οι ανθρωπίδες από την Αττική και την Βουλγαρία ήταν από τους πρώτους προγόνους του ανθρώπου και χρονικά πολύ λίγο μετά τον διαχωρισμό πιθήκων και ανθρώπων, και μάλιστα πολύ νωρίτερα από τους ανθρωπίδες που έχουν βρεθεί στην Αφρική.

Η υπόθεση που μόλις διατυπώθηκε είναι παρά πολύ ελκυστική διότι υποδεικνύει ότι η αρχή του διαχωρισμού πιθήκου και ανθρώπου έγινε στην βορειοανατολική Μεσόγειο, μέχρι στιγμής στην νοτιοανατολική Ευρώπη και αυτοί οι ανθρωπίδες έζησαν και στην Αττική. Δηλαδή, η Ιστορία του ανθρώπου, της Ανθρωπότητας ολόκληρης, άρχισε στην Αττική πριν από 7 εκατ. χρόνια και ευρύτερα στα Βαλκάνια. Στην πραγματικότητα, όμως, στο επιστημονικό μικροσκόπιο της εξέλιξης του ανθρώπου πρέπει να απαντηθούν με αρκετή βεβαιότητα συγκεκριμένα ερωτήματα πριν η άποψη αυτή γίνει αποδεκτή από την πλειοψηφία των παλαιοανθρωπολόγων. Το γεγονός ότι καθ' υπόθεσιν ο *Graecorithecus* είχε πάρα πολλές ομοιότητες με τον μετέπειτα άν-

⁹² Δες πρόχειρα *Wikipedia*, λμ. «Hominidae» at <<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hominidae>> και κυρίως Ian Tattersall, et. al., eds, *Encyclopedia of Human Evolution and Prehistory* (Chicago: St. James Press, 1988), λμ. «Hominidae», «Homininae», «Hominoidea».

θρωπο και διαφορές από τον πίθηκο δεν τον κάνει και κατ' ανάγκην άνθρωπο, μια που ζώα μπορεί να έχουν στοιχεία ίδιας ομοπλασίας (homoplasy) αλλά να ανήκουν σε τελείως διαφορετικό είδος. Επίσης, η προς τα πίσω εξελικτική κατάληξη ανθρώπου και πιθήκου μετρά 7 εκατ. χρόνια για το κάθε ένα είδος και άρα είναι πολύ δύσκολο να διακρίνουν οι επιστήμονες την σημαντική εκείνη διαφορά που θα προσέδιδε την διαφοροποίηση στα δύο είδη πριν από τόσα εκατομμύρια χρόνια, στην αρχή του διαχωρισμού τους. Επιπλέον, η εξέλιξη του ανθρώπου αλλά και των πιθήκων ουσιαστικά βασίζεται συνήθως και κυρίως σε λίγα δόντια που έχουν βρεθεί από κάθε εξελικτικό στάδιο και σπάνια σε άλλα οστά, με αποτέλεσμα να λείπουν «κομμάτια από το παζλ» της εξελίξεως, δηλαδή δεν υπάρχει μια πλήρης επιστημονική εικόνα.

Παρ' όλα αυτά, το ανθρώπινο είδος ξεχωρίζει από τους πιθήκους από την συνεχή όρθια στάση του και συνεπώς εάν κάποιο είδος ανθρωπιδών αποδειχθεί ότι βαδίζει για μεγάλες αποστάσεις στα δύο του πόδια και όχι ότι απλώς στεκόταν όρθιο ή έκανε λίγα βήματα τότε κατ' ανάγκην ανήκει στο ανθρώπινο είδος. Ο μόνος τρόπος να αποδειχθεί κάτι τέτοιο είναι να βρεθούν απολιθωμένα αποτυπώματα πελμάτων από τα οποία να μπορεί να διαγνωσθεί η συνεχής όρθια βάδιση. Η ανθρώπινη όρθια βάδιση είχε σημαντικές επιπτώσεις και στην ανατομία ολόκληρου του ανθρώπινου σκελετού. Σήμερα, το αποτύπωμα του πέλματος ενός πιθήκου στο μέσον του είναι ιδιαίτερα πλατύ ενώ ενός ανθρώπου στενό και αρκετά λεπτό εξαιτίας του τόξου (καμάρα) που σχηματίζεται στο πέλμα κάθε ποδιού. Το 2010, διεθνής ομάδα επιστημόνων μελέτησε απολιθώματα αποτυπωμάτων στη βραχώδη παραλιακή περιοχή του χωριού Τράχηλος Χανίων, στην βορειοδυτική Κρήτη. Σε επιφάνεια τριών τετραγωνικών μέτρων διαπίστωσαν 28 αποτυπώματα ποδιών που είχαν μήκος 10-12 εκ. και πλάτος 3-7 εκ. και από τα οποία οι επιστήμονες έλαβαν προπλάσματα σιλικόνης για να τα μελετήσουν σε τρισδιάστατη μορφή στο εργαστήριο. Αφού αποκλείστηκε η πιθανότητα να έχουν γίνει από τετράποδο ζώο ήταν εύκολο να διακρίνουν πέντε δάκτυλα με το ένα να είναι μεγαλύτερο από τα άλλα αλλά όχι μακρύτερο, όπως του πιθήκου, καθώς και την απουσία μεγάλων νυχιών επάνω σε αυτά που θα πιστοποιούσαν κάποιου είδους οπλή. Ωστόσο, στα αποτυπώματα δεν φαινόταν η καμάρα που σχηματίζει το πέλμα του ανθρώπου αλλά γνωρίζουμε από την Αφρική ότι αυτή σχηματίστηκε με βεβαιότητα στο ανθρώπινο πόδι πριν από 2,5 εκατ. χρόνια. Συνεπώς, τα αποτυπώματα στον Τράχηλο φαίνεται ότι έγιναν από μέλος ανθρωπιδών που περπατούσε όρθιο στα δύο του πόδια. Η χρονολόγηση των αποτυπωμάτων έγινε με γεωλογικές παρατηρήσεις, μεθόδους και μετρήσεις. Αρχικά διαπιστώθηκε ότι τα αποτυπώματα είχαν γίνει πριν από 5,6 εκατ. χρόνια ενώ περαιτέρω παρατηρήσεις ανέβασαν την χρονολογία στο πριν από τα 6 εκατ. χρόνια. Γεωλογικές έρευνες έχουν αποδείξει ότι την εποχή εκείνη η βορειοδυτική πλευρά της Κρήτης ήταν ενωμένη με την νοτιοανατολική Πελοπόννησο με μια σχετικά στενή λωρίδα γης. Έτσι, ίσως θα μπορούσε να υποθεθεί ότι ο *Graecopithecus* περπάτησε από την Αττική στην Κρήτη πριν από τουλάχιστον 6 εκατ. χρόνια. Τα παλαιότερα άλλα αποτυπώματα βαδίσεως ανθρωπιδών είχαν βρεθεί στην περιοχή Λαετόλη (Laetoli), στην Τανζανία, στην ανατολική Αφρική, και είχαν χρονολογηθεί ότι έγιναν πριν από 3,7 εκατ. χρόνια. Το γεγονός ότι εκείνα τα αποτυπώματα δείχνουν ότι τα πέλματα των ανθρωπιδών είχαν καμάρα ενώ στην Κρήτη δεν υπάρχει η καμάρα στα αποτυπώματα μπορεί να εξηγηθεί από το γεγονός ότι και σήμερα ορισμένοι άνθρωποι έχουν πλατυποδία (πέλμα χωρίς καμάρα), πόσο μάλλον στην αρχή του διαχωρισμού ανθρωπιδών και πιθήκων όταν, όπως και με τα δόντια από την σιαγόνα του Πύργου Βασιλίσσης, όλα τα σημερινά χαρακτηριστικά στα οστά του ανθρώπου δεν είχαν πλήρως σχηματοποιηθεί.⁹³ Συνεπώς, η παλαιοανθρωπολογική πρόταση από την

⁹³ Για όλες τις πληροφορίες σχετικά με τα οστά σε Ελλάδα και Βουλγαρία δες Madelaine Böhm and Rüdiger Braun and Florian Breier, *Ancient Bones. Unearthing the Astonishing New Story of How we became Human* (Brunswick, Australia: Scribe, 2020), Part 1 & Part 2 & Part 3.10-11. Αυτά τα

δεύτερη δεκαετία του 21ου αιώνα ως προς την καταγωγή του πρώτου ή εκ των πρώτων από τους ανθρωπίδες που ξεχώρισαν από τον πίθηκο είναι ότι αυτοί έζησαν στην Αττική, στην Βουλγαρία, στην Κρήτη και όχι στην Αφρική. Επιστημονικά, λοιπόν, αμφισβητείται η θεωρία της προελεύσεως του ανθρώπου από την Αφρική. Not out of Africa. *Out of Europe*, φωνάζουν κάποιοι επιστήμονες.

Για έναν ιστορικό, τα τεκμήρια αυτά θα ήταν αρκετά για να αποφανθεί ότι υπάρχουν αρκετές ενδείξεις ότι η αρχή της εξελίξεως του ανθρώπου συντελέστηκε στην νοτιοανατολική Ευρώπη αλλά ένας παλαιοανθρωπολόγος θα επέμενε ότι τα στοιχεία είναι ανεπαρκή για να ταράξουν την μέχρι σήμερα επιστημονική πεποίθηση ότι το ανθρώπινο είδος γεννήθηκε στην Αφρική. Φυσικά, η θεωρία αυτή δεν έχει προς το παρόν γίνει ευρέως αποδεκτή και η κριτική δεν αφορά στην χρονολόγηση των ευρημάτων αλλά στον ελάχιστο αριθμό τεκμηρίων στα οποία βασίζεται. Η διαφορά στις ρίζες των δοντιών των ανθρωπιδών από την Αττική και την Βουλγαρία σε σχέση με τους πιθήκους θεωρείται ένα και μοναδικό τεκμήριο που δεν είναι από μόνο του πειστικό για τους περισσότερους επιστήμονες της εξελίξεως του ανθρώπου ενώ τα αποτυπώματα δεν έχουν αναλυθεί ανεξάρτητα από την σχέση τους με τον *Graecopithecus*. Λείπουν, με άλλα λόγια, τα απολύτως πειστικά τεκμήρια για την υποστήριξη της θεωρίας περί εξαπλώσεως του ανθρώπου στην Γη από την Ευρώπη. Ακόμη, όμως, και εάν ήθελαν οι επιστήμονες να βρουν αυτή την αρχή του ανθρώπινου είδους στην Αφρική, θα χρειαζόταν μία όσο το δυνατόν πιο πλήρης σειρά απολιθωμάτων ανθρωπιδών για να αποδειχθεί τότε έγινε ο διαχωρισμός ανθρωπιδών και πιθήκων, πράγμα που με τα σημερινά δεδομένα είναι αδύνατον.⁹⁴

Η παλαιοντολογία, η παλαιοανθρωπολογία και η αρχαιολογία είναι επιστήμες που απαιτούν γόνιμο διάλογο για να εξαχθούν συμπεράσματα ή προσωρινά συμπεράσματα ή ακόμη και υποθέσεις εργασίας αποδεκτές από την πλειοψηφία των επιστημόνων. Γι' αυτόν τον λόγο δημοσιεύονται εργασίες σε επιστημονικά περιοδικά με αναφορές σε σχετικά τεκμήρια και πλήρη βιβλιογραφική τεκμηρίωση με σημειώσεις/υποσημειώσεις. Το ίδιο συμβαίνει και στις μονογραφίες ή ακόμη και στα βιβλία εκλαϊκευμένης αλλά όχι απλουστευμένης επιστήμης με εκτενείς βιβλιογραφίες. Το κατά πόσον μία θεωρία θα γίνει αποδεκτή ή μερικώς αποδεκτή ή θα απορριφθεί τελείως εξαρτάται από τον αριθμό και την ποιότητα των τεκμηρίων που θα προσκομίσουν οι υποστηρικτές της για να πείσουν την επιστημονική κοινότητα. Αυτά συμβαίνουν όταν πρόκειται για επιστημονικό διάλογο σε επιστημονική βάση. Αντιθέτως, στην περίπτωση της ψευδοαρχαιολογίας, δεν υπάρχει διάλογος αλλά απόψεις οι οποίες είτε είναι εξαρχής επιστημονικά αβάσιμες είτε διαστρεβλώνουν κατά βούλησιν τεκμήρια και επιστημονικές απόψεις.

Η ψευδοϊστορία

Η ψευδοϊστορία βαδίζει στα αγνάρια της ψευδοαρχαιολογίας και πολλές φορές συνδέεται με αυτήν. Τα γνωρίσματά της είναι παρόμοια με αυτά της ψευδοαρχαιολογίας. Οι ψευδοϊστορικοί θεωρούν ότι μύθοι, παραδόσεις, λογοτεχνικές ιστορίες είναι πραγματική Ιστορία. Δεν εφαρμόζουν καμία κριτική σκέψη ή σκεπτικισμό στις αναφορές και γενικά στην συγγραφή της Αρχαίας Ευρωπαϊκής Ιστορίας από τους Αρχαίους Ιστορικούς ή της Μεσαιωνικής από τους χρονικογράφους και αγνοούν τον

μέρη του βιβλίου βασίζονται στις επιστημονικές δημοσιεύσεις: Madelaine Böhme et al., «Messinian age and savannah environment of the possible hominin *Graecopithecus* from Europe,» *PLoS ONE* 12(5) (22 May 2017): e0177347 και Jochen Fuss and Nikolai Spassov and David R. Begun and Madelaine Böhme, «Potential hominin affinities of *Graecopithecus* from the Late Miocene of Europe,» *PLoS ONE* 12(5) (22 May 2017): e0177127.

⁹⁴ Jay Kelley, review of *Ancient Bones. Unearthing the Astonishing New Story of How we became Human*, by Madelaine Böhme and Rüdiger Braun and Florian Breier, *The Quarterly Review of Biology* 96 (September 2021): 223.

σχολιασμό τους από τους επιμελητές-φιλολόγους των κριτικών εκδόσεων. Πιστεύουν ακράδαντα στους μύθους που έχουν δημιουργηθεί για οποιαδήποτε ιστορική περίοδο και προσπαθούν να αποδείξουν ότι πρόκειται για πραγματικά ιστορικά γεγονότα. Αδυνατούν να κατανοήσουν ή αποφεύγουν την κριτική θεώρηση των γεγονότων της Ιστορίας από πανεπιστημιακά εκπαιδευμένους ιστορικούς, όπως αυτά δημοσιεύονται σε άρθρα σε επιστημονικά ιστορικά περιοδικά, επιστημονικά τεκμηριωμένες μονογραφίες ή εκδόσεις Γενικής Ιστορίας. Συνήθως, έχουν συγκεκριμένη αποστολή για να υποστηρίξουν συγκεκριμένη πολιτική ή θρησκευτική άποψη της ιστορίας τους παρά να αναζητήσουν επιστημονικά την Ιστορία την ίδια. Δεν αποδέχονται ότι η Ιστορία αλλά και η συγγραφή της αποτελούνται από τεκμηριωμένα γεγονότα, υποθέσεις εργασίας, συνδυασμό γεγονότων, απόψεις, εκτιμήσεις και αμφιβολίες αλλά δέχονται μόνο ό,τι αυτοί θεωρούν ότι είναι απολύτως αληθινό. Είναι απόλυτα πεπεισμένοι ότι η Ιστορία βασίζεται μόνο σε ηθικές ή πολιτικές αρχές και κατακεραυνώνουν οποιαδήποτε ακαδημαϊκή και επιστημονική της θεώρηση, όπως αυτή ασκείται από τους πανεπιστημιακά εκπαιδευμένους ιστορικούς. Επιλέγουν και αξιοποιούν στο έπακρο μόνο εκείνες τις πηγές που εξυπηρετούν αυτό που επιθυμούν εκείνοι να αποδείξουν ως ιστορία. Εκτιμούν ότι πίσω από οποιαδήποτε κριτική των απόψεών τους κρύβεται συνωμοσία, ρατσισμός, αθεΐα, εθνοκεντρισμός, πολιτική ή θρησκευτική σκοπιμότητα και αρνούνται να την συζητήσουν.⁹⁵

Γνωστά παραδείγματα ψευδοϊστορίας είναι ο αφροκεντρισμός (δηλαδή, ο δυτικός πολιτισμός γεννήθηκε στην Αφρική), ο ευρωκεντρισμός (δηλαδή, η μόνη σωστή πολιτισμική έποψη του κόσμου είναι η ευρωπαϊκή), ο δημιουργισμός (creationism) κατά τον οποίο ο κόσμος δημιουργήθηκε από τον Θεό χωρίς την φυσική διαδικασία της εξέλιξης των ειδών, η άρνηση του Ολοκαυτώματος των Εβραίων, της Γενοκτονίας των Αρμενίων και των Χριστιανών του Πόντου (βόρεια Τουρκία). Από την άλλη πλευρά, βέβαια, δεν πρέπει να συγχέεται η ψευδοϊστορία με την λογοτεχνική παράδοση των λαών της Υδρογείου, όπως ο Κατακλυσμός και η ελληνική μυθολογία, στην οποία ορισμένες φορές οι ιστορικοί βρίσκουν ψήγματα ιστορικής πραγματικότητας αλλά και την οποία δεν εκλαμβάνουν ως απόλυτη και μοναδική αλήθεια αλλά απλώς ως λογοτεχνία. Ούτε φυσικά η ιστορική λογοτεχνία, δηλαδή λογοτεχνία βασισμένη σε ιστορικά γεγονότα, ή οι ιστορικές κινηματογραφικές ταινίες ή τηλεοπτικές σειρές που είναι απλώς κινηματογράφος ή τηλεόραση, αποτελούν μέρος της ψευδοϊστορίας και ούτε φυσικά τα ιστορικά/αρχαιολογικά ντοκιμαντέρ με εκπαιδευμένους ιστορικούς ή αρχαιολόγους ως επιστημονικούς συμβούλους. Η λογοτεχνία είναι λογοτεχνία, ο κινηματογράφος είναι κινηματογράφος και αποτελούν ιστορίες αλλά όχι Ιστορία ενώ η ψευδοϊστορία προσποιείται ότι είναι Ιστορία και εξ αιτίας αυτής της της ιδιότητας ονομάζεται και προσποιητή ιστορία. Για παράδειγμα, η διήγηση ενός Γερμανού, συνεργάτη των Ναζί και «αυτόπτη μάρτυρα», της ζωής των αιχμαλώτων στο στρατόπεδο συγκεντρώσεως του Άουσβιτς⁹⁶ αλλά και η προπαγανδιστική ναζιστική ταινία μίας ώρας του 1942 *Το Γκέτο* (της Βαρσοβίας, *Das Ghetto*),⁹⁷ με τα οποία παρουσιάζεται ως ειδυλλιακή η ζωή των αιχμαλώτων Εβραίων και άλλων στα ναζιστικά στρατόπεδα συγκεντρώσεως και στο γκέτο είναι φυσικά ψευδοϊστορία. Η μόνη πραγματική Ιστορία που περιέχουν είναι πόσο εξαιρετικοί υπήρξαν οι Ναζί στην σύλληψη και στην εφαρμογή της προπαγάνδας. Η ψευδοϊστορία παρουσιάζεται με διάφορες εκδοχές,

⁹⁵ Robert Todd Carroll, ed., *The Skeptic's Dictionary*, λμ. «pseudohistory».

⁹⁶ Christophersen/Roeder, *Auschwitz. An Unbiased Eyewitness Report on the Real Life in a Concentration Camp. There were no Gas Chambers!* New edition printed in the USA (Schwarzenborn, West Germany: Deutsche Burgerinitiative, 1979). First edition in German as *Die Auschwitz Lüge*, 1973 and in English as *The Auschwitz Lie*, 1974.

⁹⁷ *Wikipedia*, λμ. «A Film Unfinished», at <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A_Film_Unfinished> και Przemysław Batorski, «May 1942. The Germans shoot a film in the Warsaw Ghetto» at <<https://www.jhi.pl/en/articles/may-1942-the-germans-shoot-a-film-in-the-warsaw-ghetto,5173>>.

όπως είναι η υπόθεση της μαύρης Αθηνάς με αρχαιολογικές και ιστορικές προεκτάσεις, η έρευνα για το ποιος λαός ήταν αυτός που ανακάλυψε πρώτος την αμερικανική ήπειρο πριν από τον Κολόμβο, οι εξωγήινοι που επισκέφθηκαν και επισκέπτονται κατά καιρούς την Γη, τα μαγνητικά πεδία ορισμένων πλανητών που πλησιάζοντας την Γη επηρέασαν την Ιστορία της, ο κατά φαντασία συγχρονισμός των ιστορικών γεγονότων των πολιτισμών στην Μεσοποταμία, στην Αρχαία Εγγύς Ανατολή, στην Αίγυπτο και στην Ελλάδα μέχρι τον Αλέξανδρο Γ' της Μακεδονίας, και φυσικά η χαμένη Ατλαντίδα.⁹⁸

Προσωρινά Συμπεράσματα: Η χαμένη Ιστορία των Αρχαίων Μεσσηνίων

Παραβλέποντας, όμως, αυτά τα προφανή ίσως για την μεγάλη πλειοψηφία ψευδοϊστορικά γεγονότα και αναλύσεις, είναι πιο ενδιαφέρον από επιστημονικής πλευράς να επικεντρωθούμε σε ένα ζήτημα ψευδοϊστορίας που αφορά σε διαμάχη ιστορικών. Πρόκειται για την χαμένη Ιστορία των Μεσσηνίων πριν από την απελευθέρωσή τους από τον Επαμεινώνδα (περ. 370/369 π.Χ.).⁹⁹ Το ιστορικό ερώτημα που τέθηκε για τους Μεσσηνίους την περίοδο που υπήρξαν είλωτες υπό τους Σπαρτιάτες ήταν εάν τότε είχαν Ιστορία. Μία μερίδα ιστορικών υποστήριξε ότι επειδή οι είλωτες Μεσσηνίοι δεν ήταν οργανωμένοι ως έθνος ή Πόλη, εξ ορισμού δεν ήταν δυνατόν να έχουν Ιστορία με βάση την αρχαιοελληνική αντίληψη ότι μόνο η Πόλις των πολιτών είχε ή μπορούσε να δημιουργήσει Ιστορία. Συνεπώς, όλες οι πληροφορίες που προέρχονται κυρίως από τον Πausανία (Βιβλίο Δ', «Μεσσηνιακά») για την παλαιά ζωή των Μεσσηνίων δεν μπορεί παρά να είναι μυθεύματα των ίδιων των Μεσσηνίων που εξύφanan οι ίδιοι μετά την απελευθέρωσή τους από τους Σπαρτιάτες. Μία άλλη ομάδα ιστορικών υπερασπίστηκε το δικαίωμα των Μεσσηνίων ειλώτων να έχουν Ιστορία και υποστήριξε ότι εξ αιτίας της υποδουλώσεώς τους οι σκλάβοι αυτοί και επιθυμούσαν και κατάφεραν να διατηρήσουν στην μνήμη τους από γενιά σε γενιά την Ιστορία τους για όσο καιρό βρίσκονταν στα δεσμά των Σπαρτιατών. Φυσικά, η άποψη αυτή ήταν τόσο αβέβαιη ιστορικά όσο και η αντίθετη αλλά οι υποστηρικτές της πίστευαν ότι υπήρχε ιστορική συνέχεια πριν και μετά την απελευθέρωση των Μεσσηνίων ειλώτων. Και οι δύο πλευρές βασίζονταν στην φιλολογική παράδοση που έχει διατηρήσει ο Πausανίας και ουσιαστικά έκρυβαν πολιτικές απόψεις και ακαδημαϊκές εμπειρίες των υποστηρικτών τους από τα πρώτα εξήντα χρόνια του 20ου αιώνα.

