verse dialogue. The title of the paper ('Didactic Verses or Poetry?') could have been rephrased, since one can argue that didactic verse is also poetry. Drawing a distinction between the genre of dialogue and that of questions and answers (ἐρωταποκρίσεις) might also have been useful here.

The last part of the book comprises two contributions on poems found in manuscripts. Marc Lauxtermann examines the poetry in manuscript Bodl. Clarke 15, a pocket-size Psalter destined for the personal use of its commissioner, Marc the Monk, dating from 1077–78, which reveals the commissioner's personal anxieties. Lauxtermann also offers new readings of Psellos' poem 1 (ed. L. G. Westerink, Teubner 1992, p. 1–13). The final contribution, by Paolo Odorico, focuses on three poems in the early eleventh-century manuscript Parisinus gr. 1711 added by its late eleventh- to early twelfth-century owner, Leo Tzykandeles (PBW Leon 25001). Odorico convincingly argues that Leo 'composed' the page containing the poetry by either collecting the three poems and putting them together or by authoring them. At the very least, the fact that Tzykandeles elected to place them together reflects his ideas about men in power. A further argument for Tzykandeles possibly putting together verses from Euripides' Hecuba and thus creating a new poem (p. 219) comes from the way vv. 3–4 are arranged in the manuscript: in order to avoid the visual appearance of enjambment, Leo has put the first two words of v. 4 in the same line as v. 3. This paper should be read together with the excellent palaeographical and codicological study of the manuscript by Filippo Ronconi (in *The Legacy of Bernard de Montfaucon: Three Hundred Years of Studies on Greek Handwriting,* eds. Antonio Bravo García and Inmaculada Pérez Martín, Turnhout 2010, pp. 503–20), which both complements and casts further light on Odorico's arguments. Minor errors can be noted in the transcription of the verses by magistros Kalos Tourmarchopolos added in 1124 (p. 213): v. 3 'τῇ φοβερὰ', v. 4 'πρόστιθη καὶ ρύσεμαι... ἀσβέστου'. The name of Kalos Toumarchopolos appears on a metrical seal from around the same time in which, as in the poem, he asks the protection of the Virgin Mary (PBW Kalos 20101).

Foteini Spingou
Princeton University

Churnjeet Mahn, *British Women's Travel to Greece, 1840–1914: Travels in the Palimpsest.* Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2012. Pp. 178.

The title of Churnjeet Mahn's important book signals the tension in the project. This is not just any recovery effort to fill in the blanks in British Hellenism by presenting the neglected work of women travelers. Certainly the book 'repl[ies] to Robert Eisner's statement that there is "a lack of good work by and about women's Greek travel"' (p. 139). It closely reads travel narratives by ten women, some less neglected than others (Jane Ellen Harrison has been the subject of two biographies and numerous studies published since 2000, while Felicia Skene, G. Muir MacKenzie and A. P. Irby, and Lucy M. J. Garnett barely appeared in a footnote before Mahn wrote about them), thus suggesting the range of women's writing about Greece from 1840 to 1914. While expressly not delivering a comprehensive survey, the book deals with the ways British women, informed by the perspectives of archaeology, ethnography, and tourism, distinguished *their* Greece from the Greece of their male compatriots, using travels to Greece to explore women's place in public life.

The word 'palimpsest' in the subtitle is key, signifying Mahn's theoretical angle. Once a paleographic term referring to writing material used at least twice, 'palimpsest' has been reinscribed in postcolonial studies to signal the complex overlay of cultural elements in conquered lands and the tendency of Western colonizers to erase that complexity with their surveying gaze. 'Travels in the Palimpsest' signifies Mahn's attention to the standpoint of privileged white female British subjects and the driving question: Were these women resistant to the crypto-colonialist project of absorbing independent Greece as a point of origin for Britain, or did they share its imperial gaze? How different really was their angle of vision?