Η πρόκληση που αντιμετώπισε η Susan E. Alcock που ασχολήθηκε με το ζήτημα αυτό ήταν «πώς θα μπορούσε η αρχαιολογία να συνεισφέρει στην μελέτη της μνήμης». Δηλαδή, πώς θα μπορούσε μέσα από την αρχαιολογία «να ανακτηθεί με ποιο τρόπο οι άνθρωποι θυμούνταν το παρελθόν;» Στην πραγματικότητα δεν είναι πάντα εύκολο να ανακαλύψει κανείς την μνήμη των ανθρώπων μέσα από την αρχαιολογία αλλά μπορεί να είναι εφικτό «να ταυτοποιήσει τα περιβάλλοντα (*contexts*) μνήμης». Ένα από αυτά τα περιβάλλοντα μπορεί να είναι η αρχαιολογική ανακάλυψη ότι σε ένα σημείο στην νοτιοδυτική Μεσσηνία οι είλωτες ζούσαν σε μικρές κοινότητες σε αντίθεση με όσους διαβίωναν στα αγροκτήματα. Συγκριτικές μελέτες και μελέτες διαβιώσεως σκλάβων έχουν δείξει ότι ο τρόπος διαβιώσεως ανθρώπων σε κατάσταση σκλαβιάς επηρεάζεται από «τον τρόπο επικοινωνίας, μεταδόσεως πληροφοριών, και ενδυναμώσεως της κοινοτικής ταυτότητας». Επίσης, οι ανασκαφές στην Μεσσηνία έδειξαν ότι υπήρχαν αποδείξεις κατοπινής λατρείας των ταφών της Εποχής του Ορειχάλκου αλλά και συνεχιζόμενη λειτουργία ορισμένων μεσσηνιακών ιερών, κυρίως του Δία στην Ιθώμη και του Απόλλωνα Κορυθού στη σημερινή Λογγά Μεσσηνίας

⁹⁸ Για τα θέματα αυτά δες Ronald H. Fritze, *Invented Knowledge. False History, Fake Science and Pseudo-Religions* (London: Reaktion 2009).

⁹⁹ Για τον ρόλο του Επαμεινώνδα σε αυτήν την περίπτωση δες Δημήτρης Ι. Λοΐζος, *Η Αρχαία Ελλάδα και οι Ανατολικοί Λαοί*, 3η έκδ., σ. 325-326.

(13 χλμ. Νότια από το Πεταλίδι), στην δυτική πλευρά του Μεσσηνιακού Κόλπου. Τα ιερά, όπως και οι σημερινές Χριστιανικές εκκλησίες, δεν ήταν μόνο τόποι λατρείας αλλά και συναντήσεων, συνομιλιών, διηγήσεων και χώρος όπου οι πιστοί μπορούσαν να ανασύρουν στο μυαλό του και να συζητήσουν με τους άλλους πιστούς μνήμες του παρελθόντος. Η εύκολη λύση, συνεχίζει η Alcock, θα ήταν να θεωρηθεί ότι τα αρχαιολογικά τεκμήρια εκφράζουν τους Μεσσηνίους *per se* αλλά είναι πιθανόν οι Μεσσήνιοι, με τον τρόπο που αναφέρονται, να είναι δημιούργημα των Σπαρτιατών, δηλαδή να είναι διάφοροι λαοί οι οποίοι απλώς έμεναν στην Μεσσηνία και έγιναν είλωτες από τους Σπαρτιάτες. Συνεπώς, οι μνήμες για τους Μεσσηνίους είλωτες «θα βρίσκονταν σε διαδικασία μετασχηματισμού, όχι σε σταθερή προσκόλληση σε ένα 'αληθινό' παρελθόν». Φαίνεται ότι αυτή η διαδικασία επιταχύνθηκε μετά την απελευθέρωση των Μεσσηνίων όταν μαζί με άλλες στην περιοχή ιδρύθηκε η Πόλη της Μεσσήνης, οι αγροτικές εγκαταστάσεις πολλαπλασιάστηκαν, τα ιερά στην ύπαιθρο αυξήθηκαν ενώ εντατικοποιήθηκε και η χρήση της γης. Οι δραματικές αυτές μεταβολές πρέπει να είχαν και σημαντική επίδραση στην αντίληψη των Μεσσηνίων για τους εαυτούς τους, δηλαδή «εφευρήματα» για να καλυφθούν τα χάσματα της παραδόσεως. Από την μακρά αναφορά του Πausανία (Βιβλίο Δ', «Μεσσηνιακά») στους Μεσσηνίους γίνεται φανερό ότι ορισμένα στοιχεία αναφέρονται πολύ συνοπτικά και άλλα εκτενώς, ιδίως σε ό,τι αφορά στην μετά την απελευθέρωση εποχή, γεγονός που είναι εμφανές και στα αρχαιολογικά τεκμήρια. Δηλαδή, φαίνεται ότι οι Μεσσήνιοι εφήρμοσαν μία διαδικασία μνήμης και λήθης, την οποία όμως δεν πρέπει να εκλαμβάνουμε ούτε ως ψευδοϊστορία ούτε ως ολική διατήρηση των παραδόσεων. Μόνο ο συνδυασμός φιλολογικών πηγών και αρχαιολογικών δεδομένων, καταλήγει η Alcock, μπορεί να δώσει απαντήσεις για την Ιστορία των Μεσσηνίων όταν βρίσκονταν υπό τον ζυγό των Σπαρτιατών αλλά και μετέπειτα.¹⁰⁰

Όντως, οι αρχαιολογικές ανασκαφές στην Αρχαία Μεσσήνη αποκάλυψαν κεραμική που βεβαιώνει την παρουσία οικισμού ήδη από τον Θ'-Η' αιώνα π.Χ. Το γεγονός αυτό αποδεικνύει «ως εσφαλμένη [την] άποψη ότι δεν υπάρχουν στην θέση της πόλης ίχνη οικισμού παλαιότερου της ιδρύσεως της νέας απελευθερωμένης Μεσσήνης από τον Επαμεινώνδα το 370/369 π.Χ.».¹⁰¹ Συγκεκριμένα, η πολεοδομική Ιστορία της πόλεως άρχισε μετά το 800 π.Χ., όταν το ιερό του Διός Ιθώματα βρισκόταν σε πλήρη λειτουργία και μάλιστα μαζί με άλλα οικοδομήματα συνιστούσε το πόλισμα Ιθώμη, στην ίδια ακριβώς θέση όπου αργότερα ιδρύθηκε η Μεσσήνη. Επιπλέον, οι φιλολογικές μαρτυρίες για την πριν τον Δ' αιώνα π.Χ. Μεσσήνη είναι σημαντικές. Οι νίκες των Μεσσηνίων αθλητών στους Ολυμπιακούς Αγώνες κατά τον Ζ' αιώνα π.Χ. είναι πολλές. Μεσσήνιοι αθλητές¹⁰² νίκησαν σε διάφορα αγωνίσματα το 768,¹⁰³ το 764,¹⁰⁴ το 752,¹⁰⁵ το 748,¹⁰⁶ το 744,¹⁰⁷ το 740,¹⁰⁸ το 736,¹⁰⁹ το 684 π.Χ.¹¹⁰ Για μια δεκαετία (περ. 737-717 π.Χ.) διεξήχθη ο Α' Μεσσηνιακός Πόλεμος μεταξύ Μεσσηνίων και Σπαρτιατών και αργότερα ο Β' Μεσσηνιακός Πόλεμος (περ. 669-657 π.Χ.) και ο Γ' Μεσσηνιακός Πόλεμος (469 με 464-460/459) ενώ υπήρξε νέα εξέγερση μετά τον κα-

¹⁰⁰ Susan E. Alcock, «The Pseudo-History of Messenia Unplugged,» *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 129 (1999): 333-341.

¹⁰¹ Πέτρος Γ. Θέμελης, *Η Αρχαία Μεσσήνη* (Αθήνα: ΤΑΠΑ, 1999), σ. 17.

¹⁰² Μάλλον συμπεριλαμβάνεται και ο Λύκος ο Μεσσήνιος, Moretti, *Olympionikai*, no. 1014.

¹⁰³ Ανδροκλος, Moretti, *Olympionikai*, no. 3

¹⁰⁴ Πολυχάρης, Moretti, *Olympionikai*, no. 4.

¹⁰⁵ Δαίκλης, Moretti, *Olympionikai*, no. 7.

¹⁰⁶ Αντικλής, Moretti, *Olympionikai*, no. 8.

¹⁰⁷ Ξενόδοκος, Moretti, *Olympionikai*, no. 9.

¹⁰⁸ Δοτάδης, Moretti, *Olympionikai*, no. 10.

¹⁰⁹ Λεοχάρης, Moretti, *Olympionikai*, no. 11.

¹¹⁰ Φάνας, Moretti, *Olympionikai*, no. 31

ταστροφικό σεισμό του 464.¹¹¹ Ο σεισμός αυτός, ο οποίος μπορεί να ήταν τελικά συνεχής σεισμική δραστηριότητα που διήρκεσε για ένα ή και περισσότερα έτη (466-463; π.Χ.), προξένησε μεγάλες ζημιές στην λακωνική ύπαιθρο αλλά και την κατάρρευση τμήματος του Ταΰγετου. Επίσης, ο σεισμός κατέστρεψε την πόλη της Σπάρτης και είχε ως αποτέλεσμα τον θάνατο 20.000 Λακεδαιμονίων (πιθανότατα σε όλη την Λακωνία).¹¹² Το 464 π.Χ., οι Μεσσήνιοι κατέλαβαν την φυσική οχυρά θέση στο όρος Ιθώμη¹¹³ και οι Σπαρτιάτες τους πολιορκήσαν για δέκα έτη μέχρι που αναγκάστηκαν να συνθηκολογήσουν και με την βοήθεια των Αθηναίων να καταφύγουν στην Ναύπακτο (455; π.Χ.).¹¹⁴ Συμμάχησαν με τους Αθηναίους στην Πύλο το 426/5 π.Χ. και αφιέρωσαν στους Δελφούς μετά την νίκη: «[Μ]εσσάνιο[ι και Ναυπάκτιοι] άνέθ[εσαν] [ά]πό Καλ[υδωνίων δεκάταν τ]ῶι Απ[όλωνι]»¹¹⁵ μαζί με το άγαλμα της Νίκης του Παιωνίου.¹¹⁶ Το 399 π.Χ., οι Σπαρτιάτες κατάφεραν να εκδιώξουν τους Μεσσηνίους από την Ναύπακτο και έτσι εκείνοι κατέφυγαν στην Σικελία και στο Ρήγιο αλλά οι περισσότεροι στην Κυρηναϊκή υπό τον Κόμωνα, αρχηγό τους στην Πύλο. Μετά την νίκη του Επαμεινώνδα και την ίδρυση της Μεσσήνης, οι εξόριστοι αυτοί προσκλήθηκαν να επιστρέψουν και να εγκατασταθούν στην νέα πόλη.¹¹⁷ Αυτή είναι η γνωστή Ιστορία της Ιθώμης/Μεσσήνης και των κατοίκων της, πριν από το κτίσιμο της νέας Μεσσήνης μετά την απελευθέρωση από τον Επαμεινώνδα, από τις φιλολογικές πηγές και τις αρχαιολογικές ανασκαφές.

Η θεωρία, λοιπόν, ότι οι Μεσσήνιοι δεν είχαν Ιστορία πριν από την απελευθέρωσή τους και ότι όλες αυτές οι πληροφορίες κυρίως από τον Πausανία είναι ψευδοϊστορία δεν ευσταθεί. Βέβαια, όπως προσπάθησε να δείξει η Alcock, δεν πρέπει όλες οι πληροφορίες από τις φιλολογικές πηγές να εκλαμβάνονται ως απολύτως αληθινές, όπως άλλωστε έχει συμβεί και σε πολλές άλλες στιγμές της Ιστορίας, αλλά πρέπει να λαμβάνονται υπόψιν ιδίως όταν τις επιβεβαιώνει η αρχαιολογία. Όταν τον 2ο μ.Χ. αιώνα ο Πausανίας έγραψε για των «Μεσσηνίων τά πολλά παθήματα»¹¹⁸ μέχρι το 370/369 π.Χ., άντλησε τις πληροφορίες του από τις διηγήσεις των Μεσσηνίων, όπως αυτές είχαν παραδοθεί από γενιά σε γενιά. Δεν έκανε ο ίδιος την επιλογή των λεπτομερειών της διηγήσεως του αλλά δεν είναι παράδοξο να θεωρηθεί ότι αποτύπωσε την μνήμη και την λήθη των Μεσσηνίων, περισσότερο τα δεινά παρά τις ευχάριστες στιγμές. Στην Ιθώμη/Μεσσήνη οι αρχαιολόγοι έχουν ανασύρει μέσα από τα σκάμματα και την μνήμη αλλά και την λήθη της ζωής των Μεσσηνίων.

Η ελλιπής ιστορία

Η λεπτή γραμμή στην επιστημονική διαφωνία των ιστορικών για την ψευδοϊστορία των Μεσσηνίων αλλά και οι αστικοί μύθοι του τύπου πόσοι ήταν έγκλειστοι στην Βαστίλη πριν από την Γαλλική Επανάσταση, πόσοι σκοτώθηκαν εκεί, δεν αποτελούν τα μόνο δεινά της ιστορικής αλήθειας. Μαζί τους φωλιάζει αλλά συνήθως ξεχωρίζει και είναι ιδιαίτερα δημοφιλής η ελλιπής ιστορία. Ως ελλιπής ιστορία μπορεί

¹¹¹ Δημήτρης Ι. Λοΐζος, *Η Αρχαία Ελλάδα και οι Ανατολικοί Λαοί*, 3η έκδ., σ. 174 & 177-178 & 230-231.

¹¹² Για τον σεισμό δεξ Θουκ., I.101 και Plinius, II.191 και Πλούταρχος, *Βίοι Παράλληλοι*, «Κίμων», XVI και Πausανίας, IV.24.6 και Δ.Σ., XI.63 και βιβλιογραφία για τον σεισμό σε Nicholas Ambraseys, *Earthquakes in the Mediterranean and Middle East* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press & Academy of Athens, 2009), pp. 81-82.

¹¹³ Τον 5^ο αιώνα π.Χ. επρόκειτο για ατείχιστο φρούριο. Δες Paul Cartledge, *Sparta and Lakonia, A Regional History 1300-362 BC* (London: Routledge & Kegan, 1979), pp. 189-190.

¹¹⁴ Θουκ., I.101-103.

¹¹⁵ PHI Greek Inscriptions, # PH240102, Central Greece (IG VII-IX) FD III 4:1[3] at <<https://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/240102>>.

¹¹⁶ Θέμελης, *Η Αρχαία Μεσσήνη* (Αθήνα: ΤΑΠΑ, 1999), σ. 21 & Εικ. 7.

¹¹⁷ Πausανίας, IV. 26.2 & 26.5.

¹¹⁸ Πausανίας, IV.29.13.

να χαρακτηριστεί η συγγραφή του ιστορικού συγγραφέα που επιλέγει, είτε από σκοπού είτε επειδή δεν έχει άλλη επιλογή, τις πηγές του. Σύνηθες φαινόμενο σε όσους ασχολούνται με την μετά το 1830 ελληνική Ιστορία είναι η επιλογή ως μόνης πηγής αληθείας οι προσωπικές μαρτυρίες από απομνημονεύματα αλλά και η προφορική ιστορία (λ.χ. συνεντεύξεις) αγνοώντας τα τεκμήρια κρατικών και άλλων υπηρεσιών στην Ελλάδα αλλά κυρίως τις πληροφορίες που μπορεί να αντλήσει ο/η ιστορικός από τα αρχεία άλλων κρατών. Ομοίως, όσοι ασχολούνται με την Αρχαία Ιστορία φροντίζουν να μελετούν και να αναφέρονται μόνο στις αρχαίες φιλολογικές πηγές μη λαμβάνοντας υπόψιν τους επιγραφές, νομισματικά τεκμήρια, αρχαιολογικές ανασκαφές, τεκμήρια από παπύρους, σχολιασμούς πηγών αλλά και μελέτες άλλων ιστορικών που έχουν ασχοληθεί με τα ίδια θέματα. Η ελλιπής ιστορία χαρακτηρίζεται από θέματα προσφιλή στο πλατύ αναγνωστικό κοινό, είναι κατά βάση μόνο πολιτική ιστορία και περιγραφή γεγονότων (περιγραφική και συμβαντολογική ιστορία, *factual history*), χωρίς βιβλιογραφική έρευνα (*literature review*), χωρίς να ληφθούν υπόψιν οι αναλύσεις Ελλήνων και ξένων πανεπιστημιακά εκπαιδευμένων ιστορικών και αρχαιολόγων. Συνήθως, τα παραδείγματα ελλιπούς ιστορίας αφορούν σε δημοσιογράφους, ιστοριοδίφες και φιλόλογους, οι οποίοι συγγράφουν ιστορίες για την Αρχαία Αθήνα, την Σπάρτη, τις ελληνικές αποικίες, τον 'Μέγα' Αλέξανδρο και τον Φίλιππο της Μακεδονίας, την Ολυμπιάδα κλπ με μόνη τους πηγή τους αρχαίους συγγραφείς και που και που κάποια μεταφρασμένα στα ελληνικά ξενόγλωσση Γενική Ιστορία και ίσως μονογραφία. Χαρακτηριστικό παράδειγμα είναι τα βιβλία του φιλόλογου Σαράντου Καργάκου. Όμως, από τους δημοσιογράφους υπάρχουν και εκείνοι (κυρίως Γρηγόρης Δαφνής, Σόλων Νεοκ. Γρηγοριάδης, Αλέξης Παπαχελάς) που πραγματοποίησαν ερευνητική δημοσιογραφία και δημοσίευσαν τα αποτελέσματά της για να βοηθήσουν με πηγές και απόψεις σε κατοπινό χρόνο τους πανεπιστημιακά εκπαιδευμένους ιστορικούς. Αυτές οι ελλιπείς ιστορίες γραμμένες γενικά από διάφορους φιλόλογους, ιστοριοδίφες, δημοσιογράφους αλλά όχι από πανεπιστημιακά εκπαιδευμένους ιστορικούς είναι πολύ διαδεδομένες και δημοφιλείς διότι είναι εύληπτες, είναι γεμάτες με απόλυτες απαντήσεις στα ερωτήματα του αναγνώστη και χωρίς αμφιβολίες, χωρίς αμφισβητήσεις διότι είναι πάντα μονομερείς. Αναδεικνύουν το μεγαλείο των «μεγάλων ανδρών» και το «θαύμα των Ελλήνων» αλλά αναλώνονται και σε συγγραφικές πολεμικές του τύπου «η ελληνική ιστορική συνέχεια και η υπονόμευσή της», όλα με μόνες πηγές τους αρχαίους συγγραφείς και προσωπικές και μόνο απόψεις και συνήθως προτάσσοντας την λέξη «Ιστορία του/της...». Μάλιστα, οι συγγραφείς αυτοί αναπτύσσουν τις απόψεις τους σε εκατοντάδες σελίδες, σε πολλούς τόμους αλλά και επί θεμάτων που μπορεί να καλύπτουν ολόκληρη την ελληνική ιστορία των 3000 περίπου ετών. Οι φιλομαθείς αναγνώστες που ζητούν να κορέσουν την ιστορική τους δίψα με εύκολες ιστοριούλες για το παρελθόν σπεύδουν να αναγνώσουν τα φιλολογικά αλλά όχι ιστορικά αυτά έργα.

Η ελλιπής ιστορία, η οποία μερικές φορές γράφεται και από πανεπιστημιακούς ιστορικούς, είναι πολύ εύκολο να διαγνωσθεί και να απομονωθεί. Το πρώτο που πρέπει να ελέγχει ο σοβαρός αναγνώστης βιβλίων Ιστορίας είναι εάν υπάρχει και τι περιλαμβάνει η βιβλιογραφία στις τελευταίες σελίδες του βιβλίου. Ορισμένοι συγγραφείς ακολουθούν το γαλλικό πρότυπο και παραθέτουν την βιβλιογραφία στην αρχή του ιστορικού βιβλίου. Η έλλειψη οποιασδήποτε βιβλιογραφίας (εκτός εάν σε σπάνιες περιπτώσεις υπάρχουν μόνο υποσημειώσεις) χαρακτηρίζει το βιβλίο ως μη ιστορική συγγραφή αλλά απλώς ως σύνολο ιστοριών και απόψεων που δεν μπορούν να επαληθευθούν από τον αναγνώστη/μελετητή. Όσο ενδιαφέρον και εάν είναι το θέμα του, το βιβλίο αυτό πρέπει να απορριφθεί και να μην απασχολήσει τον ιστορικό μελετητή καθόλου διότι δεν είναι αξιόπιστο. Στην περίπτωση που παρατίθεται βιβλιογραφία πρέπει να ελεγχθεί εάν αυτή χρησιμοποιείται σε εντός κειμένου παραπομπές (ση-

μειώσεις/υποσημειώσεις) ή είναι απλώς διακοσμητική. Δηλαδή, μήπως ο συγγραφέας για να μεταμφιέσει την ιστορία του σε επιστημονική ιστορική συγγραφή απλώς παρέθεσε μία σειρά από βιβλιογραφικές αναφορές που όπως δεν φαίνεται ότι χρησιμοποιήθηκαν για την συγγραφή του ιστορικού κειμένου. Υπάρχει και η περίπτωση να έχουν χρησιμοποιηθεί ορισμένες μόνο πηγές/βιβλιογραφία στις υποσημειώσεις ενώ στο τέλος ή στην αρχή του βιβλίου τα παρατιθέμενα βιβλία είναι πολύ περισσότερα. Δηλαδή, ο συγγραφέας παρέθεσε πολλά non-vidi (που δεν τα εξέτασε/μελέτησε καν) βιβλία για λόγους εντυπωσιασμού του αναγνωστικού του κοινού. Με άλλα λόγια, μία αξιόπιστη ιστορική συγγραφή πρέπει να είναι λεπτομερώς βιβλιογραφικά υπομνηματισμένη με σημειώσεις/υποσημειώσεις εντός κειμένου και την αντίστοιχη βιβλιογραφία συγκεντρωμένη στο τέλος ή στην αρχή του βιβλίου. Με απλά λόγια, ο συγγραφέας Ιστορίας πρέπει να δείχνει στον αναγνώστη πού ακριβώς βρήκε (πηγή) την πληροφορία που αναφέρει στο κείμενό του, έτσι ώστε να μπορεί ο δεύτερος να την επαληθεύσει αλλά και να την κατανοήσει καλύτερα διαβάζοντας ολόκληρη την πηγή, εάν παρατίθεται μόνο απόσπασμά της στην ιστορική συγγραφή. Μάλιστα, ο υποψιασμένος μελετητής μπορεί και να ελέγξει ύποπτη βιβλιογραφική αναφορά στην σημείωση/υποσημείωση για να διαπιστώσει εάν όντως αναφέρεται ή είναι σχετική με αυτό που πραγματεύεται ο συγγραφέας στο συγκεκριμένο σημείο παραθέσεως και δεν είναι αόριστη και παραπλανητική (άσχετη με το θέμα). Οι σημειώσεις/υποσημειώσεις και η ανάλογη βιβλιογραφία είναι το πρώτο κριτήριο μιας εμπειριστατωμένης και αξιόπιστης συγγραφής Ιστορίας. Ο πανεπιστημιακά εκπαιδευμένος ιστορικός, μάλιστα, μπορεί να προχωρήσει και στην αξιολόγηση της χρησιμοποιημένης βιβλιογραφίας και ιδίως στην διαπίστωση σημαντικών ελλείψεων που μπορεί να παρουσιάζει. Δηλαδή, να διαπιστωθεί εάν ο συγγραφέας αξιοποίησε τις σημαντικές πηγές για το θέμα που έχει επιλέξει ή για παράδειγμα περιορίστηκε στην ελληνόφωνη βιβλιογραφία και μόνο. Ο αναγνώστης πρέπει να βεβαιώνεται ότι υπάρχουν σημειώσεις/υποσημειώσεις εκεί όπου ο συγγραφέας αναφέρεται σε πηγές ή σε γνώμες άλλων και να είναι ξεκάθαρα τα σημεία όπου διατυπώνει την δική του προσωπική άποψη. Η ίδια διαδικασία πρέπει να ακολουθείται και πριν την ανάγνωση ιστορικών άρθρων, στα οποία βέβαια χρησιμοποιούνται μόνο σημειώσεις/υποσημειώσεις. Ο αναγνώστης όμως δεν πρέπει να μένει σε αυτόν τον τεχνικό έλεγχο της ιστορικής συγγραφής αλλά να προχωρά και βαθύτερα στην αξιολόγηση του βιβλίου που μελετά.

Το επόμενο στάδιο αξιολογήσεως ενός ιστορικού άρθρου, μονογραφίας και βιβλίου γενικότερα αφορά στο περιεχόμενό του. Μπορεί μία μελέτη να είναι βιβλιογραφικά εμπειριστατωμένη αλλά τα επιχειρήματα του συγγραφέα να βασίζονται επί σαθρού εδάφους, δηλαδή επί δεδομένων που τελικά αποδεικνύουν εν μέρει ή δεν αποδεικνύουν καθόλου τους ιστορικούς ισχυρισμούς του συγγραφέα. Τέτοιου είδους αξιολόγηση απαιτεί έρευνα σε άλλες πηγές ή βαθιά γνώση του θέματος από τον μελετητή πριν αυτός αποφασίσει για την αξία και την επιστημονική βαρύτητα της συγγραφής που έχει κάτω από το μικροσκόπιο του. Πάντως, δεν είναι σπάνιο σε ιστορικά βιβλία που πραγματεύονται μακρές ιστορικές περιόδους, στις ονομαζόμενες συνόψεις, στην ελληνική αλλά και σε άλλες γλώσσες, ιδίως όταν απευθύνονται στο ευρύ μορφωμένο κοινό, οι σημειώσεις/υποσημειώσεις να είναι περιορισμένες ή να λείπουν τελείως και να παρατίθεται ενδεικτική και ταξινομημένη βιβλιογραφία για όποιον αναγνώστη θα ήθελε να εμβαθύνει στα θέματα του βιβλίου. Ο βαρύνων παράγων για την αξιολόγηση αυτών των βιβλίων είναι το βιογραφικό του συγγραφέα, ο οποίος συνήθως έχει συγγράψει αρκετές εμπειριστατωμένες μελέτες (άρθρα και βιβλία) και κατόπιν συγγράφει ιστορική σύννοψη για τους φοιτητές και το μορφωμένο κοινό. Εν πάσι περιπτώσει και σε κάθε περίπτωση «οὐκ ἐν τῷ πολλῷ τὸ εὖ, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ εὖ τὸ πολὺ», όπως έχει επικρατήσει η παράφραση του «οὐκ ἐν τῷ μεγάλῳ τὸ εὖ κείμενον

είναι, ἀλλὰ ἐν τῷ εὖ τὸ μέγα»,¹¹⁹ σε ὅ,τι αφορά στον αριθμό των πονημάτων των ιστορικών και αρχαιολόγων.

Μία ἄλλη εκδοχή ελλιπούς ιστορίας, η οποία στην πραγματικότητα είναι μια απλή παράθεση ιστορικών παραδόξων, ανθεί ἤδη ἀπὸ την Αρχαιότητα. Ορισμένοι συγγραφείς ἀρέσκονται να συλλέγουν και να παραθέτουν ιστορικές λεπτομέρειες που συνήθως ἀπλῶς ἀποτελοῦν το ἀλάτι και το πιπέρι της ιστορικής συγγραφῆς. Μπορεῖ να εἶναι μυθεύματα ἢ ιστορικά περιθωριακά σταχυολογήματα τα οποία ὁμως διεγείρουν την περιέργεια του ἀναγνώστη ἀλλὰ δεν ἀποτελοῦν σημαντική πληροφορία για την ιστορική συγγραφή. Γνωστά παραδείγματα, σε σχέση με την συνολική βιογραφία πρωταγωνιστῶν της Ιστορίας, εἶναι ὅτι ο Αλέξανδρος της Μακεδονίας ἐφθάσε μέχρι το μαντεῖο στην ἔρημο Σίουα/Σίβα της Αιγύπτου για να λάβει χρησμό, ὅτι η Κλεοπάτρα της Αιγύπτου ἐπαιρνε το λουτρό της μέσα σε γάλα για να φροντίσει την ἐπιδερμίδα της, ὅτι πέθανε ἀπὸ δάγκωμα φιδιού που ἐκρυβε στον κόρφο της, ὅτι το ἀγγίγμα του βασιλιά Μίδα μετέτρεπε οτιδήποτε σε χρυσό, ὅτι η καισαρική τομή ονομάσθηκε ἀπὸ τον τρόπο με τον οποίο γεννήθηκε ο Ιούλιος Καίσαρας κοκ. Οι ιστορικοί εἶναι πάρα πολὺ προσεκτικοί με τους ονομαζόμενους ἀρχαίους παραδοξογράφους ἢ τις παραδόσεις που καταγράφουν οι ἀρχαῖοι συγγραφείς και ἀναφέρουν τις καταγραφές τους εἴτε για να ἐνισχύσουν κάποιο γεγονός που ἔχει καταγραφεί και ἀπὸ ἄλλες ἐγκυρότερες ἀρχαῖες φιλολογικές πηγές εἴτε ως παράδοξο/λεπτομέρεια ἐνός ιστορικού γεγονότος ἢ της παραδόσεως, πάντα ἀναφέροντας ὅτι η πληροφορία προέρχεται ἀπὸ ἀρχαῖο παραδοξολόγο ἢ σύμφωνα με τις παραδόσεις. Το ζήτημα ὁμως γίνεται πολὺ σοβαρό ὅταν ἀυτὰ τα παράδοξα παρουσιάζονται ως πραγματική Ιστορία για να τέρψουν και την περιέργεια των σημερινῶν ἀναγνωστῶν. Μάλιστα, ορισμένες φορές διαφημίζονται και ως Ιστορία χωρὶς τις βαρετές λεπτομέρειες. Σε ἕνα τέτοιο βιβλίο στην ἀγγλική γλῶσσα ἀφενός ἀναφέρεται η ἀπίθανη ιστορία που ἀφορᾶ ἀπαγωγές ἐκατοντάδων δισεκατομμυρίων ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ τον τύραννο του γαλαξία μας Xenu που μετὰφέρθηκαν στην Γη ἀπὸ ἄλλα μέρη του γαλαξία μας σε ἀγνωστο χρόνο ἀλλὰ και η πιθανή πληροφορία ὅτι περί το 456 π.Χ. ο Αισχύλος σκοτώθηκε ὅταν αετὸς ἐρίξε χελώνα στο κεφάλι του. Σε ἄλλο σημεῖο του βιβλίου ἀναφέρεται ἀπλῶς το γεγονός της κοπῆς των κεφαλῶν του Ερμῆ το 415 π.Χ. και η κατηγορία ἐναντίον του Αλκιβιάδη ως «The Case of the Missing Penises» (η ὑπόθεση των χαμένων πεῶν/ψωλῶν) ἀλλὰ και ὅτι οι ιερές χήνες ἐσωσαν την Ρώμη ἀπὸ τους Γαλάτες το 390 π.Χ. Ο συγγραφέας συνεχίζει με μύθους και ιστορικά παραλειπόμενα μέχρι και το 2007 ὅταν ἀναφέρει ὅτι ἐγινε ἀνεκτή η χρήση της λέξεως σκατὰ στο Βρετανικό Κοινοβούλιο.¹²⁰ Ο συγγραφέας ἀυτοῦ του βιβλίου ἀναφέρεται ἀπὸ τους ἐκδότες του ως ο ἰδανικός ὁδηγὸς στην ἐκλαΐκευση της ιστορίας.¹²¹ Φυσικά, δεν ὑπάρχει καμία εἰσαγωγή που να ἐξηγεί το περιεχόμενο του βιβλίου ἐνῶ σε καμία μικρὴ χρονολογική καταγραφή δεν γίνεται βιβλιογραφική παραπομπή. Ἐτσι, ο ἀνυποψίαστος και πιθανόν νεαρός ἀναγνώστης μένει με την ἐντύπωση ὅτι διαβάζει και μαθαίνει Ιστορία ευχάριστα χωρὶς βαρετές πραγματικές ιστορικές λεπτομέρειες.

Μία παρόμοια εκδοχή των παραλειπομένων της Ιστορίας ἀλλὰ με ἐντονη πολιτική χροιά για το περιεχόμενό τους ἔχει ἐκδοθεῖ ἀπὸ Ἕλληνα δημοσιογράφο με οικονομικές σπουδές, ο οποίος τιτλοφορεῖ το ἔργο του Ιστορία. Στον πρόλογο του πρώτου τόμου του βιβλίου του εἶναι τελείως ἀπαξιωτικός για τους ιστορικούς ἀλλὰ και για την Ιστορία την ἴδια. Γράφει: «Η ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ ΕΙΝΑΙ ΜΙΑ ΠΟΥΤΑΝΑ. Γι ἀυτὸ τη σέβομαι βαθύτατα. [...] Μπορεῖ να σε κάνει να την ἐρωτευτεῖς ἢ να την σιχαθείς. Να σε διδάξει ἢ να σε καταστρέψει. [...] Να σε κάνει κυνικό ἢ ονειροπόλο. Φονιά ἢ ιεραπόστολο. Θύτη ἢ θύμα. Και λοιπόν; Το ἴδιο της κάνει. Δε δίνει δεκάρα.», «Οι

¹¹⁹ Αθήναιος, XIV.26 (629b).

¹²⁰ Ian Crofton, *History Without the Boring Bits* (London: Quercus, 2007).

¹²¹ Δες <<https://www.simonandschuster.com/authors/Ian-Crofton/172272903>>.

ιστορικοί είναι χειρότεροι από τους απατημένους συζύγους. Ονειρεύονται όχι μόνο την παρουσία τους μέσα στην ψυχή της ιστορίας αλλά και την ολοκληρωτική εξουσία τους πάνω σ' αυτή την ακανθώδη ψυχή. Αλαζονεία!». Αφού αναρωτιέται τι είναι η ιστορία με ερωτηματικά, «Είναι η μοίρα; Είναι ο Θεός; Η νομοτέλεια; [...] η δράση των ατόμων; Είναι η κίνηση των μαζών; Είναι οι παραγωγικές δυνάμεις και οι παραγωγικές σχέσεις; [...] οι έξοχες κινήσεις των στρατηγών, οι δραματικές αποφάσεις των πολιτικών; [...] Ανοησίες. Τίποτα απ' όλα αυτά. Η ιστορία είναι απλώς μία πουτάνα». Τα κείμενα του βιβλίου μεταδόθηκαν αρχικά σε καθημερινή ραδιοφωνική εκπομπή «με σκοπό να μάθουν οι ακροατές κομμάτια της ελληνικής και της παγκόσμιας ιστορίας αλλά πρωτίστως να συγκρίνουν όσα συνέβαιναν 'κάποτε' με όσα συμβαίνουν σήμερα».¹²² Ο συγγραφέας οραματίζεται την Ιστορία ως ιερόδουλη και τους ιστορικούς ως εξουσιαστές της, χειρότερους από ερωτικά απατημένους. Τα κείμενα στους δύο τόμους είναι του τύπου διαβάστε για να μάθετε πώς λειτουργούσε και πώς λειτουργεί ο κόσμος και οι άνθρωποι που τον αποτελούν, να διδαχθείτε. Φυσικά, τίποτα από αυτά τα παραπάνω δεν είναι Ιστορία. Είναι απλώς απόψεις για διάφορα συμβάντα της Ιστορίας, δοσμένες με έξυπνη δημοσιογραφική πένα και ενίοτε με πολιτική χροιά και άποψη, που προσποιούνται ότι είναι Ιστορία και μάλιστα η διδακτική πλευρά της Ιστορίας. Πέρα, λοιπόν, από τον εμπρηστικό πρόλογο, τα σύντομα άρθρα από τα οποία αποτελείται το βιβλίο είναι εγκυκλοπαιδικού χαρακτήρα με ίσως κάποιες γαργαλιστικές αιχμές στην κατάληξή τους και με πληροφορίες που έχουν αντληθεί κυρίως από ελληνικό περιοδικό εκλαϊκευμένης Ιστορίας, όπως δείχνει η βιβλιογραφία στο τέλος κάθε τόμου. Δηλαδή, διήγηση ιστορικών στιγμών ή θεμάτων με επιπλέον προσωπική άποψη αλλά όχι Ιστορία. Στον πρόλογο του δεύτερου τόμου, ο οποίος γράφτηκε χρονολογικά μετά τον πρώτο, ο συγγραφέας παραδέχεται με εντιμότητα ότι «το περιεχόμενο του βιβλίου αυτού δεν είναι αποτέλεσμα πρωτογενούς ιστορικής έρευνας. Αυτό το έκαναν άλλοι, άξιοι ερευνητές για μένα. Εγώ έκανα σύνθεση πολλαπλών ιστορικών πληροφοριών [προφανώς εννοεί την ποικιλία των θεμάτων και μόνο, όχι βιβλιογραφική έρευνα για κάθε θέμα] για να τις μετατρέψω σε ένα εκλαϊκευμένο ραδιοφωνικό ένθετο».¹²³ Οντως, τα βιβλία αυτά θα ήταν (και είναι) ένα διασκεδαστικό ανάγνωσμα παραλίας για όσους θα ήθελαν να μάθουν κάτι από το ιστορικό παρελθόν σε μορφή εγκυκλοπαιδικής περιλήψεως. Αυτό που δημιουργεί το μέγα πρόβλημα είναι η λέξη ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ τυπωμένη με κεφαλαία μεγάλα γράμματα στα εξώφυλλα των δύο τόμων, παραπλανητική για όποιον γνωρίζει τι σημαίνει πραγματικά συγγραφή Ιστορίας. Το ιστορικό περιεχόμενο ενός βιβλίου δεν το κάνει πάντα και Ιστορία και συνεπώς οι σοβαροί αναγνώστες πρέπει να αναγνωρίζουν τι διαβάζουν.

Η συγγραφή της Ιστορίας είναι μια μακρά και επίπονη πνευματική διαδικασία, η οποία το 21ο αιώνα έχει γίνει και ιδιαίτερα πολύπλοκη ως προς το πλήθος, την εύρεση και ανάλυση πηγών και απόψεων για να γίνει πραγματική ιστορική συγγραφή. Οι ιστορικοί αναγκαστικά αναλώνονται στις βαρετές για το πλατύ κοινό λεπτομέρειες της Ιστορίας αναζητώντας απαντήσεις στα ερωτήματά τους για ό,τι συνέβη στους ανθρώπους στο παρελθόν. Σπάνια η ανθρώπινη Ιστορία φαίνεται καθαρά στους ιστορικούς στον καθρέπτη. Συνήθως, ο/η ιστορικός πρέπει να ερευνησει πολύ, να αναζητήσει και να βρει ποικιλία πηγών, να τις συνδυάσει και έτσι να μπορέσει να διακρίνει την ανθρώπινη Ιστορία. Η διαδικασία αυτή δεν έχει να προσφέρει τίποτα στην υγεία του ανθρώπου, στο κτίσιμο των πόλεων και των χωριών του, στην φροντίδα για το περιβάλλον που ζει. Είναι όμως η ενασχόληση των ιστορικών που προσφέρει απαντήσεις για το τι έγινε στο παρελθόν, πώς έγινε, υπό ποιές συνθήκες, πώς και ποιοι ενεπλάκησαν, ποια ήταν η εξέλιξη και ποιο το αποτέλεσμα. Όπως ο κάθε άνθρωπος θέλει

¹²² Δημήτρης Καμπουράκης, *Μια σταγόνα Ιστορία. Αγγελικές και σατανικές μορφές στο τιμόνι των ανθρώπινων πληθυσμών*, 2 τόμ. (Αθήνα: Πατάκης, 2002 (α' τόμος) & 2003 (β' τόμος), 1:13-16.

¹²³ *Ιδιο*, 2:14.

να έχει όνομα, να γνωρίζει την μητέρα του και τον πατέρα του, αναζητά την καταγωγή της οικογένειά τους και να γνωρίζει «από που κρατά η σκούφια του», έτσι και μία κοινότητα ανθρώπων, οι άνθρωποι σε όλη την Υφήλιο θέλουν να γνωρίζουν ποιοι είναι, τι και πώς έπραξαν οι πρόγονοί τους. Πολλοί διδάσκονται από αυτή την γνώση και την χρησιμοποιούν για να πορευθούν στο μέλλον. Η γνώση αυτή όμως του παρελθόντος πρέπει να είναι ο γόνιμος σπόρος που κρύβεται μέσα στον καρπό, όχι η όμορφη φλούδα του και το φανταχτερό περιτύλιγμά του. Η γνώση του παρελθόντος περιλαμβάνει ολόκληρη την ανθρώπινη δραστηριότητα, τις εξερευνήσεις και τις μεταναστεύσεις του ανθρώπου, την κοινωνική του ζωή, την σκέψη και την φιλοσοφία του, τον τρόπο που λειτουργεί, θεραπεύεται και πεθαίνει το σώμα του, την ζωή των άλλων οργανισμών στην Γη, την οικοδόμηση κτισμάτων, την νομοθεσία του, και τόσα άλλα επιτεύγματα και αποτελέσματα του βίου του. Η Ιστορία ως πνευματική ζωή για τον άνθρωπο είναι τόσο σημαντική όσο και η αναπνοή του για την σωματική του επιβίωση.

Τεχνητή νοημοσύνη

Η τεχνητή νοημοσύνη είναι η τεχνολογική εξέλιξη που έχει κατακλύσει την καθημερινή ζωή του ανθρώπου στον 21ο αιώνα. Ήδη, χωρίς να το έχουμε πολυκατάλαβει μας βοηθά και μας καθοδηγεί καθημερινά. Τα προγράμματα πλοηγήσεως (navigator) στα αυτοκίνητα, οι χάρτες, που διαθέτει το κινητό μας τηλέφωνο, η ταμπλέτα μας ή ο υπολογιστής μας χρησιμοποιούν τεχνητή νοημοσύνη για να μας δείξουν πώς θα μεταβούμε από το ένα σημείο στο άλλο, πώς θα αποφύγουμε τους μονόδρομους και την κίνηση των δρόμων για να φθάσουμε γρηγορότερα στον προορισμό μας και πολλά άλλα. Οι διαφημίσεις που παρουσιάζονται σε ιστοτόπους που επισκεπτόμαστε είναι προϊόν τεχνητής νοημοσύνης με την οποία συγκεντρώνονται στοιχεία από τις ηλεκτρονικές περιηγήσεις μας και κατόπιν μας προβάλλονται διαφημίσεις που ταιριάζουν με τις προτιμήσεις μας για προϊόντα και υπηρεσίες. Ο τηλεθεατής ή ο χρήστης υπολογιστή έχει πια την δυνατότητα να επικοινωνεί με την τηλεόραση, τον υπολογιστή, και άλλες ηλεκτρονικές συσκευές με φωνητικές εντολές τις οποίες τα μηχανήματα κατανοούν και εκτελούν ή προτείνουν εναλλακτικές ενέργειες. Ήδη από το 2019, στην Γερμανία πειραματίζονται με τον καθηγητή-ρομπότ.¹²⁴ Η τεχνητή νοημοσύνη δεν είναι παρά μια σειρά από μαθηματικούς αλγόριθμους με τους οποίους συνδυάζονται διάφορα στοιχεία για να επιτευχθεί το επιθυμητό σε εμάς αποτέλεσμα.