Mahn takes seriously the visual dimension of travellers' standpoints. This is an important contribution, suggesting new areas of research on the visual technologies that inform travel writing. A 'palimpsest' represents a kind of text, but it is also a two-dimensional image suggesting a way of seeing. The 'palimpsest' competes in Mahn's analysis with another more visual type, the 'panorama': the wide, unbroken, circuit view of a scene. Patented as an art form in 1787, the panorama inspired the dioramas of Jacques Daguerre and popular multi-media circular displays in the mid-1800s (the British Museum's inverted display of the Parthenon frieze is a panorama, as Mahn points out on page 28) and long horizontal photographic collages around

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0307013100007345 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1870. All these forms helped British subjects to experience things beyond their reach, making them temporarily the 'monarch of all I survey'.

In Chapter 1, Mahn follows the parallel development of the panorama and mass tourism in the second half of the nineteenth century, when railways extended the pleasures of the Grand Tour to the British middle class and women began to travel in large numbers. At about that time, panoramas became visual aids for travellers. Mahn discusses how the panorama replaced earlier technologies of seeing. For example, Murray's handbooks of the1840s, palimpsest-like, suggested 'communion with the Orient' (p. 17) as the authentic traveller's experience through unassimilated quotations of descriptions of Ottoman spaces. By 1880 tourist guidebooks had erased most Ottoman layers and the embedding of those layers in the local present – just as the Acropolis restoration project purged the site of post-classical accretions and disassociated the surrounding environment. In their place, rendered in pictures as well as words, were panoramic views with ancient ruins in the foreground and scenes of daily life pushed into the distance (p. 140).

Mahn's analysis of women's travel writing in Chapters 2, 3 and 4 follows the tensions between these different modes of seeing. Chapter 2 studies works by Harrison (1850–1928) and Agnes Smith Lewis (1843–1926), two Cambridge-based scholars of antiquity who published guidebooks in the mode of palimpsests. At first glance the two women's standpoint vis-à-vis the contemporary surface seems different. Harrison translated the 'Attica' portion of the *Periegesis* by Pausanias, adding to it recent archaeological evidence and her own interpretations of Greek art to produce her *Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens* (1890). Skimming past both present and classical layers, she imagined social relations in Greece at their deepest, archaic level. In contrast, Lewis learned Modern Greek, was sympathetic to Orthodox Christianity, and saw present-day and ancient Greece on a continuum. She elected to translate a Modern Greek guidebook on the *Monuments of Greece* by Panagiotis Kastromenos, the brother of Sophia Schliemann. Yet like Harrison she 'selectively erased [from] vital aspects of the landscape and monuments [she] sought to represent' (p. 39) Greek perspectives so as to rewrite Greece from a British woman's standpoint.

Mahn's analysis in Chapter 3 of ethnographic studies by five writers – Skene (1846), MacKenzie and Irby (1867), Fanny Blunt (1878), and Garnett (1890 and 1914) – also suggests sameness in apparent differences, in this case, in work that squeezes discrete descriptions of the lives of Greek women into a panoramic evolutionary view. Well-connected British women distinguished themselves in ethnographic writing. They claimed the power of greater access than men to the spaces of women's lives and felt uniquely authorized to draw conclusions about national character from their ethnographic sketches. They occasionally expressed uncertainty, as when MacKenzie and Irby could not absolutely identify the national face of women in Thessaloniki under Ottoman rule. But with Greek sculpture as their point of visual reference and living examples falling short of the prototype, they felt confident in locating Greek women somewhere between the Muslim harem and the West, thus producing a racial order that placed the authors 'in a position of unrivalled authority in determining access to … representation and dissemination' (p. 76) in relation to their less developed Greek subjects.

Mahn carries the theme of access to representation into her discussion of work by Emily Pfeiffer (1883), Isabel Julien Armstrong (1892), and Catherine Janeway (1896) in Chapter 4. Here attention shifts from women's representation of others to women's consciousness of themselves as travelling subjects. By the late nineteenth century, British women travellers' seeing eye was immersed in technologies of vision. Panoramas, dioramas, magic lanterns, and 'especially the cheap reproductions of photographs, *carte-de-visite* and postcards' (p. 101) had made places such as the Acropolis a visual anchor. The familiarity of the image was uncanny. As Pfeiffer observed in 1885: '"[p]ictures, painted and verbal, have for once done their work with due effect, since nothing seems strange or wholly unexpected. Your coming seems rather a return; in any case, you have arrived, you are not *parvenu*"' (p. 103, quoting Pfeiffer). Mahn shows how the experience of awkward redundancy (p. 108) encouraged the staging of 'ironic relationships to Greece's antiquity, not simply capturing the picture of the genius' of the place 'but what it means to be a British woman, parasol in hand, at the Parthenon' (p. 103).