Η τεχνητή νοημοσύνη έχει πια εισχωρήσει και στην επιστημονική καθημερινότητα ιστορικών και αρχαιολόγων. Η διερεύνηση στο διαδίκτυο μέσω μιας μηχανής αναζήτησεως (λ.χ. Google Search) υποβοηθείται από τεχνητή νοημοσύνη έτσι ώστε να μας παρουσιάζονται τα πιο κοντινά αποτελέσματα σε ό,τι προσπαθούμε να βρούμε. Η αυτόματη αλλά συνήθως πολύ ακριβής μετάφραση από μία ανθρώπινη γλώσσα σε μία άλλη στις κινητές μας συσκευές αλλά και στον υπολογιστή μας είναι μία ακόμη εφαρμογή τεχνητής νοημοσύνης. Επίσης, με την χρήση τεχνητής νοημοσύνης, σε εξειδικευμένες βάσεις κειμένων είναι δυνατό να βρούμε όχι μόνο τα σημεία εκείνα του/των κειμένου/ων όπου είναι καταγεγραμμένες οι δύο οι περισσότερες συνεχόμενες λέξεις τις οποίες διερευνάμε αλλά και τα άλλα σημεία όπου παρεμβάλλεται και λέξη/λέξεις ανάμεσά τους. Δηλαδή η διερεύνηση της φράσεως «εἶπεν Κύριος ὁ Θεός» θα μπορούσε να μας παρουσιάσει και τις ταυτίσεις «εἶπεν αὐτῷ Κύριος ὁ Θεός».¹²⁵ Ήδη από τα πρώτα χρόνια του 21ου αιώνα αν όχι και λίγο νωρίτερα ήταν δυνατόν να συντεθεί κατανοητό ποίημα με τεχνητή νοημοσύνη χωρίς την παρεμβολή ανθρώπου

¹²⁴ «Introducing Germany's Robot Professor,» Updated: 5 November 2023 at <<https://www.toolify.ai/ai-news/introducing-germanys-robot-professor-19970>> and 25 February 2019 at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Amfrm2V_K00>.

¹²⁵ Δες τα παραδείγματα σε *Αγία Γραφή*, «Γένεσις», κεφ. 4.

ενώ αργότερα έγινε δυνατόν να συντεθεί και πεζό κείμενο από υπολογιστή στον οποίο χρησιμοποιούνταν αλγόριθμοι τεχνητής νοημοσύνης. Ήδη και τουλάχιστον από το 2023 είναι δυνατόν να συντεθεί επιστημονικό κείμενο με την χρήση υπολογιστή και προγράμματος τεχνητής νοημοσύνης. Ο καθηγητής του Τμήματος Ψηφιακών Συστημάτων του Πανεπιστημίου Πειραιώς Στέφανος Γκρίτζαλης ανακοίνωσε ότι τροφοδότησε το πρόγραμμα τεχνητής νοημοσύνης ChatGPT (<https://chat.openai.com/auth/login>) με ερωτήσεις για δύο μαθήματα της Σχολής Αρχιτεκτόνων Μηχανικών και το πρόγραμμα επέτυχε βαθμολογία μεγαλύτερη από 7/10. «Σε ερωτήσεις κρίσεως, το ChatGPT γράφει σίγουρα Άριστα»,¹²⁶ ανέφερε χαρακτηριστικά ο καθηγητής. Τα διαδικτυακά προγράμματα τεχνητής νοημοσύνης τροφοδοτούνται με συγκεκριμένες ερωτήσεις, συγκεντρώνουν τις πληροφορίες και τις ιδέες επί των ερωτήσεων από το Διαδίκτυο επιλέγοντας τις πηγές τους και συνθέτουν ένα νέο πρωτότυπο κείμενο με βάση τα συγκεντρωμένα στοιχεία. Τι θα γίνει, λοιπόν, τις εργασίες των φοιτητών, τα επιστημονικά άρθρα, τις μονογραφίες θα τις συγγράφουν τα προγράμματα τεχνητής νοημοσύνης; Ήδη λειτουργεί στο Διαδίκτυο το αντίδοτο πρόγραμμα της συγγραφής κειμένων με τεχνητή νοημοσύνη, το GPTZero (<https://gptzero.me/>), το οποίο αποκαλύπτει τα κείμενα που έχουν συντεθεί με τον τεχνητό τρόπο. Οι καθηγητές, βέβαια, διαθέτουν και παραδοσιακά εργαλεία και μεθόδους για την ανακάλυψη των νέων λογοκλόπων, όπως εξηγεί ο καθηγητής στο Τμήμα Διοικητικής Επιστήμης και Τεχνολογίας του Οικονομικού Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών ο Διομήδης Σπινέλλης.¹²⁷ Συγκεκριμένο προσχέδιο πτυχιακής εργασίας που του παραδόθηκε του κίνησε την περιέργεια όταν πρόσεξε ότι ήταν πολύ καλογραμμένο γραμματικά και συντακτικά για φοιτητικό προσχέδιο, άλλα ήταν γενικόλογο χωρίς να καλύπτει το θέμα σε βάθος. «Ήταν σαν ένα κείμενο το οποίο έχει συνταχθεί στα αγγλικά από κάποιον Έλληνα που δεν έχει τα αγγλικά μητρική του γλώσσα», επισημαίνει ο καθηγητής. Ο Σπινέλλης δεν ήταν απορριπτικός στην προσπάθεια του φοιτητή να αντλήσει έτοιμες πληροφορίες και ιδέες και του έδωσε συγκεκριμένες οδηγίες για να συμπληρώσει βιβλιογραφικά ό,τι του είχε προσφερθεί άκοπα αλλά και να διατυπώσει στο προσχέδιο πώς και γιατί χρησιμοποίησε το πρόγραμμα ChatGPT, τους επιστημονικούς κινδύνους τους οποίους μπορεί ο ίδιος να αντιμετωπίσει εξαιτίας της χρήσεως του λογισμικού, αλλά και ποια ήταν η δική του συμβολή στο προσχέδιο της πτυχιακής εργασίας, δηλαδή πώς διόρθωσε ή κατεύθυνε τον τρόπο με τον οποίο το πρόγραμμα εξτέλεσε τις εντολές που είχε λάβει.¹²⁸ Συνεπώς, για μία ακόμη φορά, ο άνθρωπος μπορεί να νικήσει την μηχανή, την οποία άλλωστε αυτός κατασκεύασε και προγραμματίσε για να το βοηθήσει είτε για καλό είτε για κακό σκοπό.

Μήπως, όμως η τεχνητή νοημοσύνη στην επιστημονική έρευνα και συγγραφή δεν είναι μόνο ο γρήγορος, εύκολος, και άκοπος τρόπος για να λάβει κανείς το πτυχίο του από το πανεπιστήμιο; Όντως, υπάρχει παγκόσμιος προβληματισμός δασκάλων, καθηγητών και πανεπιστημιακών και σε όλα τα επίπεδα της εκπαίδευσής για την χρήση ή την απαγόρευση της τεχνητής νοημοσύνης στις εκπαιδευτικές διαδικασίες που αφορούν στην συγγραφή εργασιών και διατριβών στο σχολείο και στο πανεπιστήμιο. Ήδη κάποιες χώρες ή πανεπιστήμια την έχουν απαγορεύσει, άλλες σκέπτονται να την απαγορεύσουν ενώ υπάρχουν και καθηγητές και πανεπιστήμια τα οποία προσπαθούν να βρουν την χρυσή τομή ή τα οφέλη από την χρήση τεχνητής νοημοσύ-

¹²⁶ «Διαβλητές οι εξετάσεις λόγω ChatGPT,» *Η Καθημερινή*, 1 Φεβρουαρίου 2024, σ. 7 ή στην <<https://www.kathimerini.gr/society/562859677/panepistimia-trampoykismoi-kai-sta-tilemathimata/>>.

¹²⁷ Απόστολος Λακασάς, «Η ευφυής λογοκλοπή έφθασε στα ελληνικά ΑΕΙ,» *Η Καθημερινή*, 9 Ιουλίου 2023, σ. 20 ή <<https://www.kathimerini.gr/society/562511068/i-eyfyis-logoklopi-efthase-sta-ellinika-aei/>>.

¹²⁸ *Ίδιο*.

νης στην επιστημονική συγγραφή.¹²⁹ Σε αυτό το κλίμα κινείται και ο Σπινέλλης, ο οποίος σκέφθηκε να εκμεταλλευθεί θετικά την σκέψη και προσπάθεια του φοιτητή του να συγγράψει την πτυχιακή του εργασία άκοπα. Θεώρησε, λοιπόν, ότι το ChatGPT «μπορεί να φωτίσει στον φοιτητή μια επιστημονική πλευρά που δεν την είχε σκεφθεί».¹³⁰ Αλλά και ο επίκουρος καθηγητής στο Τμήμα Επικοινωνίας, Μέσων και Πολιτισμού στο Πάντειο Πανεπιστήμιο Κώστας Καρπούζης έχει παρόμοιες απόψεις. Πιστεύει ότι πρέπει καθηγητές και φοιτητές να εκπαιδευθούν για να χρησιμοποιήσουν την τεχνητή νοημοσύνη με εποικοδομητικό τρόπο ως προς την εύρεση πληροφοριών και βιβλιογραφικών πηγών. Άλλοι συνάδελφοί τους, όμως, είναι βέβαιο ότι δεν έχουν την ίδια γνώμη και θεωρούν ότι η χρήση της τεχνητής νοημοσύνης για τις φοιτητικές εργασίες και διατριβές δεν είναι παρά ένα τυπικό παράδειγμα λογοκλοπής.¹³¹ Η κρίσιμη μάζα για την επιτυχία της τεχνητής νοημοσύνης να συνθέτει επιστημονικά κείμενα έχει πια σχηματισθεί και είναι ότι πλέον η μηχανή μπορεί να χρησιμοποιήσει κριτική σκέψη έτσι ώστε να μιμηθεί πραγματικά την φοιτητική συγγραφή.

Δύο καθηγητές του Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) των Η.Π.Α. συνεργάστηκαν για να μελετήσουν με ποιον τρόπο θα ήταν δυνατόν να χρησιμοποιηθεί η τεχνητή νοημοσύνη προς όφελος των φοιτητών όταν τους ζητηθεί να συγγράψουν ερευνητικές εργασίες. Ο καθηγητής Συνθέσεως Λόγου (Professor of Rhetoric)¹³² Edward Schiappa και ο καθηγητής Ψηφιακών Μέσων (Professor of Digital Media) Nick Montfort έστειλαν τον Ιανουάριο του 2023 στους συναδέλφους τους στο πανεπιστήμιο ένα ανεπίσημο και μη δεσμευτικό υπόμνημα με το οποίο πρότειναν τρόπους για να χρησιμοποιηθεί η τεχνητή νοημοσύνη εποικοδομητικά στην έρευνα των φοιτητών για τις επιστημονικές εργασίες τους αλλά και στην σύνταξη των μελετών τους. Φυσικά, είχε ήδη διαπιστωθεί η χρήση προγραμμάτων τεχνητής νοημοσύνης για την σύνταξη εργασιών και πολλοί καθηγητές ήταν προβληματισμένοι και ζητούσαν κάποια καθοδήγηση. Η πρώτη τους συμβουλή προς φοιτητές και καθηγητές οποιουδήποτε μαθήματος, συμπεριλαμβανομένων και των μαθημάτων των Ανθρωπιστικών Επιστημών, ήταν ότι η τεχνητή νοημοσύνη θα μπορούσε να κινητοποιήσει την σκέψη ή να εγείρει νέες ιδέες σχετικά με ερευνητικά ζητήματα. Προτάθηκε στους καθηγητές να διερευνήσουν μόνοι τους την νέα αυτή τεχνολογία (ChatGPT αλλά και άλλα παρόμοια προγράμματα) και να αναγνώσουν επιστημονικά άρθρα σχετικά με την τεχνητή νοημοσύνη αλλά και τα Μεγάλα Γλωσσικά Μοντέλα¹³³ (LLM=Large Language Models). Να μελετήσουν με ποιον τρόπο η τεχνητή νοημοσύνη θα μπορούσε να συσχετισθεί με τα μαθησιακά αποτελέσματα (learning outcomes) κάθε μαθήμα-

¹²⁹ «Δύο γραμμές αντιμετώπισης από τα ιδρύματα του εξωτερικού,» *Η Καθημερινή*, 9 Ιουλίου 2023, σ. 20 ή <<https://www.kathimerini.gr/society/562511068/i-eyfyis-logoklopi-efthase-sta-ellinika-aei/>>.

¹³⁰ Λακασάς, όπως παραπάνω.

¹³¹ Λακασάς, όπως παραπάνω.

¹³² Η επιστήμη της συνθέσεως προφορικού και γραπτού λόγου είναι γενικά άγνωστη στα ελληνικά δημόσια πανεπιστήμια. Στο ελληνικό εκπαιδευτικό σύστημα, οι βασικές τεχνικές της εξαντλούνται στο σχολικό μάθημα της Εκθέσεως και στο ίδιο μάθημα στα φροντιστήρια μέσης εκπαίδευσης. Αντιθέτως, στα αμερικανικά πανεπιστήμια είναι βασικό, υποχρεωτικό και απαραίτητο μάθημα του πρώτου έτους (δύο συνεχόμενων διδακτικών εξαμήνων) στο οποίο όλοι οι φοιτητές ανεξαρτήτως σχολής, κλάδου και τμήματος μαθαίνουν πώς να συνθέτουν σωστά συντακτικά και γραμματικά το κείμενο της εργασίας τους, να εργάζονται με επιστημονική μέθοδο για την πρώτη τους πανεπιστημιακή ερευνητική εργασία (πώς να πραγματοποιούν βιβλιογραφική έρευνα, να συγκροτούν σχολιασμένη βιβλιογραφία, να χρησιμοποιούν ανάλογα με την επιστήμη τους τις μεθόδους βιβλιογραφικών παραπομπών), αλλά και να παρουσιάζουν σε λίγα λεπτά προφορικά την εργασία τους και τα αποτελέσματά της.

¹³³ Δες πρόχειρα *Βικιπαιδεία*, λμ. «Μεγάλο Γλωσσικό Μοντέλο» στην <https://el.wikipedia.org/wiki/%CE%9C%CE%B5%CE%B3%CE%AC%CE%BB%CE%BF_%CE%B3%CE%BB%CF%89%CF%83%CF%83%CE%B9%CE%BA%CF%8C_%CE%BC%CE%BF%CE%BD%CF%84%CE%AD%CE%BB%CE%BF%>>.

τος που δίδασκαν. Να προσπαθήσουν να συμβαδίσουν τα μαθησιακά αποτελέσματα με την χρήση της νέας τεχνολογίας. Στις *Οδηγίες και Πληροφορίες (Syllabus)* που διανέμουν σε κάθε μάθημα στην αρχή κάθε ακαδημαϊκού εξαμήνου στους φοιτητές τους να συμπεριλάβουν με σαφή τρόπο την δική τους πολιτική για την χρήση της τεχνητής νοημοσύνης στην σύνταξη της/των εργασιών που θα πρέπει να υποβάλλουν οι φοιτητές στο τέλος της ακαδημαϊκής περιόδου.

Η χρήση των νέων αυτών τεχνολογιών μπορεί σε ορισμένα μαθήματα να είναι και επιθυμητή και αναγκαία ενώ σε άλλα να θεωρείται απλώς λογοκλοπή. Για παράδειγμα σε μαθήματα ψηφιακών τεχνολογιών μπορεί να πρέπει οι φοιτητές να μάθουν και να εκπαιδευτούν στην χρήση της τεχνητής νοημοσύνης για την συγγραφή κειμένου ως μέσου νέας μορφής συντάξεως κειμένου για διάφορες χρήσεις αλλά και να διαπιστώσουν τα οφέλη και τους κινδύνους που εγκυμονούν. Επίσης, να μελετήσουν τους διαφορετικούς τρόπους γραφής ανάμεσα στην μηχανή και στον άνθρωπο. Από την άλλη πλευρά αν σε άλλα μαθήματα η υποβοηθούμενη συγγραφή θεωρείται λογοκλοπή, τότε ίσως η χρήση των προγραμμάτων τεχνητής νοημοσύνης θα μπορούσε να αποτελέσει απλώς παράδειγμα καλής γραμματικής και συντακτικής γραφής επί συγκεκριμένων θεμάτων. Όμως, τουλάχιστον στο MIT, η κλασική μέθοδος διδασκαλίας καλού προφορικού και γραπτού λόγου είναι προς το παρόν η συνιστώμενη, ιδίως στα μη τεχνολογικά μαθήματα. Στο άμεσο μέλλον, βέβαια, είναι πιθανόν η εκμάθηση του σωστού τρόπου επιστημονικής συγγραφής να απαιτεί την χρήση της τεχνητής νοημοσύνης ως βοηθητικού εργαλείου, ως σύνολο παραδειγμάτων προτάσεων και παραγράφων. Πάντως, συμβουλεύουν οι συντάκτες του υπομνήματος, οι καθηγητές πρέπει να αναθέτουν στους φοιτητές τους εργασίες επί πολύ συγκεκριμένων θεμάτων έτσι ώστε να αποφεύγουν την παράνομη χρήση της τεχνητής νοημοσύνης, μια που τα συγκεκριμένα προγράμματα παράγουν κείμενα γενικόλογα και απλοποιημένα. Ανάλογα με την φύση του μαθήματος, οι καθηγητές μπορούν να ζητούν από τους φοιτητές τους να ολοκληρώνουν μικρές εργασίες στην τάξη (όπου άλλωστε απαγορεύεται οποιαδήποτε ηλεκτρονική συσκευή εν λειτουργία), να ζητούν την προσωπική και αιτιολογημένη άποψη των φοιτητών επί των θεμάτων που τους αναθέτουν, να επιμένουν οι εργασίες να περιλαμβάνουν αυτούσιες σύντομες παραθέσεις από τις πηγές που χρησιμοποιήθηκαν για την συγγραφή τους, να απαιτούν προφορική παρουσίαση των εργασιών από λίγες σημειώσεις και όχι ανάγνωση τους στην τάξη, όπου είναι επιθυμητό και δυνατόν να χρησιμοποιούν οι φοιτητές παραδείγματα από συμβάντα των τελευταίων περίπου δέκα ημερών. Όλες αυτές οι μέθοδοι θα ελαχιστοποιήσουν ή θα αποκλείσουν την χρήση τεχνητής νοημοσύνης για την σύνταξη των φοιτητικών εργασιών μια που τα προγράμματα χρησιμοποιούν συγκεκριμένο σώμα κειμένων που δεν συμπεριλαμβάνει αυτά που δημοσιεύθηκαν στο Διαδίκτυο τις τελευταίες ημέρες. Παρ' όλα αυτά, ο καθηγητής που θα αποφασίσει ότι θέλει να απαγορεύσει την χρήση προγραμμάτων τεχνητής νοημοσύνης θα πρέπει να κάνει σαφές στους φοιτητές του ότι οι εργασίες τους θα υποβληθούν στα προγράμματα αναγνώρισεως λογοκλοπής Turnitin και GPTZero και ότι εκείνοι θα υποστούν τις ανάλογες ακαδημαϊκές συνέπειες σε περίπτωση που διαπιστωθεί ότι έχει παραβιασθεί η ακαδημαϊκή ακεραιότητα σε συγκεκριμένη εργασία. Οι προτάσεις των καθηγητών του MIT, όπως, γράφουν και οι ίδιοι είναι απλώς σημεία προς συζήτηση αλλά ένα είναι βέβαιο: η χρήση της τεχνητής νοημοσύνης στην συγγραφή κειμένων ήρθε για να μείνει.¹³⁴

Ορισμένα πανεπιστήμια, όπως το University of Portsmouth at Myport, νοτιοδυτικά του Λονδίνου, αγκάλιασαν αμέσως την τεχνητή νοημοσύνη και βρήκαν θετικά σημεία αλλά διαπίστωσαν και ζητήματα για τα οποία οι φοιτητές πρέπει να είναι

¹³⁴ Edward Schiappa and Nick Montfort, «Advice Concerning the Increase in AI-Assisted Writing,» 10 January 2023 at <<https://nickm.com/post/2023/01/advice-concerning-the-increase-in-ai-assisted-writing/>>.

προειδοποιημένοι. Πρώτα-πρώτα οι καθηγητές δεν πρέπει να εμποδίσουν την χρήση της τεχνητής νοημοσύνης στην συγγραφή φοιτητικών κειμένων αλλά υπάρχουν περιπτώσεις στις οποίες η χρήση της μπορεί να οδηγήσει σε παρανοήσεις ή λανθασμένες πληροφορίες. Η τεχνητή νοημοσύνη δεν πρέπει να τίθεται επάνω από τις ικανότητες του φοιτητή στην έκφραση προσωπικής γνώμης και κριτικής σκέψεως διότι η υπερβολική χρήση της θα εμποδίσει τον φοιτητή να αναπτύξει αυτές τις δεξιότητες και συνεπώς να επιτύχει στις σπουδές του και στην κατοπινή εργασία του. Η απλή συγγραφή από την μηχανή εργασίας που θα υποβληθεί αυτούσια από τον φοιτητή για ακαδημαϊκή κρίση σημαίνει ακαδημαϊκό παράπτωμα. Μερικές αποδεκτές χρήσεις της τεχνητής νοημοσύνης είναι απαντήσεις σε ερωτήματα των φοιτητών ακόμη και όταν ο καθηγητής δεν είναι διαθέσιμος, παραγωγή προκαταρκτικών ιδεών και προσχέδιο εργασίας προς μελέτη και συζήτηση, εύρεση εικόνων, στατιστικών στοιχείων, διαγράμμάτων και άλλων συμπληρωματικών μιας εργασίας στοιχείων, κριτική επισκόπηση του παραγομένου κειμένου ή συγκεντρωμένου υλικού, πρότυπα καλής χρήσεως της γλώσσας, εξηγήσεις βασικών εννοιών, εύρεση πιθανών ερωτήσεων που θα τεθούν σε διαγωνίσματα, παρότρυνση στον φοιτητή που έχει χαθεί στο υλικό του για να βρει μια άκρη και να συνεχίσει την σύνταξη της εργασίας του. Επειδή οι αλγόριθμοι τεχνητής νοημοσύνης απλώς συμπληρώνουν την μία λέξη και φράση μετά την άλλη βασιζόμενοι σε πιθανά σενάρια συνεχίσεως του κειμένου, δεν είναι πάντα ακριβείς στα αποτελέσματά τους. Ανάλογα με τους αλγορίθμους που χρησιμοποιούνται στα προγράμματα τεχνητής νοημοσύνης, μπορεί τα αποτελέσματα να μην αντανακλούν την πιο πρόσφατη πραγματικότητα από πλευράς δημοσιεύσεων ενώ μπορεί και οι βιβλιογραφικές παραπομπές να είναι λανθασμένες ή ανύπαρκτες (fictitious). Τα αποτελέσματα μπορεί να εκφράζουν μονομερείς απόψεις από πολιτικής, θρησκευτικής, κοινωνικής, εθνικής απόψεως, να περιέχουν ρατσιστικές θέσεις ή ιδέες μισογυνισμού ή απλώς να αναπαράγουν στερεότυπες αντιλήψεις. Εάν στην φοιτητική εργασία έχουν χρησιμοποιηθεί αθέλητα αλλά λόγω της χρήσεως προγραμμάτων τεχνητής νοημοσύνης ιδέες άλλων συγγραφέων χωρίς ή με λανθασμένες βιβλιογραφικές αναφορές, αυτές θεωρούνται προϊόντα λογοκλοπής. Το ίδιο συμβαίνει και εάν οι φοιτητές χρησιμοποιήσουν τέτοια προγράμματα για να τους βοηθήσουν και δεν το αναφέρουν στην εργασία τους. Εάν, όμως, τα αποτελέσματα χρησιμοποιηθούν με σωστό τρόπο μπορεί να βοηθήσουν στην περαιτέρω ανάπτυξη της κριτικής σκέψεως και των τεχνικών και δεξιοτήτων αξιολογήσεως επιχειρημάτων και ιδεών.¹³⁵

Από τις απόψεις που παρατέθηκαν παραπάνω γίνεται φανερό ότι η χρήση προγραμμάτων τεχνητής νοημοσύνης μπορεί να αποτελέσει ένα ακόμη βοηθητικό εργαλείο για φοιτητές και καθηγητές για την βελτίωση των προπτυχιακών και μεταπτυχιακών ερευνητικών εργασιών. Φυσικά και εγκυμονεί πολλούς κινδύνους ακόμη και για αυτόν/αυτήν που δεν έχει πρόθεση την λογοκλοπή και για αυτό πρέπει ο χρήστης να γνωρίζει πολύ καλά αυτά τα εργαλεία τεχνολογίας πριν τα χρησιμοποιήσει. Η χρήση της τεχνητής νοημοσύνης μπορεί να επεκταθεί ως βοηθητικό ερευνητικό εργαλείο και για την σύνταξη διδακτορικών διατριβών, μονογραφιών ή επιστημονικών άρθρων αλλά ποτέ ως υποκατάστατο της κριτικής ικανότητας του συγγραφέα διότι όταν ανακαλυφθεί και αυτός/αυτή και το σύγγραμμά του/της θα καταλήξουν στα ακαδημαϊκά σκουπίδια. Δύο παραδείγματα καλής χρήσεως της τεχνητής νοημοσύνης για ακαδημαϊκούς σκοπούς μπορούν ίσως να δείξουν πώς πρέπει να χρησιμοποιείται. Ας υποθέσουν ότι επιθυμείτε να μεταφράσετε μία ή μερικές φράσεις από την γερμανική γλώσσα στην ελληνική και χρησιμοποιείται τον Google translator <<https://translate.google.com/>>. Το αποτέλεσμα θα είναι σε γενικές γραμμές ικανοποιητικό αλλά θα

¹³⁵ University of Portsmouth at Myport, «Using AI at university,» at <<https://myport.ac.uk/student-life/help-and-advice/study-skills/digital-skills/using-ai-at-university>>.

υπάρχουν ελληνικές λέξεις που θα είναι είτε δυσνόητες είτε ακατανόητες σε σχέση με το υπόλοιπο κείμενο είτε γραμματικά λάθος είτε σε λάθος συντακτική σειρά. Συνεπώς, εάν χρησιμοποιήσετε την μετάφραση χωρίς καμία αλλαγή το αποτέλεσμα θα είναι αυτό που ονομάζουμε «γκουγκλομετάφραση», δηλαδή μετάφραση με λάθη. Αντιθέτως, εάν όπου χρειάζεται χρησιμοποιήσετε την παραδοσιακή μέθοδο αποδόσεως της/των λανθασμένων λέξεων με την χρήση λεξικού και πιθανόν αναμορφώσετε λίγο το κείμενο, το αποτέλεσμα θα είναι μάλλον ικανοποιητικό. Ο συνδυασμός, δηλαδή, και των δύο μεθόδων εγγυάται επιτυχία. Μερικές φορές, κανείς θέλει απλώς να γνωρίζει σε τι αναφέρεται το κείμενο προς μετάφραση και όχι να το μεταφράσει ακριβώς, οπότε τότε ο σκοπός με την χρήση της τεχνητής νοημοσύνης του Google translator έχει επιτευχθεί πολύ γρήγορα και άκοπα. Το δεύτερο παράδειγμα αφορά σε αρχαία ελληνικά κείμενα. Στην προσπάθειά σας να εντοπίσετε κάποιο από τα κείμενα του Λουκιανού η έρευνα με τεχνητή νοημοσύνη σας υποδεικνύει δύο ιστότοπους, ο ένας από τους οποίους προσφέρει το κείμενο (ή και την μετάφρασή του) σε αρχείο PDF σαρωμένο από έντυπο βιβλίο ενώ ο άλλος σε μορφή κειμένου σελίδας (html) Διαδικτύου. Η εύκολη και χωρίς καθόλου σκέψη ενέργεια είναι να χρησιμοποιήσετε την δεύτερη εκδοχή διότι είναι εύκολα αναγνώσιμη. Συνήθως, όμως, σε αυτές τις περιπτώσεις δεν αναφέρεται από ποια πηγή έχει ληφθεί το αρχαίο κείμενο. Μήπως είναι από την έκδοση του 16ου αιώνα ή και παλιότερη και άρα όχι το στερεότυπο με διορθώσεις κείμενο που έχει γίνει σήμερα αποδεκτό ως τελικό (συνήθως των αρχών του 20ου αιώνα) ή άκριτη παλιά μετάφραση; Τα κείμενα του Λουκιανού που θεωρήθηκαν συνολικά, μεταφράστηκαν και τυπώθηκαν κατά τον 20ο αιώνα είναι το στερεότυπο κείμενο και/ή η μετάφραση που πρέπει να χρησιμοποιήσετε. Εδώ, λοιπόν, υπεισέρχεται η προσωπική σας ακαδημαϊκή κρίση στα αποτελέσματα της διερευνησεως με την βοήθεια της τεχνητής νοημοσύνης για το πιο σωστό αρχαίο κείμενο ή μετάφραση.

Τέλος, η αναζήτηση με την βοήθεια μηχανής τεχνητής νοημοσύνης για το θέμα «Ανασκαφές στις Αιγές» θα δημιουργήσει ένα κείμενο που θα περιλαμβάνει κάποιες αρχαιολογικές δημοσιεύσεις, δημοσιογραφικά κείμενα, θετικές και αρνητικές απόψεις και αντιρρήσεις διαφόρων συγγραφέων για διάφορα επιμέρους ζητήματα σχετικά με το θέμα ταξινομημένες ανά επιμέρους θεματικές ενότητες. Η σωστή χρήση του αποτελέσματος είναι να αποφασίσει ο φοιτητής/φοιτήτρια και να ξεχωρίσει εκείνες τις ενότητες τις οποίες θα ήθελε να διερευνήσει βιβλιογραφικά, να βεβαιωθεί ότι δεν έχει παραλείψει κανένα από τα σημαντικά ζητήματα του θέματος και να διδαχθεί χωρίς να αντιγράψει από τον τρόπο συγκροτήσεως του κειμένου. Το κείμενο της μηχανής ή τμήματά του τελικά δεν θα χρησιμοποιηθούν αυτούσια στην τελική εργασία του φοιτητή ή της φοιτήτριας. Η συμβουλή προς τους καθηγητές είναι ότι αυτό που απαγορεύεται επιδιώκεται να χρησιμοποιηθεί και από την ακαδημαϊκή κοινότητα. Η απαγόρευση οδηγεί σε ευρύτερη και άλογη χρήση μόνο και μόνο για να επιτευχθεί ένα γρήγορο και άκοπο αποτέλεσμα με τελικό σκοπό να παραπλανήσει τον καθηγητή ή την καθηγήτρια ως προς τον/την δημιουργό του.

Κεφάλαιο 6

Η Περιοδολόγηση της Ιστορίας και η Ορολογία της

Περιοδολόγηση είναι νεοελληνικός γλωσσικός νεολογισμός, ο οποίος περιγράφει αυτό που αναφέρεται σε άλλες ευρωπαϊκές γλώσσες ως *periodization/Périodisation/Periodisierung/Periodizzazione/Periodización*, δηλαδή τον χωρισμό της Ιστορίας αλλά και της αρχαιολογίας σε περιόδους για την καλύτερη και ευκολότερη κατανόησή, μελέτη, και ανάλυσή τους.¹³⁶ Η λέξη περίοδος, όμως, εμπεριέχει την έννοια της αρχής και τους τέλους, αυτό ακριβώς που ήθελαν να εκφράσουν οι μελετητές και συγγραφείς της Ιστορίας στον 17ο, στον 18ο, στον 19ο αλλά και σε μεγάλο μέρος του 20ου μ.Χ. αιώνα, όταν χώριζαν την Ιστορία σε Αρχαία, Μεσαιωνική και Νεώτερη. Από τις τελευταίες δεκαετίες του 20ου μ.Χ. αιώνα, όμως, η αντίληψη αυτή έχει αλλάξει όπως φαίνεται και από μια νέα ιστορική Εποχή που ονομάστηκε Ύστερη Αρχαιότητα (περ. 284-622 μ.Χ.). Επίσης, η αρχαιολογική ορολογία εμπλουτίστηκε με την λέξη διάχυση της μίας Εποχής μέσα στην επόμενη, δηλαδή, οι αρχαιολόγοι δεν είναι ικανοποιημένοι με την άποψη ότι οι άνθρωποι σταμάτησαν να χρησιμοποιούν τον λίθο ως εργαλείο μία συγκεκριμένη χρονιά ή έστω γύρω στο 4000 π.Χ. και άρχισαν να χρησιμοποιούν τον χαλκό από το 4000 π.Χ. και μετά. Το ίδιο συμβαίνει και στην Ιστορία με το τέλος της Αρχαίας Ιστορίας και την αρχή της Μεσαιωνικής ή των Μέσων Χρόνων. Σε όλες τις περιπτώσεις που παρατηρείται αλλαγή στην αρχαιολογία και στην Ιστορία υπάρχει μια μεταβατική περίοδος, μια περίοδος συντήξεως του παλιού με το νέο, διαχύσεως του νέου μέσα στο παλιό και αντιστρόφως. Η λέξη περίοδος, λοιπόν, στην αρχαιολογική και ιστορική της διάσταση πρέπει να χρησιμοποιείται όταν είναι γνωστό με σημαντική ακρίβεια η αρχή και το τέλος ενός συμβάντος. Σε αντίθετη περίπτωση και ιδίως όταν αναφερόμαστε σε μακρές αρχαιολογικές ή ιστορικές χρονικές διάρκειες, η καταλληλότερη λέξη είναι η Εποχή. Γενικώς, οι αρχαιολόγοι, στην προσπάθειά τους να δείξουν την εκκίνηση, την κορύφωση και την δύση ενός φαινομένου/υλικού πολιτισμού χρησιμοποιούν τις λέξεις Πρώιμη, Μέση, Ύστερη/Όψιμη Εποχή και για την σταδιακή αλλαγή από την μία Εποχή στην άλλη την λέξη μετάβαση ή μεταβατική περίοδος. Πολλές φορές, ή επισήμανση ότι μία κοινωνία ή ένας υλικός πολιτισμός εισήλθε στην Εποχή του Σιδήρου δεν σημαίνει ότι εγκαταλείφθηκε παντελώς ή χρήση του ορειχάλκου αλλά απλώς ότι παρατηρείται αυξανόμενη η χρήση του σιδήρου στην κατασκευή εργαλείων και όπλων παράλληλα με την κατασκευή των ιδίων αντικειμένων από κράματα του χαλκού μέχρι φυσικά την πλήρη επικράτηση της χρήσεως του σιδήρου.

Στην μελέτη και συγγραφή της Ιστορίας και ιδίως της Ιστορίας της τέχνης, από τον 17ο μ.Χ. αιώνα υιοθετήθηκε ορολογία της περιγραφής κάθε ξεχωριστής Εποχής, η οποία χρησιμοποιείται ακόμη και σήμερα αν και στην πραγματικότητα είναι απολύτως παρωχημένη. Από περίπου το 1100 π.Χ. μέχρι το 800 π.Χ. η ιστορική ορολογία ταυτίζεται με την ορολογία της Ιστορίας της τέχνης ενώ κατόπιν χρησιμοποιήθηκε και για τις δύο επιστήμες η ίδια ορολογία, αν και στην πραγματικότητα η ονοματολογία των Εποχών προέρχεται από την μελέτη της τέχνης και μόνο. Πρωτοπόροι

¹³⁶ Δες για τις διάφορες αντιλήψεις της ιστορικής περιοδολογήσεως στον 21ο αιώνα, τα κριτήρια που προτείνεται να εφαρμοσθούν, αλλά και τις ονομασίες και το περιεχόμενο των περιόδων της Παγκόσμιας Ιστορίας στο Peter N. Stearns, «Periodization in World History: Challenges and Opportunities,» in *21st-Century Narratives of World History. Global and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, ed. R. Charles Weller (Cham, Switzerland: Spring Nature/Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), pp. 83-109.

και δημιουργοί της ιστορικής περιοδολογήσεως και της ορολογίας της υπήρξαν κατά κύριο λόγο οι Γερμανοί ιστορικοί του 18ου και 19ου μ.Χ. αιώνα σε αρμονία με τους Γάλλους και Άγγλους συναδέλφους τους των ιδίων αιώνων και τους Αμερικανούς του 20ου αιώνα. Όλοι οι άλλοι ιστορικοί του κόσμου απλώς ακολούθησαν ό,τι διάβαζαν στα γερμανικά, γαλλικά, αγγλικά, αμερικανικά βιβλία Ιστορίας. Έτσι, διακρίνουμε την Ιστορία της Ευρώπης και της Μεσογείου σε Γεωμετρική, Αρχαϊκή, Κλασική/Κλασική, Ελληνιστική, Ρωμαϊκή, Ύστερη Αρχαιότητα (Πρωτο-Χριστιανική, Παλαιο-Χριστιανική), Δυτικό Μεσαίωνα, Βυζαντινή, Νεώτερη, Πρόσφατη, Σύγχρονη Εποχή.

Μέχρι το τέλος του 19ου μ.Χ. αιώνα ήταν βέβαιο σε όλους τους ερευνητές και μελετητές των Ανθρωπιστικών Επιστημών ότι η Ιστορία άρχιζε με τα Έπη του Ομήρου και τις παλαιότερες ελληνικές επιγραφές, δηλαδή μετά τον Η' αιώνα π.Χ. Η ανακάλυψη, όμως, κατά τις πρώτες δεκαετίες του 20ου μ.Χ. αιώνα δέλτων με γραφή στην Μεσοποταμία, στην Κρήτη και στην ηπειρωτική Ελλάδα και ενεπίγραφων τοιχογραφιών στην Αρχαία Αίγυπτο μετατόπισαν την αρχή της καταγεγραμμένης Ιστορίας, έστω και σε μορφή λογιστικών εγγραφών και σύντομων φράσεων, κατά περίπου 2000 χρόνια προς τα πίσω. Για την Αρχαία Εγγύς Ανατολή, την Αίγυπτο και την Κρήτη αλλά και για τους Μυκηναίους/Αχαιούς, αρχαιολόγοι και ιστορικοί χρησιμοποιούν τοπικές χρονολογήσεις με το όνομα ηγεμόνα (λ.χ. Χαμουραβί, Ραμσής Γ', Σολομών, Δαρείος) ή πολιτισμών (λ.χ. Βαβυλωνιακός, Χεταϊκός, Μινωικός, Μυκηναϊκός, Ασσυριακός, Περσικός πολιτισμός). Για τον ελλαδικό χώρο αλλά και όπου ταξίδεψαν και εγκαταστάθηκαν Έλληνες μετά την Μυκηναϊκή Εποχή, η Γεωμετρική Εποχή σε τέχνη και Ιστορία πήρε το όνομά της από την διακόσμηση των αγγείων. Οι ζωγραφισμένες κυματοειδείς γραμμές και τα φυτικά σχέδια των μυκηναϊκών αγγείων μετατρέπονται στην Γεωμετρική Εποχή σε ομόκεντρους κύκλους και ημικύκλια, οι οποίοι δεν σχηματίζονται με το χέρι αλλά με είδος διαβήτη, το ζωγραφικό σκέλος του οποίου ήταν πολλοί χρωστήρες (πινέλα). Ο μυκηναϊκός κόσμος και πολιτισμός κατέρρευσε μεν αλλά δεν εξαφανίστηκε. Αναμείχθηκε σταδιακά με νέα στοιχεία που ήρθαν ή εμφανίστηκαν στον ελλαδικό χώρο.

Ενώ η Γεωμετρική Εποχή συχνά αναφερόταν/αναφέρεται ως Σκοτεινοί Χρόνοι, δηλαδή πολιτισμική στασιμότητα και λιγοστά τεκμήρια, στην πραγματικότητα ήταν μια μεταβατική περίοδος κατά την οποία στην διακόσμηση της αγγειοπλαστικής τα απλοϊκά γεωμετρικά σχέδια έγιναν μαϊανδροι και το αγγείο γέμισε με παραστάσεις ως αυτοτελή σύνολα που είχαν ζωγραφισθεί με ακρίβεια και συμμετρία. Από την άλλη πλευρά, εμφανίζεται μία νέα πλαστική τέχνη η οποία δεν δείχνει να έχει σχέση με την μυκηναϊκή, είναι μία πλαστική (λ.χ. αγαλματοποιία) *ab initio* (εξ αρχής) που βασίζεται σε έναν «πρωτόγονο ρεαλισμό». Η γεωμετρική τέχνη αποδεικνύει την κυριαρχία της Αθήνας στον ελλαδικό χώρο. Περίπου από το 800 π.Χ./700 π.Χ. (για την τέχνη) και μέχρι το 500/480 π.Χ., ιστορικοί και αρχαιολόγοι όρισαν την Αρχαϊκή Εποχή. Ονομάστηκε Αρχαϊκή διότι είχε θεωρηθεί ότι από τότε άρχισε η ελληνική τέχνη αλλά την ίδια περίοδο υπήρξε και η πολιτειακή αρχή της ελληνικής Πόλεως. Ο χαρακτηρισμός Αρχαϊκή διαχώριζε την προϊστορία, όπως είχε γίνει αντιληπτή κατά τον 18ο και 19ο μ.Χ. αιώνα, με την Ιστορία αλλά όριζε και την αρχή της λάμψεως του αρχαίου ελληνικού πολιτισμού, όπως είχε γίνει αντιληπτός στους ίδιους αιώνες. Η αμέσως επόμενη, Κλασική/Κλασική Εποχή, εμπνεύστηκε από την άποψη ότι η τέχνη, ο πολιτισμός αλλά και η δημοκρατία ως σύστημα διακυβερνήσεως είχαν επιτύχει την τελειότητα. Η λέξη προέρχεται από το λατινικό *classicus*¹³⁷ το οποίο σημαίνει ο πολίτης πρώτης τάξεως, ο έξοχος πολίτης και μεθερμηνευόμενον η τέλεια τέχνη και πολιτική περίοδος του ανθρώπου. Η Ελληνιστική Εποχή που ξεκίνησε με τον θάνατο

¹³⁷ Δες Λατινικό Λεξικό Τσακαλώτος, λμ. «classicus», αρ. 1 & 2.

του Αλεξάνδρου Γ' (Μέγα) της Μακεδονίας το 323 π.Χ. και ολοκληρώθηκε με την ναυμαχία στο Άκτιο το 31 π.Χ. εξέφρασε την διάχυση του ελληνικού πολιτισμού σε Δυτική Ασία και Βορειοδυτική Αφρική και τον πολιτισμικό εξελληνισμό¹³⁸ των κατοίκων τους, ή την προσπάθεια αυτών να μιμηθούν τους Έλληνες.¹³⁹

Η Ρωμαϊκή Εποχή περιγράφει την κυριαρχία της ρωμαϊκής αυτοκρατορίας στην Ευρώπη, στην Μεσόγειο και στην Αρχαία Εγγύς Ανατολή ενώ η Πρωτο- και η Πάλαιο-Χριστιανική τους πρώτους Χριστιανικούς αιώνες. Η Ύστερη Αρχαιότητα καλύπτει την ιστορική περίοδο της Ευρώπης και της Ανατολικής Μεσογείου από τα τέλη του 3ου μ.Χ. αιώνα μέχρι και τις αρχές του 7ου μ.Χ. αιώνα, όταν πια η Ανατολική Ρωμαϊκή Αυτοκρατορία είχε καταρρεύσει και την είχε αντικαταστήσει το Βυζαντινό Κράτος. Η Ύστερη Αρχαιότητα είναι μια μακρά μεταβατική περίοδος που έγινε μάρτυρας της παρακμής της Ρωμαϊκής Αυτοκρατορίας και της αντικαταστάσεως της στην Δυτική Ευρώπη από τις πρώτες ηγεμονίες των ονομαζόμενων νεοφερμένων Γερμανικών Φύλων. Η ονομασία της δικαιολογείται από την συνεχιζόμενη παρουσία του ελληνορωμαϊκού πολιτισμού και των αρχών διοικήσεως της αυτοκρατορίας μέχρι την εγκαθίδρυση του βασιλείου των Φράγκων στην Δύση και του Βυζαντινού Κράτους στην Ανατολή. Ακολουθεί η ονομαζόμενη Μεσαιωνική Εποχή στην Δύση, με το άδικο αρνητικό πρόσημο του σκοταδισμού, και η Αναγέννηση ως πρώτο τμήμα της Νεώτερης Εποχής της Ιστορίας του ανθρώπου στην Ευρώπη.¹⁴⁰ Σήμερα, το 2023, ως Πρόσφατη Ιστορία θεωρούμε την περίοδο του 20ου μ.Χ. αιώνα μέχρι και το 1989-1990, την κατάρρευση του Υπαρκτού Σοσιαλισμού στην Ευρώπη και στις άλλες χώρες όπου επικρατούσε αυτό το σύστημα διακυβερνήσεως. Η Σύγχρονη ή Τρέχουσα Ιστορία είναι αυτή των τελευταίων ετών μέχρι και το προηγούμενο δευτερόλεπτο. Η Σύγχρονη Ιστορία ανήκει περισσότερο στην ερευνητική δημοσιογραφία και στους δημοσιογράφους της παρά στους ιστορικούς, μια που οι ιστορικοί για να συγγράψουν χρειάζεται να βασισθούν κυρίως σε αρχειακές πηγές. Τα κρατικά αρχεία στην Ευρώπη συνήθως διατίθενται στην μελέτη των ιστορικών, έστω και εν μέρει, τουλάχιστον τριάντα χρόνια μετά τα συμβάντα στα οποία αναφέρονται τα τεκμήρια που περιέχουν και πολύ συχνά μετά από πενήντα ή και πολύ περισσότερα χρόνια. Για την ελληνική Ιστορία, οι τελευταίες περιόδους περιλαμβάνουν την Περίοδο των Πολιτικών Αναταραχών (1950-1967), την Δικτατορία των Συνταγματαρχών (1967-1974), και την Μεταπολίτευση (βουλευτικές εκλογές, 1974-2019), χωρίς σχεδόν καθόλου αρχειακές πηγές στην διάθεση των Ιστορικών. Σε ό,τι αφορά στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ιστορία και παρά τις στρεβλώσεις της ιδίως μέχρι την Αναγέννηση, η περιοδολόγηση της Ιστορίας μπορεί να περιλαμβάνει αστοχίες στην ορολογία της αλλά είναι πολύ χρήσιμη στους ιστορικούς και στους μη ειδικούς για την γρήγορη τοποθέτηση συμβάντων και προσώπων μέσα στον ιστορικό χρόνο.

Ανεξάρτητα, λοιπόν, από τις αιτίες περιοδολογήσεως της αρχαιολογίας και της Ιστορίας, οι διάφορες Εποχές όντως σηματοδοτούν την πολιτική, κοινωνική, οικονομική, πολιτισμική διαφοροποίηση ανάμεσα σε συγκεκριμένους αιώνες ή σε σειρά αιώνων. Οι αλλαγές που παρατηρούν αρχαιολόγοι και ιστορικοί δείχνουν ότι ο κόσμος των ανθρώπων αλλά και το εκάστοτε περιβάλλον τους συνεχώς μεταβάλλεται. Η Ιστορία είναι μία ευθεία γραμμή με περιοδικές εξάρσεις προς την επάνω ή προς την κάτω της πλευρά. Αρχίζει με την δημιουργία του Σύμπαντος, συγκεκριμενοποιείται με την εξάπλωση του ανθρώπινου είδους επί της Γης, παίρνει σάρκα και οστά όταν οι άνθρωποι αρχίζουν να την καταγράφουν ως πράξεις τους και λέξεις τους, του-

¹³⁸ Δες τις ερμηνείες της λέξεως ελληνίζω στο Λεξικό Δημητράκος, λμ. «ελληνίζω».

¹³⁹ Για την έκφραση αυτών των Εποχών στην τέχνη δες συνοπτικά Μιχάλης Τιβέριος, *Εισαγωγή στην Αρχαία Ελληνική Τέχνη* (Αθήνα: Ίδρυμα Γουλανδρή-Χορν, 1995).

¹⁴⁰ Δες πρόχειρα Wikipedia, λμ. «History of Europe» at <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Europe>.

λάχιστον από την Παλαιολιθική Εποχή. Ιστορία είναι κάθε παρουσία της ανθρώπινης δραστηριότητας, από το τρίγωνο των Παλαιολιθικών ανθρώπων ζωγραφισμένο ή χαραγμένο μέσα στο σπήλαιο, τα εργαλεία και σκεύη, οι κατοικίες, τα μνημεία, οι διενέξεις, η θεωρητική σκέψη, η επιστημονική σκέψη, οι πολιτισμοί, οι πόλεμοι και τα έργα της ειρήνης, ακόμη και οι μεταβολές του φυσικού περιβάλλοντος και το τυχαίο συμβάν αλλά κυρίως η μελέτη του ίδιου του ανθρώπου ως μέρος της ανθρώπινης Ιστορίας του. Το τέλος της Ιστορίας είναι η εξάλειψη της ανθρώπινης ζωής και δραστηριότητας στο Σύμπαν.

Κεφάλαιο 7

Ακαδημαϊκός Επαρχιωτισμός

Ο ακαδημαϊκός επαρχιωτισμός δεν έχει σχέση με την πόλη ή την περιοχή ή ακόμη και την χώρα στην οποία μένει αυτός/αυτή που τον νοιώθει ούτε με συγκεκριμένη φυλή, εθνότητα ή θρησκευτική πίστη. Είναι κατά βάση συναίσθημα και αντίληψη που εκφράζονται στην ακαδημαϊκή κοινότητα από ένα ή περισσότερα μέλη της προς άλλα μέλη της κοινότητας αντανακλώντας συνήθως σύμπλεγμα ακαδημαϊκής κατωτερότητας ή ανωτερότητας. Έχει συγκεκριμένα χαρακτηριστικά τα οποία εμφανίζονται στο άτομο που νοσεί από ακαδημαϊκό επαρχιωτισμό σε διάφορους βαθμούς. Σε ορισμένες περιπτώσεις ατόμων ο αριθμός των χαρακτηριστικών αυτών είναι μικρός ενώ σε άλλες πολύ μεγάλος. Η ασθένεια αυτή μάλλον έχει την αιτία της στην προσπάθεια ορισμένων ακαδημαϊκών να δείξουν την ανωτερότητά τους απέναντι στους συναδέλφους τους ή να κρύψουν την κατωτερότητά τους, κυρίως προς τους χαμηλότερους βαθμολογικά από τους ίδιους (λ.χ. προς τους υφισταμένους τους ή τους φοιτητές τους). Το φαινόμενο αυτό θα μπορούσε να ενταχθεί στον κώδικα δεοντολογίας των ακαδημαϊκών επειδή μερικές φορές έχει δυσάρεστα αποτελέσματα αν και άλλες έχει παροτρύνει αυτούς που τον υπόκεινται στην ακαδημαϊκή επιτυχία. Η αποφυγή ή απομόνωση του ακαδημαϊκού επαρχιωτισμού είναι πολύ απλή: απρόσκοπτη πρόσβαση όλων των επιστημόνων, και στην συγκεκριμένη περίπτωση των ιστορικών και των αρχαιολόγων, στην επιστημονική γνώση.

Τα χαρακτηριστικά του ακαδημαϊκού επαρχιωτισμού ενυπάρχουν στο άτομο που τελικά θα τα εκφράσει στην ώριμη περίοδο της ακαδημαϊκής του ζωής από την σχολική ηλικία. Αυτές οι ιδιαιτερότητες μπορούν να συνοψισθούν σε μερικές προτάσεις, όπως ίσως θα τις διατύπωνε ένας γιατρός. Το κυριότερο χαρακτηριστικό του ακαδημαϊκού επαρχιώτη είναι να θεωρεί ότι είναι ανώτερος από όλους τους άλλους συναδέλφους του ενώ στην πραγματικότητα είναι συνήθως πολύ κατώτερος τους. Να έχει κόμπλεξ κατωτερότητας ή ανωτερότητας απέναντι στους ξένους (άλλων χωρών) συναδέλφους του ή να τους κακολογεί για να κρύψει την δική του ανικανότητά και επιστημονική ανεπάρκεια. Να ψέγει την έλλειψη χρηματοδοτήσεως ή επιχορηγήσεων για την δική του ακαδημαϊκή αναληψία ή αδιαφορία. Να θεωρεί τους φοιτητές ή συναδέλφους του με εμπειριστατωμένη διαφορετική επιστημονική άποψη από την δική του ως εχθρούς και όχι ως επιστημονικούς συνομιλητές. Να μην παραδέχεται τις επιστημονικές του αβλεψίες και να θεωρεί ότι είναι γενικά αλάθητος. Να μην παραδέχεται την επιστημονική του άγνοια για ορισμένα ζητήματα και να θεωρεί ότι έχει επιστημονική άποψη για κάθε αρχαιολογικό και ιστορικό ζήτημα. Να θεωρεί ότι μόνο η δική του επιστημονική άποψη πρέπει να είναι σεβαστή. Να αποκρύπτει από τις ομιλίες ή δημοσιεύσεις του τις απόψεις των συναδέλφων του ή να προσποιείται ότι δεν πρόλαβε να τις μελετήσει για να μην συγκριθούν με τις δικές του. Να υποστηρίζει, μεταξύ αστείου και σοβαρού, αλλά τελικά σοβαρά, ότι είναι ο μόνος αρχαιολόγος ή ιστορικός που γνωρίζει τι πραγματικά συνέβη γενικά στο παρελθόν και/ή πώς. Ορισμένα από αυτά τα χαρακτηριστικά emπίπτουν και σε θέματα ακαδημαϊκής ακεραιότητας αλλά τις περισσότερες φορές ο ακαδημαϊκός επαρχιωτισμός είναι τόσο μεγάλος στο άτομο που τον έχει που μπορεί και προς στιγμήν να αγνοηθούν.

Πέρα από το συναδελφικό επιστημονικό κλίμα που πρέπει να υφίσταται ανάμεσα σε όλους τους αρχαιολόγους και ιστορικούς ανεξαρτήτως ακαδημαϊκής θέσεως, επιπέδου πτυχίων, εθνότητας ή φυλής, υπάρχουν και κάποια αντικειμενικά

δεδομένα που είναι αναγκαίο να συνυπάρχουν. Το πρώτο και κυριότερο είναι η απρόσκοπτη νόμιμη πρόσβαση όλων των επιστημόνων σε οποιοδήποτε είδους πληροφορία απαιτείται για την έρευνά τους. Σε πολύ μεγάλο βαθμό, αυτό έχει επιτευχθεί στις Η.Π.Α. αλλά όχι στον ίδιο βαθμό στην Ευρώπη και πάρα πολύ λιγότερο στην Ελλάδα. Στην Ελλάδα, λοιπόν, ούτε οι ίδιοι οι πανεπιστημιακοί έχουν πρόσβαση σε όλες τις διεθνείς μονογραφίες και άρθρα περιοδικών διότι δεν έχει καλλιεργηθεί στο έθνος και στο κράτος η ακαδημαϊκή κουλτούρα και τα μακροχρόνια επιστημονικά και εθνικά οφέλη της βιβλιοθήκης ως συνόλου πηγών. Με άλλα λόγια, ούτε οι πανεπιστημιακές βιβλιοθήκες/σπουδαστήρια, ούτε το Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών και τα Ινστιτούτα του, ούτε καν η νέα Εθνική Βιβλιοθήκη διαθέτουν πλήρη πρόσβαση σε όλες τις απαραίτητες σε ιστορικούς και αρχαιολόγους ηλεκτρονικές βάσεις βιβλίων, περιοδικών, και σημαντικών πηγών πόσο μάλλον να διαθέτουν τις κυριότερες διεθνείς έντυπες επιστημονικές εκδόσεις του 20ου αιώνα. Εκτός όμως από τις αντικειμενικές ελλείψεις επιστημονικών γνώσεων, λείπει από την ελληνική εκπαιδευτική κουλτούρα η έννοια χρήσεως της βιβλιοθήκης. Η ιδέα της βιβλιοθήκης, φυσικής ή ηλεκτρονικής, πρέπει να καλλιεργηθεί σε κάθε παιδί από το Νηπιαγωγείο, από τους δασκάλους και καθηγητές στο σχολείο. Δηλαδή, το παιδί, ο έφηβος, ο νέος, ο φοιτητής, ο επιστήμονας πρέπει να κάνει κτήμα του την αντίληψη ότι η οποιαδήποτε πληροφορία τού είναι αναγκαία για την ακαδημαϊκή καθημερινότητά του βρίσκεται σε μια βιβλιοθήκη, φυσική (έντυπη) ή ηλεκτρονική, και στην οποία πρέπει να έχει πλήρη και απρόσκοπτη πρόσβαση.

Κατά τον 20ο αιώνα πολλοί λίγοι Έλληνες και συνήθως οι επιστήμονες που είχαν σπουδάσει στο εξωτερικό συγκροτούσαν από μόνοι τους έντυπες βιβλιοθήκες ελληνικών και ξενόγλωσσων βιβλίων, μικρές ή και μεγάλες με χιλιάδες βιβλία. Υπήρχαν, όμως, και ορισμένοι που δεν είχαν πανεπιστημιακές θέσεις και η μόρφωσή τους μπορεί να ήταν λυκειακή ή τεχνική αλλά αγαπούσαν το βιβλίο και πίστευαν ότι πρέπει να κατέχει κανείς κυριολεκτικά την γνώση για να γνωρίζει τον κόσμο. Ένας από αυτούς ήταν και ο πατέρας μου, ο οποίος μέχρι το τέλος του 20ου αιώνα είχε καταφέρει να συγκεντρώσει μερικές χιλιάδες επιστημονικά και λογοτεχνικά βιβλία και να υποκαταστήσει αυτό που στις Η.Π.Α. και στην Μεγάλη Βρετανία ονομάζεται κοινοτική βιβλιοθήκη. Αυτός ήταν που ενέπνευσε σε εμένα και στον αδελφό μου την αγάπη για τα βιβλία και την διερεύνηση της γνώσεως. Με αυτόν τον τρόπο, λοιπόν, με την συγκρότηση προσωπικής βιβλιοθήκης, ορισμένοι Έλληνες δίδαξαν στα παιδιά τους την αγάπη για την γνώση. Στον 21ο αιώνα, όμως, η έντυπη γνώση όλο και μειώνεται με παράλληλη αύξηση της γνώσεως σε ηλεκτρονική μορφή. Είναι συνεπώς απαραίτητο στο σχολείο αν όχι και στο σπίτι το παιδί να εξασκηθεί στην ηλεκτρονική διερεύνηση για γνώση.

Ο εκπαιδευτικός στόχος του σημερινού σχολείου δεν είναι πλέον να μεταδώσει γνώσεις που πρέπει να αποστηθίσει ο μαθητής για την υπόλοιπη ζωή του αλλά να μπορεί αυτός/αυτή να γνωρίζει πού και πώς θα βρει στην βιβλιοθήκη ή στο Διαδίκτυο αυτό το οποίο αναζητά. Φυσικά, η αποστήθιση δεν πρέπει να εκλείψει τελείως σε ότι λ.χ. αφορά στην προπαίδεια στην αριθμητική και σε άλλες ανώτερες μαθηματικές σχέσεις, στην γραμματική, σε βασικούς κανόνες των φυσικών επιστημών αλλά και σε ποιον αιώνα συνέβησαν τα πολύ σημαντικά ιστορικά γεγονότα. Όμως, η σημερινή πρόκληση στην εκπαίδευση από το νηπιαγωγείο μέχρι τις διδακτορικές πανεπιστημιακές σπουδές είναι η εύρεση της σωστής πληροφορίας μέσω του Διαδικτύου αλλά και γενικά η αξιολόγηση των ηλεκτρονικών πληροφοριών αλλά και των παλαιότερων έντυπων πληροφοριών. Είναι απαραίτητο, λοιπόν, ο Έλληνας μαθητής/τρια και φοιτητή/τριας να εξασκηθεί από το εκπαιδευτικό του/της ίδρυμα σε αυτήν την διαδικασία. Στο σχολείο αλλά και στο σπίτι, μια που πλέον δεν υπάρχει μαθητής ή μαθήτρια που να μην έχει έξυπνο τηλέφωνο, ταμπλέτα ή υπολογιστή, πρέπει

το παιδί και ο νεαρός/ή η νεαρή να μάθουν πώς να βρίσκουν την επιστημονική πληροφορία που χρειάζονται για την εκπαίδευσή τους. Εδώ, δεν αναφερόμαστε σε απλές αναζητήσεις για μουσική ή στίχους ή βιογραφικές πληροφορίες ή γενικά χρηστικές πληροφορίες (ταξίδια, συγκοινωνίες, ωράρια λειτουργίας κλπ) αλλά για επιστημονικές πληροφορίες.

Στο μάθημα της Ιστορίας θα πρέπει να ανατίθενται στον μαθητή/τρια ερευνητικές εργασίες όχι πληροφοριακού χαρακτήρα. Δηλαδή, η εργασία δεν πρέπει να είναι λ.χ. μόνο πώς διεξήχθη η μάχη του Μαραθώνα αλλά γιατί συνέβη, χαρακτηρισμός προσωπικοτήτων, τα αποτελέσματά της και κυριότερο όλων η δημοκρατική ισχύς των Ελλήνων και ιδίως των Αθηναίων. Με άλλα λόγια, ο μαθητής/τρια πρέπει να ψάξει λίγο βαθύτερα από την έντυπη εγκυκλοπαίδεια ή την *Βικιπαίδεια* αλλά και να σκεφθεί για να βρει απαντήσεις στα ερευνητικά ερωτήματα που θα θέσει ο δάσκαλος/α ή καθηγητής/τρια. Πού θα ψάξει; Αυτό είναι το έργο του διδάσκοντος/ουσας και για το έντυπο αλλά και για το ηλεκτρονικό υλικό και προϋποθέτει εκτός από την ηλεκτρονική συσκευή του μαθητή και την ύπαρξη σχολικής ή δημοτικής βιβλιοθήκης με το απαραίτητο υλικό προς διερεύνηση. Σημαντικές απόψεις υπάρχουν βέβαια και σε έντυπες πηγές. Επειδή ο διδάσκων/ουσα όμως μπορεί να μην γνωρίζει πού και τι υλικό υπάρχει διαθέσιμο, σε αυτό το ζητούμενο πρέπει να βοηθήσουν οι σύλλογοι διδασκόντων, οι σύλλογοι γονέων, το εκπαιδευτικό ινστιτούτο.

Στην επόμενη εκπαιδευτική βαθμίδα, στο πανεπιστήμιο, ο φοιτητής/τρια χρειάζονται εξειδικευμένη βοήθεια αλλά και ειδική πρόσβαση στις απαραίτητες για την έρευνά τους εξειδικευμένες πηγές. Δεν θα πρέπει να εγκλωβισθούν στον ακαδημαϊκό επαρχιωτισμό των ελληνικών και μόνον πηγών, εκτός εάν πρόκειται για δημοσιεύσεις ανασκαφών ή αξιόλογων ιστορικών και αρχαιολογικών μελετών και όχι για γενικότατες πανεπιστημιακών εγχειριδίων και σημειώσεων, τα οποία είναι απαραίτητα βέβαια ως εισαγωγές. Οι φοιτητές/τριες θα πρέπει να γνωρίζουν πολύ καλά τουλάχιστον την αγγλική γλώσσα για να έχουν πρόσβαση στην σχετική βιβλιογραφία μονογραφιών και επιστημονικών περιοδικών ιστορίας και αρχαιολογίας. Από την άλλη πλευρά, τα τμήματα Ιστορίας και Αρχαιολογίας των πανεπιστημίων θα πρέπει να φροντίσουν για την δυνατότητα προσβάσεως των φοιτητών/τριών τους στις εξειδικευμένες βάσεις δεδομένων (βιβλία, περιοδικά, άλλες πηγές) είτε με μόνιμες συνδρομές είτε με διασυνδέσεις με μεγάλες ξενόγλωσσες ακαδημαϊκές βιβλιοθήκες του εσωτερικού (λ.χ. των ξένων αρχαιολογικών ινστιτούτων στην Ελλάδα) αλλά και άλλων του εξωτερικού. Ο φοιτητής/τρια δεν θα πρέπει να έχει την δικαιολογία του δεν μπορώ να βρω άλλες πληροφορίες/πηγές. Στο επίπεδο του διδακτορικού διπλώματος, βέβαια, οι πηγές πρέπει κατά το δυνατόν να εξαντλούνται από τον/την υποψήφιο/α για το δίπλωμα και μετέπειτα εξειδικευμένο/η επιστήμονα και σε όλες τις γλώσσες (αρχαίες, μεσαιωνικές και σημερινές) που αφορούν στο θέμα που έχει επιλέξει και στις οποίες πρέπει ο ίδιος/α να έχει φροντίσει να εκπαιδευθεί. Πλέον, μέσω Διαδικτύου και εκτός από τις πηγές στη αγγλική γλώσσα, η πρόσβαση είναι δυνατή και σε πηγές στην γαλλική, γερμανική, ιταλική και ισπανική γλώσσα.

Μετά την ολοκλήρωση της εκπαίδευσής του/της ιστορικού και/η αρχαιολόγου πρέπει να υπάρχει η δυνατότητα προσβάσεως του/της σε όλες τις πηγές που μπορεί να χρειασθεί για περαιτέρω έρευνά είτε ανήκει σε ακαδημαϊκή κοινότητα είτε είναι ανεξάρτητος ερευνητής. Οι ανεξάρτητοι ερευνητές πολλές φορές ασχολούνται με θέματα που τα αποφεύγουν όσοι επικεντρώνονται σε συγκεκριμένα ιστορικά και αρχαιολογικά ζητήματα και μόνον. Ανεξάρτητοι ερευνητές, όπως ο Γιάννης Κορδάτος, ο Πέτρος Ε. Γαρουφαλιάς, ο Αλέξης Παπαχελάς, πλούτισαν την ελληνική βιβλιογραφία με μελέτες που έγιναν κατόπιν σημεία βιβλιογραφικής αναφοράς. Δεν πρέπει όμως η ελληνική ιστορική και αρχαιολογική βιβλιογραφία να εναπόκειται στο φιλότιμο, στα προσωπικά έξοδα και στο επιστημονικό μεράκι ορισμένων επιστημόνων, είτε

μέλη συγκεκριμένης ακαδημαϊκής κοινότητας είτε ανεξάρτητων, για να ανθίσει. Πρέπει η ελληνική πολιτεία να διαθέσει όλους εκείνους τους πόρους που απαιτούνται για την απρόσκοπτη και χωρίς όρους πρόσβαση όλων των επιστημόνων στις πηγές που χρειάζονται για τις έρευνές τους. Με τα σημερινά (2023) δεδομένα των ιστορικών και αρχαιολογικών ηλεκτρονικών βάσεων, ιστορικοί και αρχαιολόγοι, φοιτητές και διδακτικό προσωπικό, θα πρέπει να έχουν μόνιμη πρόσβαση τουλάχιστον στις βάσεις JSTOR, Elsevier, Harvard, Cambridge, Oxford, Wiley, Springer, Brill και De Gruyter για να μην είναι ακαδημαϊκοί επαρχιώτες. Η ολιστική επιστημονική γνώση είναι η πνευματική δύναμη ενός έθνους.

ΣΥΜΠΕΡΑΣΜΑ

Συνοπτικά και απλοϊκά θα μπορούσε να πει κανείς ότι ο αρχαιολόγος κάνει ανασκαφές για να βρει αντικείμενα από το παρελθόν και αρχαιολογία είναι ο τρόπος που σκάβει ενώ ιστορικός είναι αυτός που διαβάζει κείμενα για αυτά που συνέβησαν παλιά, τα βάζει σε μια σειρά και γράφει την Ιστορία του παρελθόντος. Αυτές τις απόψεις έχει στον νου του ο μέσος Έλληνας όταν ερωτηθεί για να δώσει τους ορισμούς των επιστημών της Αρχαιολογίας και της Ιστορίας και των εργατών τους. Συνήθως τρέφει πολύ μεγάλη εκτίμηση για τους αρχαιολόγους που αναδεικνύουν το μεγαλείο των Αρχαίων Ελλήνων και πολύ μικρή για τους ιστορικούς που διαστρεβλώνουν τα γεγονότα σύμφωνα με τις προσωπικές τους πολιτικές απόψεις. Αυτές, όμως, οι ιδέες δεν πρέπει να συγχέονται με τις επιστήμες της Αρχαιολογίας και της Ιστορίας και τους πανεπιστημιακά εκπαιδευμένους θεράποντές τους. Αυτοί είναι που πρέπει να επιδιώξουν με το σοβαρό έργο τους και τα δημοσιεύματά τους να τοποθετήσουν τις επιστήμες τους στην θέση που τους αρμόζει στο πάνθεον των επιστημών. Πρέπει να απομονώσουν την ψευδοαρχαιολογία και την ψευδοϊστορία και να δείξουν την διαφορά τους με τις ανακοινώσεις προσωρινών επιστημονικών συμπερασμάτων που δεν έχουν ακόμη γίνει αποδεκτά και που τελικά είτε θα γίνουν αποδεκτά είτε θα απορριφθούν από την επιστημονική κοινότητα. Όμως, ο μεγάλος εχθρός του αρχαιολόγου και του ιστορικού είναι ο ίδιος του ο εαυτός. Πρέπει, μέσα στην επιστημονική και ακαδημαϊκή του καριέρα να μάθει να συνεργάζεται με τους συναδέλφους του αντί να τον διακατέχει το αίσθημα του συναγωνισμού και να εκφράζει τον ακαδημαϊκό του επαρχιωτισμό. Επίσης, η πολιτεία πρέπει να φροντίσει να του παράσχει από την αρχή της εκπαιδευτικής του ζωής την παιδεία της βιβλιοθήκης φυσικά προς όφελος της επιστήμης αλλά και για να αποφύγει μία άλλη μορφή του ακαδημαϊκού επαρχιωτισμού. Η επιστημονική άμιλλα και η πλήρης και απρόσκοπτη πρόσβαση σε όλες τις πηγές γνώσεως που του χρειάζονται είναι αυτές που θα προωθήσουν τον ίδιο ακαδημαϊκά αλλά και μέσω αυτού την επιστήμη του.

Ο ιστορικός και ο αρχαιολόγος πρέπει κατά την άσκηση του λειτουργήματός τους να επιδεικνύουν νηφαλιότητα, επιστημονική συγκρότηση, αποστασιοποίηση από οποιαδήποτε πολιτική, θρησκευτική, κοινωνική ή άλλη πεποιθήση, η οποία μπορεί να παρεισφρήσει στο έργο τους. Πρέπει να είναι ανεξάρτητοι και να εργάζονται ανεξάρτητα από οποιοδήποτε μικρό ή μεγάλο κέντρο εξουσίας. Ο οδηγός για τα συμπεράσματά τους είναι μόνο τα τεκμήρια που έχουν στην διάθεσή τους και θα πρέπει να υποτάξουν τις ιδεολογίες τους ως ερευνητές. Φυσικά, δεν εννοούμε ο ερευνητής να παραθέσει απλώς τα τεκμήρια χωρίς την δική του άποψη ή κριτική ή τις υποθέσεις εργασίας του αλλά να μην περιορίσει ηθελημένα την έρευνα του και να μην επιλέξει μόνο εκείνα τα τεκμήρια που αποδεικνύουν την προαποφασισμένη του θέση. Με άλλα λόγια, για το θέμα που επιλέγει να ασχοληθεί ο ιστορικός και ο αρχαιολόγος πρέπει το μυαλό του να είναι λευκή άγραφη πινακίδα (*tabula rasa*), η οποία θα συμπληρωθεί σταδιακά από όλα του τα ευρήματα, τις διαπιστώσεις και τις σκέψεις του για αυτά. Αφού εξετάσει με κριτική ματιά τις πηγές του, θα εξάγει τα συμπεράσματά του από όλα του τα τεκμήρια. Δεν πειράζει εάν έχει αμφιβολίες τις οποίες πρέπει να εκφράσει ούτε εάν τα συμπεράσματά του είναι προσωρινά, πράγμα που πρέπει να το δηλώσει ευθέως. Ιστορικός και αρχαιολόγος πρέπει πάντα να έχουν κατά νου ότι τα συμπεράσματά τους πρέπει να υποστηρίζονται από τα τεκμήρια που έχουν παραθέσει και να μην είναι έξω και μακριά από αυτά. Σε αυτήν την κατεύθυνση βοηθά, βέβαια, ο συνεπής και εξαντλητικός σωστός βιβλιογραφικός και άλλος υπομνηματισμός στα

μελετήματα. Ιστορικός και αρχαιολόγος ασκούν λειτούργημα για τα αποτελέσματα του οποίου θα λογοδοτήσουν στις νεώτερες γενεές.

Η αρχαιολογία έχει τον 21ο αιώνα ξεφύγει πια από το τυπικό έργο ανασκάπτο χρησιμοποιώντας τα ανθρώπινα χέρια ή απλά εργαλεία και χρησιμοποιεί εξελιγμένες επιστημονικές μεθόδους ανασκαφής και καταγραφής. Είναι μια επιστήμη που έχει ανάγκη και άλλες επιστήμες και επιστήμονες έτσι ώστε τα συμπεράσματά της να είναι κοντύτερα στην πραγματικότητα του παρελθόντος. Συνήθως, στις ανασκαφές ή/και στην εξέταση των ευρημάτων απασχολούνται πλειάδα διαφορετικών επιστημόνων οι οποίοι αναλαμβάνουν να φέρουν εις πέρας συγκεκριμένο έργο. Οι παλαιοανθρωπολόγοι θα ασχοληθούν με τα ανθρώπινα οστά που πιθανόν θα βρεθούν στην ανασκαφή, οι παλαιοζωολόγοι με αυτά των ζώων, οι παλαιοβοτανολόγοι με εκείνα των φυτών. Γεωλόγοι μπορεί να είναι απαραίτητοι για να διευκρινίσουν την μορφολογία και την σύσταση πετρωμάτων ή διακοσμητικών λίθων που θα βρεθούν. Ειδικοί μηχανικοί θα ασχοληθούν με την χημική και άλλη σύσταση της πρώτης ύλης που χρησιμοποιήθηκε για τα αγγεία ή τους λίθους κτισμάτων πέρα από τη διακόσμηση των αγγείων ή των κτηρίων των ιδίων, έργο των ιστορικών της τέχνης. Νομισματολόγοι θα ασχοληθούν με τα νομίσματα, και γλωσσολόγοι ή φιλόλογοι με τις επιγραφές. Οι αρχαιολόγοι οι ίδιοι με την καθοδήγηση του/της επικεφαλής αρχαιολόγου της συγκεκριμένης ανασκαφής, στην οποία συνήθως συμμετέχουν και φοιτητές, θα έχουν την ευθύνη για την καταγραφή της ακριβούς θέσεως των ευρημάτων και για την κατά το δυνατόν συνολική ανάσχυση τους χωρίς να διασκορπιστούν, θραυστούν ή καταστραφούν. Ο/η επικεφαλής αρχαιολόγος πάντα με την βοήθεια των συναδέλφων του στην ανασκαφή θα προσπαθήσει να ταυτίσει τα ευρήματα, να τα κατατάξει και να τα χρονολογήσει και τέλος να φροντίσει για την δημοσίευση των αποτελεσμάτων της ανασκαφής. Αν και όλη αυτή η διαδικασία ακούγεται απλή και σύντομη, είναι τελικά ιδιαίτερα περίπλοκη επιστημονικά και πολύ χρονοβόρα, έτσι ώστε πολλές φορές οι επικεφαλής αρχαιολόγοι να ασχολούνται για όλη τους την ζωή με μία μόνο μεγάλη ανασκαφή και τα ευρήματά της.

Το ίδιο περίπλοκη και χρονοβόρα μπορεί να αποδειχθεί και η εργασία του ιστορικού. Μετά την ολοκλήρωση του περιγράμματος της μονογραφίας ή του επιστημονικού άρθρου, θα ακολουθήσει ή έρευνα σε διάφορες πηγές πληροφοριών για το συγκεκριμένο θέμα. Ανάλογα με την υπό εξέταση εποχή μπορεί οι πηγές αυτές να περιλαμβάνουν επιγραφές, ιστορικές μαρτυρίες, φιλολογικά μνημεία, έργα ιστορικών, διπλωματικά και άλλα αρχεία. Μεγάλο προσόν του ιστορικού είναι η σωστή και συστηματική κατάταξη του υλικού του έτσι ώστε το έργο του να είναι εύκολο να χωρισθεί σε ενότητες και κεφάλαια κατά την τελική συγγραφή. Ο ιστορικός πρέπει να είναι πολύ προσεκτικός με τις πληροφορίες και τις απόψεις που ανακαλύπτει και πρέπει να τις αξιολογεί πριν τις χρησιμοποιήσει. Δηλαδή, πόσο ασφαλής και έγκυρη μπορεί να είναι μία πηγή για να χρησιμοποιηθεί στο έργο του. Πόση αμφιβολία ή βεβαιότητα εκπέμπει η πηγή σε αυτό στο οποίο αναφέρεται. Πώς αυτή η πηγή μπορεί να συγκριθεί με άλλες πηγές επί του ίδιου θέματος και πώς μπορεί ο ιστορικός να διακρίνει ποια και γιατί είναι η πιο πειστική ανάμεσα σε αντικρουόμενες πηγές. Η κριτική σκέψη είναι ένα άλλο μεγάλο προσόν του ιστορικού, η σκέψη που βασίζεται στα τεκμήρια και όχι στην φαντασία ή στις προσωπικές ιδεολογίες του ιστορικού.

Τελικά, μέσα από την μελέτη των πηγών, ο ιστορικός θα ανακαλύψει την *imaginaire* των πρωταγωνιστών της Ιστορίας, τις πλάνες και τις λανθασμένες (όπως αποδεικνύεται εκ των αποτελεσμάτων) πεποιθήσεις τους, την πίστη τους σε συγκεκριμένες παρορμήσεις τους που θα τους οδηγήσει στην νίκη ή στην ήττα, σε οράματα που θα εξηγήσουν παράτολμες ή φαινομενικά αδύνατες επιδιώξεις. Η συγγραφή της Ιστορίας έχει ως σκοπό να αποκαταστήσει την *réalité* του παρελθόντος με βάση τα τεκμήρια που θα προσκομίσει ο ιστορικός χωρίς επιλογές, προκαταλήψεις ή προαπο-

φασισμένα συμπεράσματα. Αυτή η *réalité* εκφράζει κατά κάποιον τρόπο και κατά ένα μέρος την άποψη ότι ο ιστορικός πρέπει να ανακαλύψει την αλήθεια για το παρελθόν αν και η αλήθεια αυτή είναι στην πραγματικότητα πάντα μια πρισματική αντανάκλαση του παρελθόντος. Το παρελθόν παρουσιάζεται στον ιστορικό μόνο μέσα από το πρίσμα των πηγών που θα ανακαλύψει και άρα δεν μπορούν αυτές οι συγκεκριμένες πηγές να αντικατοπτρίσουν το τι ακριβώς, πώς και γιατί έγινε. Ακόμη και εάν υπήρξε ο ίδιος αυτόπτης μάρτυρας γεγονότων και απόψεων συγκεκριμένων πρωταγωνιστών ή του πλήθους των ανθρώπων που έλαβαν μέρος σε ένα συμβάν, η αντίληψή του για αυτά θα είναι πάντα μερική και προσωπική. Άλλωστε ισχύει το αξίωμα του «εις μάρτυς ίσον ουδείς μάρτυς», μια που δεν είναι δυνατόν να επιβεβαιωθεί η μαρτυρία τού ενός μάρτυρος. Αυτή ακριβώς είναι μία από τις εργασίες που προσπαθεί να φέρει σε πέρας ο ιστορικός, δηλαδή την διασταύρωση των πηγών του επί συγκεκριμένων ζητημάτων. Πολλές φορές, όμως, ο μάρτυς είναι ένας και είναι ο ιστορικός αυτός που πρέπει να αξιολογήσει την αξιοπιστία του και κατά πόσο μετέφερε σωστά στις αναμνήσεις του όσα υπέπεσαν στην αντίληψή του. Πρέπει να έχει γίνει λοιπόν πλέον κατανοητό πόσο δύσκολη είναι η αποκάλυψη της *imaginaire* των πρωταγωνιστών της Ιστορίας και η ανακάλυψη της *réalité* του παρελθόντος από τον ιστορικό και πόσο επίπονο είναι το έργο του κατά την συγγραφή της Ιστορίας έτσι ώστε να μην παραπλανήσει τους αναγνώστες του. Τελικά, δεν μπορεί να υπάρχει μία και μόνη αντικειμενική απεικόνιση του παρελθόντος αλλά μόνο προσωπικές απεικονίσεις των ιστορικών, οι οποίες πολλές φορές συμπίπτουν ή αποκλίνουν συγκρινόμενες μεταξύ τους. Ο μόνος, όμως, σωστός δρόμος για την απεικόνιση της *réalité* του παρελθόντος διέρχεται μέσα από την επιστημονική ακεραιότητα του ιστορικού.

BIBLIOΓΡΑΦΙΑ - BIBLIOGRAPHY

Η βιβλιογραφία που παρατίθεται δεν είναι εξαντλητική των θεμάτων που συζητούνται σε κάθε κεφάλαιο του βιβλίου αλλά μόνο ορισμένα από τα κείμενα που έχουν μελετηθεί για την συγγραφή τους. Οπωσδήποτε, όμως, αποτελεί εφελκτήριο για περαιτέρω διερεύνηση θέσεων και απόψεων επί των κειμένων μας.

This is not an exhaustive bibliography of the topics discussed in this work but a partial list of bibliographical sources studied for it. Of course, it can be used as a stepping stone for further study of the themes discussed in this book.

Συνομογραφίες

- λ.χ. λόγου χάριν
π.χ. παραδείγματος χάριν

1. Η Ιστορία και η Αρχαιολογία ως Επιστήμες

American Historical Association. “Writing History: An Introductory Guide to How History Is Produced,” at <<https://www.historians.org/teaching-and-learning/teaching-resources-for-historians/teaching-and-learning-in-the-digital-age/the-history-of-the-americas/the-conquest-of-mexico/for-students/writing-history-an-introductory-guide-to-how-history-is-produced>>.

Arnold, John H. *History: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Bintliff, John. Ed. *A Companion to Archaeology*. Malden, MA,: Blackwell, 2004.

Bowkett, Lawrence and Stephen Hill and Diana & K. A. Wardle. *Classical Archaeology in the Field: Approaches*. London: Bristol Classical Press/Duckworth, 2001.

Fagan, Brian M. and Nadia Durrani. *Archaeology. A Brief Introduction*. 12th Ed. London; Routledge, 2016.

Gosden, Chris. *Prehistory. A Very Short Introduction*. 2nd Ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Καραγιαννόπουλος, Ιωάννης. *Εισαγωγή στην επιστήμη της ιστορίας*. 3η έκδ. Εταιρεία Βυζαντινών Ερευνών. Θεσσαλονίκη: Βάνιας, 1989.

Sanders, Guy D. R. and Sarah A. James and Alicia Carter Johnson. *Corinth Excavations. Archaeological Manual*. Grand Forks, ND.: The Digital Press at the University of North Dakota, 2017.

2. The Historian in the 21st century

- Bloch, Marc. «Réflexions d'un historien sur les fausses nouvelles de la guerre.» *Revue de synthèse historique*, 33 (1921): 13-35 = «Reflections of a Historian on the False News of the War.» *Michigan War Studies Review*, 2013-51 (1 July 2013) at <<http://www.miwsr.com/2013-051.aspx>>.
- Bloch, Marc. *The Historian's Craft*. Trans. by Peter Putnam. N. York: Vintage, 1953 = *Apologie pour l'histoire ou Métier d'historien* [1940-1943]. Paris : Colin, 1949.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. “The Role of Intellectuals Today.” (1996). *Theoria* 49, no 99 (June 2002): 1-6.
- Burke, Peter. Ed. *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*. Cambridge: Polity Press/Blackwell, 1991.
- Carrier, Richard C. “The Function of the Historian in Society.” *The History Teacher* 35 (August 2002): 519-526.
- Etzioni, Amitai and Alyssa Bowditch. Eds. *Public Intellectuals An Endangered Species?* Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2006.
- Foucault, Michel and Gilles Deleuze. “Intellectuals and Power. A conversation between Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze.” (1972). In Donald F. Bouchard. Ed. *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews by Michel Foucault*. Ithaca, N.Y. : Cornell University Press, 1977.
- Gustafson, Melanie S. *Becoming a Historian. A Survival Manual for Women and Men*. Washington, D.C.: American Historical Association and Committee on Women Historians, 1991.
- Loizos, Demetris I. “Internet Publications ?” *Anistoriton*. V971 14 November 1997. <<http://www.anistor.gr/english/enback/v971.htm>> (accessed 12 June 2021).
- McNeill, William H. “Why Study History? (1985).” American Historical Association. <[https://www.historians.org/about-aha-and-membership/aha-history-and-archives/historical-archives/why-study-history-\(1985\)](https://www.historians.org/about-aha-and-membership/aha-history-and-archives/historical-archives/why-study-history-(1985))> (accessed 16 May 2021).
- OHLA. Oral History in the Liberal Arts. <<https://ohla.info/>> (accessed May 2021).
- Perkin, Harold. Ed. *History. An Introduction for the Intending Student*. London: Routledge & Kegan, 1970.
- “Quality History Education in the 21st Century. Principles and Guidelines.” Council of Europe. September 2018.
- Russell, Bertrand. “The Role of the Intellectual in the Modern World.” *The American Journal of Sociology* 44 (January 1939): 491-498.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. “A plea for Intellectuals.” (1965). In *Between Existentialism and Marxism*. London: Verso, n.d.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. "A Friend of the People." (1970). In *Between Existentialism and Marxism*. London: Verso, n.d.

Stearns, Peter N. "Why Study History? (1998)." American Historical Association. <[https://www.historians.org/about-aha-and-membership/aha-history-and-archives/historical-archives/why-study-history-\(1998\)](https://www.historians.org/about-aha-and-membership/aha-history-and-archives/historical-archives/why-study-history-(1998))> (accessed 19 May 2021).

"The Education of Historians for the Twenty-first Century (2004)." American Historical Association. <[https://www.historians.org/about-aha-and-membership/aha-history-and-archives/historical-archives/the-education-of-historians-for-the-twenty-first-century-\(2004\)](https://www.historians.org/about-aha-and-membership/aha-history-and-archives/historical-archives/the-education-of-historians-for-the-twenty-first-century-(2004))> (accessed 1 June 2021).

"Why Become a Historian?" American Historical Association. <<https://www.historians.org/jobs-and-professional-development/career-resources/why-become-a-historian>> (accessed 8 May 2021).

"Why should you study history?" University of Wisconsin, Madison - Department of History. <<https://history.wisc.edu/undergraduate-program/history-careers/why-history/>> (accessed 21 May 2021).

3. What is History in the 21st Century

Bagnall, Roger S. and Raffaella Cribiore. *Women's letters from ancient Egypt. 300 BC-AD 800*. Ann Arbor: The Univ. of Michigan Press, 2006.

Barthes, Roland. *Michelet*. N. York: Hill & Wang, 1987 = *Michelet*. Paris: Seuil, 1954.

Barzun, Jacques. *Clio and the Doctors. Psycho-history Quanto-history & History*. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1974.

Beard, Charles A. and Mary R. Beard. "Introduction" of *The Rise of American Civilization*. 2 Vols. New York: Macmillan, 1927.

Beard, Charles A. "That Noble Dream." *The American Historical Review* 41 (October, 1935): 74-87.

Beard, Charles A. "Grounds for a Reconsideration of Historiography." In *Theory and Practice in Historical Study: A Report of the Committee on Historiography*. Social Science Research Council (U.S.) Bulletin 54, pp. 3-14. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1946.

Beard, Charles A. and Sydney Hook. "Problems of Terminology in Historical Writing." In *Theory and Practice in Historical Study: A Report of the Committee on Historiography*. Social Science Research Council (U.S.) Bulletin 54, pp. 103-140 (including the "Prepositions"). New York: Social Science Research Council, 1946.

- Boyd, Kelly. Ed. *Encyclopedia of Historians and Historical Writing*. 2 Vols. London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1999.
- Braudel, Fernand. “Histoire et Sciences sociales: La longue durée.” *Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 13 (no 4, 1958): 725-753 = Fernand Braudel. *On History*, pp. 25-63. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980 = *Écrits sur l'histoire*. Paris: Flammarion, 1969. Replies by Rostow, Walt W. «Histoire et sciences sociales : la longue durée.” *Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 14 (no 4, 1959): 710-718 and Kula, Witold. “Histoire et économie: la longue durée.” *Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations*. 15 (no 2, 1960): 294-313.
- Braudel, Fernand. “The History of Civilizations. The past Explains the Present.” [1958?]. In *Encyclopédie Française*. Vol. 20, *Le Monde en devenir (Histoire, évolution, prospective)*. Chapitre 5. Paris: Larousse, 1959.
- Braudel, Fernand. *Grammaire des civilisations*. Paris: Flammarion, 1963/1993.
- Bury, John Bagnell. “The Science of History.” [1902 Inaugural Address]. In *Selected Essays of J. B. Bury*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1930.
- Bury, John Bagnell. “Cleopatra's Nose.” [1916]. In *Selected Essays of J. B. Bury*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1930.
- Cannadine, David. “What is History Now?” *Proceedings of the British Academy* 122 (2004): 29-51.
- Carlyle, Thomas. “Thoughts on History.” *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country*, vol. II. no X (November 1830): 413-418 = “On History.” In vol. II, pp. 253-263. *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays*. 7 Vols. London: Chapman & Hall, 1888.
- Carlyle, Thomas. *Carlyle on Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic In History*. Ed. Archibald Macmechan. Boston: Ginn. Atheneum Press, 1901.
- Carr, E. H. *What is History?* 2nd Ed. by R. W. Davies. London: Penguin, 1987. 1st edition published in 1961.
- Cochrane, Eric. *Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance*. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Collingwood, Robin George [R. G.]. *The Idea of History* [1936]. Oxford: Clarendon, 1946.
- Coulanges, Fustel de. “An Inaugural Lecture.” [1862]. In *The Varieties of History*. 2nd Ed. Fritz Stern. Ed., pp. 179-188. New York: Meridian, 1972.
- Coulanges, Fustel de. “Introduction” of *Histoire des institutions politiques de l'ancienne France. La Gaul Romaine*. [1874]. Paris: Hachette, 1874 = *The Varieties of History*. 2nd Ed. Fritz Stern. Ed., pp. 188-190. New York: Meridian, 1972

- Croce, Benedetto. *History. Its theory and Practice*. N. York: Russell, 1920/1960 = *Theory of History and Historiography* = *Teoria e storia della storiografia*. 2nd. Ed. Bari: Laterza, 1920.
- Dilthey, Wilhelm. “2. On Understanding and Hermeneutics: Student Lecture Notes (1867–68).” In *Hermeneutics and the Study of History*. Selected Works. Vol. IV. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1996.
- Dilthey, Wilhelm. *The Formation of the Historical World in the Human Sciences*. Selected Works. Vol III. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 2002.
- Elton, G. R. *The Practice of History* [1967]. N. York: Crowell, Apollo, 1970. [Page numbering differs from the original 1967 edition]
- Elton, G. R. *Return to Essentials*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1991.
- Evans, Richard J. *In Defense of History*. London: Granta, 1997/2000.
- Evans, Richard J. “What is History? – Now.” In *What is History Now?* David Cannadine. Ed., pp. 1-18. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002
- Finley, M. I. *Ancient History. Evidence And Models*. London: Penguin, 1987.
- Gaddis, John Lewis. *The Landscape of History : How Historians Map the Past*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2002
- Gooch, G. P. *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century*. Boston: Beacon, 1959.
- Hegel, Georg. W. F. [*Lectures on*] *The Philosophy of History*. [1822, 1828, 1830]. Trans by John Sibree, 1857. New York: Prometheus Books, 1991 = Kitchener, Ontario: Batoche Books, 2001 = *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Weltgeschichte*. 2nd ed. 1840.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. “The Revival of Narrative: Some Comments.” *Past & Present* 86 (February 1980): 3-8 = Eric Hobsbawm. *On History*. Chapter 14. New York: The New Press, 1997.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. *On History*. New York: The New Press, 1997.
- Hughes, H. Stuart. *History as Art and as Science*. N. York: Harper & Row, 1964.
- Huizinga, Johan. “A Definition of the Concept of History.” [1936] In *Philosophy & History: Essays Presented to Ernst Cassirer*. Raymond Klibansky and H. J. Paton, Eds., pp. 1-10. New York: Harper and Row, 1963
- Huizinga, Johan. “The idea of History.” In *The Varieties of History*. 2nd Ed. Fritz Stern. Ed., pp. 290-303. New York: Meridian, 1972.
- Humboldt, Wilhelm von. “On the Historian's Task. [1821]” *History and Theory* 6 (no. 1, 1967): 57-71 = In *The Theory and Practice of History*. Leopold von Ranke.

Georg G. Iggers and Konrad von Moltke. Eds., pp. 5-23. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1973 = *Über die Aufgabe des Geschichtschreibers*. [1821]. Leipzig: Im Insel, no date [1921?].

Iggers, Georg G. and Konrad von Moltke. "Introduction." In *The Theory and Practice of History*. Leopold von Ranke. Georg G. Iggers and Konrad von Moltke. Eds. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1973.

Jaurès, Jean. *Histoire socialiste de la Révolution française*. 5 Vols. Paris: 1901-1923. An abridged version in English at <<https://www.marxists.org/archive/jaures/index.htm#1901>>

Jenkins, Keith. *At the Limits of History. Essays on Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge, 2009.

Jenkins, Keith. *On 'What is History?'. From Carr and Elton to Roty and White*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Jenkins, Keith. *Refiguring History. New thoughts on an old discipline*. London: Routledge, 2003.

Jenkins, Keith. *Re-Thinking History*. London: Routledge, 1991. 2nd ed., 2004.

Jenkins, Keith. *Why History? Ethics and postmodernism*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Jenkins, Keith. Ed. *The Postmodern History Reader*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Kaye, Harvey J. *The British Marxist Historians*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1984.

Ladurie, Emmanuel Le Roy. "L'histoire immobile." *Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations*. 29 (no 3, 1974): 673-692.

Ladurie, Emmanuel Le Roy. *The Territory of the Historian*. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1979 = *Le territoire de l'historien*. Paris: Gallimard, 1973.

Le Goff, Jacques. *Must we Divide History into Periods?* N, York: Columbia Univ. Press. 2015 = Jacques Le Goff. *Faut-il vraiment découper l'histoire en tranches?* Paris: Seuil, 2014.

Livy (Livius), Titus. *Ab Urbe Condita (History of Rome)*. Book I. Introduction. Loeb.

Lord John Acton - Henri Berr. "Specialization and Historical Synthesis: Lord Acton and Berr." In *The Varieties of History*. 2nd Ed. Fritz Stern. Ed., pp. 246-255. New York: Meridian, 1972.

Luce, T. J. *The Greek Historians*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Lucian. "How to Write History." In Vol. VI of *Lucian's Works*. Loeb.

Macaulay, Thomas. "Art. III-The Romance of History. England. By Henry Neele. London, 1828." *The Edinburgh Review* XLVII (January-May 1828): 331-367 =

“History (May 1828).” In *The Miscellaneous Writings and Speeches of Lord Macaulay*, pp. 133-159. London: Longmans, 1889.

Machiavelli, Nicolo. *Discourses on the First Decade of Titus Livius* [1531]. London: Kegan, Trench & Co, 1883 = *Discorsi sopra la prima Deca di Tito Livio*. Sansoni, Firenze 1971 (Letteratura italiana Einaudi).

Macfie, Alexander. Review. “Keith Jenkins Retrospective” (review no. 1266). *Reviews in History*, 7 June 2012. <<https://reviews.history.ac.uk/review/1266>>.

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. *The German Ideology*. Moscow: Progress Publishers = <<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/german-ideology/index.htm>>.

Marx, Karl. *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. Moscow: Progress Publishers = <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Marx_Contribution_to_the_Critique_of_Political_Economy.pdf>

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. *The Manifesto of the Communist Party*. Moscow: Progress Publishers = <<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1848/communist-manifesto/index.htm>>

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. *Correspondence 1846-1895*. A Selection with Commentary and Notes. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1934. For the 17 April 1871 letter see also at <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1871/letters/71_04_17.htm>

Meinecke, Friedrich. “Values and Causalities in History.” In *The Varieties of History*. 2nd Ed. Fritz Stern. Ed., pp. 290-288. New York: Meridian, 1972.

Meinecke, Friedrich. “Memorial address [for Leopold von Ranke] given on 23 January 1936 in the Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften.” In Friedrich Meinecke. *Historism. The Rise of a New Historical Outlook*, pp. 496-511. New York: Harder and Herder, 1972.

Mellor, Ronald. *The Roman Historians*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Michelet, Jules. *Histoire de France*. 19 Vols. New Edition. Paris: Lacroix, 1880.

Michelet, Jules. *Histoire de la Révolution Française*. 9 Vols. Paris: Vasseur, 1868/1883.

Michelet, Jules. *Histoire du XIXe siècle*. 3 Vols. Paris: Levy, 1875.

Mommsen, Theodor. “On the Training of Historians. Rectorial Address.” (1874) In *The Varieties of History*. 2nd Ed. Fritz Stern. Ed., pp. 192-196. New York: Meridian, 1972.

- Niebuhr, Barthold Georg. *Lectures on Ancient History*. [1829-1830]. 3 Vols. Philadelphia: Blanchard & Lea, 1852.
- Novick, Peter. *That Noble Dream. The 'Objectivity Question' and the American Historical Profession*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1988.
- Patrick Joyce – Catriona Kelly. “History and Post-Modernism. I & II.” *Past and Present* 133 (November 1991): 204-213.
- Plekhanov, G. V. *The Role of the Individual in History*. [1898]. London; Lawrence & Wishart, 1940.
- Ranke, Leopold von. [On the Relations of History and Philosophy. 1830s]. In *The Theory and Practice of History. Leopold von Ranke*. Georg G. Iggers and Konrad von Moltke. Eds., pp. 29-32. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1973.
- Ranke, Leopold von. [On the Character of Historical Science. 1830s]. In *The Theory and Practice of History. Leopold von Ranke*. Georg G. Iggers and Konrad von Moltke. Eds., pp. 33-46. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1973.
- Ranke, Leopold von. [The Role of the Particular and the General in the Study of Universal History. 1860s]. In *The Theory and Practice of History. Leopold von Ranke*. Georg G. Iggers and Konrad von Moltke. Eds., pp. 57-59. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1973.
- Ranke, Leopold von. [Prefaces]. In *The Theory and Practice of History. Leopold von Ranke*. Georg G. Iggers and Konrad von Moltke. Eds., pp. 135-164. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1973.
- Stone, Lawrence. “The Revival of Narrative: Reflections on a New Old History.” *Past & Present*, 85 (November 1979): 3-24 = Lawrence Stone. *The Past and the Present*, Chapter 3. Boston: Routledge & Kegan, 1981.
- Stone, Lawrence. “Notes. History and Post-Modernism.” *Past & Present* 131 (May 1991): 217-218.
- Stone, Lawrence – Gabrielle M. Spiegel. “History and Post-Modernism. III” *Past and Present* 135 (May 1992): 189-208.
- Thucydides. Loeb.
- Toynbee, Arnold J. *A Study of History*. 10 Vols abridged into 2 by D. C. Somervell. Ed. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1946.
- Toynbee, Arnold J. *Civilization on Trial*. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1948.
- Trevelyan, George Macaulay. “Clio, A Muse.” In *Clio, A Muse and Other Essays Literary And Pedestrian*, pp. 1-55. London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1913. Original version published as [George Macaulay Trevelyan.] “The Latest View of History.” *The Independent Review* 1 (October 1903-January 1904): 395-414.

Vico, Giambattista. *The New Science*. 3rd Ed. (1744). Ithaca, N. York: Cornell Univ. Press, 1948 [text divided into paragraphs] = *La scienza nuova*. Milano: Rizzoli, 1959 (Letteratura italiana Einaudi).

“Giambattista Vico.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* at <<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/vico/>>.

Voltaire. “Ch. 1. Introduction.” *Le Siècle de Louis XIV*. 2 Vols. Nouv. Ed. Paris: Garnier, [1922] = *The Age of Louis XIV*. Vol. XII. In “The Works of Voltaire. A Contemporary Version.” N. York: Hubert Guild, 1901.

Voltaire. “XI. Remarques sur la manière d'étudier et d'écrire l'histoire.” and “XII. Suite du même sujet.” Of “Fragments sur l'histoire.” In “Mélanges Historiques.” Tome II. *Oeuvres Complètes de Voltaire*. Paris: Dupont, 1823 = “Observations on History.” Vol. XIX. *Essays on Literature, Philosophy, Art, History*. In “The Works of Voltaire. A Contemporary Version.” N. York: Hubert Guild, 1901.

Walsh, W. H. “'Meaning' in History.” In *Theories of History*. Ed. Patrick Gardiner, pp. 296-307. New York: Free Press, 1959.

White, Hayden. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

White, Hayden. *Tropics of Discourse. Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.

White, Hayden. *The Content of the Form. Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

4. Αρχαιολογία, Ανθρωπολογία, Εθνογραφία και Προϊστορία

Fahlander, Fredrik and Terje Oestigaard. *Material Culture and Other Things. Post-disciplinary studies in the 21st Century*. Eds. Fredrik Fahlander and Terje Oestigaard. Lindome, Sweden: Bricoleur Press, 2004.

Johnson, Matthew. *Archaeological Theory. An Introduction*. 3rd Ed. Oxford: Willey Blackwell, 2020.

Samaran, Charles. Επιμ. *Ιστορία και μέθοδοί της* (μετ. του *L'Histoire et ses méthodes*, 1961). 4 Τόμ. Αθήνα: Μορφ. Ίδρ. Εθνικής Τραπέζης, 1981.

Smith, Michael E. and Gary M. Feinman and Robert D. Drennan and Timothy Earle and Ian Morris. «Archaeology as a Social Science.» *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS)* [USA], vol. 109, no 20 (15 May 2012): 7617-7621.

5. Ψευδοαρχαιολογία και ψευδοϊστορία, Ελλιπής αρχαιολογία και ιστορία, Τεχνητή Νοημοσύνη (βιβλιογραφία θεωρητικών ζητημάτων)

- Fagan, Garret G. Ed. *Archaeological Fantasies*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Feder, Kenneth L. *Frauds, Myths, and Mysteries. Science and Pseudoscience in Archaeology*. 10th Ed. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2020.
- Lefkowitz, Mary A. and Guy MacLean Rogers. Eds. *Black Athena Revisited*. Chapel Hill: The Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1996.
- Carroll, Robert Todd. Ed. *The Skeptic's Dictionary*, λμ. «pseudohistory».
- Fritze, Ronald H. *Invented Knowledge. False History, Fake Science and Pseudo-Religions*. London: Reaktion 2009.
- Schiappa, Edward and Nick Montfort. «Advice Concerning the Increase in AI-Assisted Writing.» 10 January 2023 at <<https://nickm.com/post/2023/01/advice-concerning-the-increase-in-ai-assisted-writing/>>.
- Tattersall, Ian and Eric Delson and John van Couvering. Eds. *Encyclopedia of Human Evolution and Prehistory*. Chicago: St. James Press, 1988.
- University of Portsmouth at Myport. «Using AI at university.» Visited 3 February 2024 at <<https://myport.port.ac.uk/student-life/help-and-advice/study-skills/digital-skills/using-ai-at-university>>.

6. Η Περιοδολόγηση της Ιστορίας και η Ορολογία της

- Γιακουμής, Γιώργος. *Η ιστορία ως έρευνα και κριτική*. Αθήνα: Πατάκης, 1984.
- Le Goff, Jacques. *Πρέπει, αλήθεια, να κόβουμε την ιστορία σε φέτες; Μετ. Δεσπ. Λαμπαδά. Αθήνα: Angelus Novus, 2016 = Must we Divide History into Periods? N. York: Columbia Univ. Press. 2015 = Jacques Le Goff. Faut-il vraiment découper l'histoire en tranches? Paris: Seuil, 2014.*
- Stearns, Peter N. «Periodization in World History: Challenges and Opportunities.» In *21st-Century Narratives of World History. Global and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*. Ed. R. Charles Weller, pp. 83-109. Cham, Switzerland: Springer Nature/Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.
- Τιβέριος, Μιχάλης. *Εισαγωγή στην Αρχαία Ελληνική Τέχνη*. Αθήνα: Ίδρυμα Γουλανδρή-Χορν, 1995.

7. Ακαδημαϊκός Επαρχιωτισμός

- Loizos, Demetris I. «Academic Integrity in History Writing.» Στο Δημήτρης Ι. Λοΐζος. *Η ηλεκτρονική ιστορική έρευνα και συγγραφή*. 3η Έκδ. PDF. Αθήνα: 2020 στην <<https://archive.org/details/@dilos>>.

Συμπέρασμα

Barzun, Jacques and Henry F. Graff. *The Modern Researcher*. 6th Ed. Belmont, CA.: Wadsworth, 2004.

Berger, Srtefan. *A Companion to Nineteenth Century Europe 1789-1914*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.

Δερτιλής, Γιώργος Β. *Ιστορία της νεότερης και σύγχρονης Ελλάδας 1750-2015*. Ηράκλειο: Πανεπιστημιακές Εκδόσεις Κρήτης, 2018.

Ελληνική Εταιρεία Ιστορικών της Εκπαίδευσης. «Ψηφιακές Πηγές». Στην <<https://www.eleie.gr/el/%CE%B5%CF%81%CE%B5%CF%85%CE%BD%CE%B1-%CE%BA%CE%B1%CE%B9-%CE%B4%CE%B9%CE%B4%CE%B1%CF%83%CE%BA%CE%B1%CE%BB%CE%B9%CE%B1/%CF%80%CE%B7%CE%B3%CE%AD%CF%82-%CE%B3%CE%B9%CE%B1-%CF%84%CE%B7%CE%BD-%CE%B9%CF%83%CF%84%CE%BF%CF%81%CE%AF%CE%B1-%CF%84%CE%B7%CF%82-%CE%B5%CE%BA%CF%80%CE%B1%CE%AF%CE%B4%CE%B5%CF%85%CF%83%CE%B7%CF%82/1127-%CF%88%CE%B7%CF%86%CE%B9%CE%B1%CE%BA%CE%AD%CF%82-%CF%80%CE%B7%CE%B3%CE%AD%CF%82.html>>.

Erskine, Andrew. Ed. *A Companion to Ancient History*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

Hsia, R. Po-chia. Ed. *A Companion to the Reformation World*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.

Ο Ελληνισμός υπό ξένη κυριαρχία. Τουρκοκρατία-Λατινοκρατία 1453-1821. Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους, Τόμ. Γ' & ΙΑ'. Αθήνα: Εκδοτική Αθηνών, 1974-1975.

James, Liz. Ed. *A Companion to Byzantium*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Lansing, Carol and Edward D. English Eds. *A Companion to the Medieval World*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

Laress, Klaus Ed. *A Companion to Europe since 1945*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2009.

Λοΐζος, Δημήτρης Ι. *Η ηλεκτρονική ιστορική έρευνα και συγγραφή*. 3η Έκδ. PDF. Αθήνα: 2020 στην <<https://archive.org/details/@dilos>>.

Martel, Gordon. Ed. *A Companion to Europe 1900-1945*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006.

Northrop, Douglas Ed. *A companion to World History*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

Ruggiero, Guido. Ed. *A Companion to the Worlds of the Renaissance*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.

Wilson, Peter H. *A Companion to Eighteenth Century Europe*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.

Δημήτριος Ι. Λοΐζος

Ο καθηγητής Δημήτριος Ι. Λοΐζος, αρχαιολόγος και ιστορικός με ειδικευση στην Ιστορία του Ευρωπαϊκού Πολιτισμού, γεννήθηκε στην Αθήνα το 1958 αλλά κατάγεται από την Ζάκυνθο και την Ιθάκη. Συνεισέφερε επί τριάντα συνεχή χρόνια (1990-2020) στην εκπαίδευση στην Ελλάδα, στο αμερικανικό πανεπιστημιακό κολλέγιο Deree College-The American College of Greece. Την περίοδο 1990-1998 δίδαξε Ελληνική, Ευρωπαϊκή και Αμερικανική Ιστορία ενώ την δεκαετία 2010-2020 διετέλεσε μέλος του Ακαδημαϊκού Συμβουλίου (Academic Council). Επίσης, υπήρξε ιδρυτής και διευθυντής (2010-2020) του Κολλεγιακού Γραφείου Διασφάλισης της Ποιότητας στην Ανωτάτη Εκπαίδευση (Validation Office) και προηγουμένως ιδρυτής και επικεφαλής (1998-2010) του Κολλεγιακού Γραφείου Φοιτητικής Ακαδημαϊκής Συμβουλευτικής (Academic Advising Office).

Είναι ο πρώτος (από το 1990) ιστορικός στην Ελλάδα, ειδικός στις Ψηφιακές Ανθρωπιστικές Επιστήμες (Digital Humanities) και στην Ιστορική Πληροφορική (History and Computing) και από τους ελάχιστους παγκοσμίως ιστορικούς με εμπειρία (1990-2010) σε εφαρμοσμένο προγραμματισμό ηλεκτρονικών υπολογιστών στις Ανθρωπιστικές Επιστήμες (Προγραμματιστής Ψηφιακών Ανθρωπιστικών Επιστημών/Digital Humanities Programming). Έχει ασχοληθεί με την ανάλυση, τον σχεδιασμό και την ανάπτυξη εφαρμογών με ηλεκτρονικούς υπολογιστές (ολοκληρωμένο προγραμματισμό βάσεων δεδομένων, εφαρμογές πολυμέσων) για την διερεύνηση, την μελέτη και την διδασκαλία της Ιστορίας. Το κυριότερο έργο του στον τομέα αυτό είναι ο *Διόφαντος Μετατροπέας Αρχαίων Μέτρων*. Επίσης, υπήρξε εκδότης και διευθυντής συντάξεως του πρώτου στον κόσμο ηλεκτρονικού περιοδικού Ιστορίας και Αρχαιολογίας, *Anistoriton/Ανιστόρητον* (1997-2017).

Ο Δ. Ι. Λοΐζος σπούδασε Αρχαιολογία και Αρχαία Ιστορία στο Εθνικό και Καποδιστριακό Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών και Νεώτερη Ιστορία και Οικονομικά στο Deree College. Ολοκλήρωσε τις μεταπτυχιακές του σπουδές στην Διπλωματική και Κοινωνική Ιστορία στο Kent State University της Πολιτείας Οχάιο των Η.Π.Α. με καθηγητές, μεταξύ άλλων, τους Dr. Lawrence S. Kaplan (US diplomatic history), Dr. S. Victor Paracosma (Balkan & modern Greek history), Dr. Henry N. Whitney (modern European history), Dr. Coburn V. Graves (early modern European & medieval history), Dr. Glee Wilson (ancient Greek history), και Dr. Harold Schwartz, (historiography) ενώ ασχολήθηκε και με την ανάπτυξη εφαρμογών για ηλεκτρονικούς υπολογιστές. Συνέγραψε και υποστήριξε διατριβή υπό τον τίτλο *Land, Peasants, and State Policy in Inter-war Greece (1924-1928)*, η οποία βασίσθηκε σε αρχειακές πηγές, ενώ δημοσίευσε και την συνέχειά της στο βιβλίο *Οι Μεγάλες Δυνάμεις, Η Μικρασιατική Καταστροφή και η Εγκατάσταση των Προσφύγων στην Ελλάδα (1920-1930)*. Τα επιστημονικά του ενδιαφέροντα περιλαμβάνουν την μελέτη του Αρχαίου Κόσμου, την Αρχαιολογία και Ιστορία της Ελλάδας και της Ευρώπης από τους προϊστορικούς χρόνους μέχρι σήμερα. Η τρέχουσα μελέτη του αφορά στον Αρχαίο Κόσμο (3 τόμοι): *Η Μεσόγειος, η Ελλάδα και η Ευρώπη: Ιστορία, Αρχαιολογία, Πολιτισμός*.

Ο πρόγονός του Δημήτριος Λοΐζος ανακάλυψε το 1868 στο σημερινό Σπήλαιο Λοΐζου στην Ιθάκη, όπου κατοικούσε (οικισμός Καλύβια Σταυρού), αρχαιοελληνική ταφή

που περιείχε ένα μαχαίρι, ξίφος και νομίσματα, τα οποία έδειξε στον H. Schliemann και έτσι ακούσια άνοιξαν μαζί το μεγάλο κεφάλαιο της Μυκηναϊκής Ιστορίας.

Προσωπική Ιστοσελίδα

<http://www.anistor.gr/loizos.htm>

Σύνδεσμοι Εργογραφίας

Research Gate

<https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Demetris-Loizos>

Academia

<https://acg.academia.edu/DemetrisLoizos>

Internet Archive

<https://archive.org/details/@dilos>

Diophant Ancient Measures Converter

<http://www.anistor.gr/history/diophant.html>