By following women's travel writing along a course from archaeological (palimpsest) to ethnographic (panoramic) to tourist (snapshot) perspectives, *British Women's Travel to Greece* creates its own compass-like construction with a foreshortened view of differences in the details of the texts under discussion. I wonder if the elegant theoretical framework following shifts in the metaphors of seeing would work if the texts were scrambled or the analysis moved at a slower pace that fully fleshed out its ideas or commented to a more satisfying degree on the wonderful array of quoted material. The book reads like a panorama. In order not to lose the dense, complex texture of the sources it has carefully laid out or the author's flashes of insight, readers

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0307013100007345 Published online by Cambridge University Press

must take time to follow the leaps of the author's brilliant but impatient mind. I also note the extra time it takes to locate sources in the bibliography, which breaks alphabetical order. In general the book bears the traces of a dissertation that needed fuller development and more careful editing. Yet it is absolutely worth owning and rereading. It sets the agenda for new work that must be written on both 'the hidden frames of knowledge about Greece that have fallen from view' (p. 140) and women travellers, who anxiously adopted those frames to articulate their vision of the past and future of modern society.

Artemis Leontis
University of Michigan

Paschalis Kitromilides, *Enlightenment and Nationalism: The Making of Modern Greece.* Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2013. Pp. xvii + 452.

Paschalis Kitromilides is a prodigiously productive scholar: his name appears on the title pages of about thirty volumes listed in the electronic catalogue of the Oxford University libraries. *Enlightenment and Nationalism* represents his Lebenswerk, his έργο ζωής, not only because he has been working on it and living with it for most of his life so far, but also because it is his magnum opus. This new volume is the latest manifestation of a work in progress whose first incarnation was his Harvard PhD thesis, completed in 1978 under the title 'Tradition, Enlightenment and Revolution'. A Greek version (*Ελληνικός Διαφωτισμός: οι πολιτικές και κοινωνικές ιδέες*) appeared in 1996, translated by Stella Nikoloudi. The main title of this latest avatar, which has been translated from the Greek by the author in collaboration with the late David Hardy, emphasizes Kitromilides' special interest in the political implications of the Greek Enlightenment – that, just as in France, so in Greece, political revolution was an inevitable practical consequence of the Enlightenment movement.

The author has written a new preface to the American edition which daringly claims that the topic of his book is directly relevant to the economic, social, political and moral crisis through which Greece is currently passing. Kitromilides began his research on his doctoral thesis in 1974, the year that saw both the occupation of a large part of his native Cyprus by Turkish forces and the fall of the Greek military dictatorship that had been responsible for the Turkish intervention. At the heart of his book is his personal disappointment at the failure of the Greek Enlightenment to radically reform Greek society into one where rulers and citizens alike respect each other and conform to liberal democratic principles. In a nutshell, his argument is that the outbreak of the Greek Revolution in 1821, which eventually resulted in the emergence of an independent Greek state, was a direct consequence of the Greek Enlightenment movement that had developed over the preceding one hundred years or so, but that many of the basic political ideals of the Enlightenment were gradually elbowed aside as one provisional constitution succeeded another while the Revolution was still proceeding, the final outcome being the institution of an absolute monarchy. If Kitromilides was disappointed in Greece at the time when he began carrying out his research, he has reason to be even more disappointed forty years later.

Some of the book's chapters are each devoted to a single figure: Rigas, Moisiodax and Korais. For me, however, among the most interesting chapters of this magisterial work are the more general ones that trace the transformations brought about by the Greek Enlightenment in the Greek view of history and geography. Until the early eighteenth century, Greek histories began with the ancient history of the Jews, and then proceeded to the story of the Roman Empire, whose eastern portion gradually morphed into the Byzantine Empire, which was succeeded by the Ottoman Empire. Thus the ancient past of the Christians was seen to be that of the Jews, and the Ottoman present was shared by all the Orthodox Christian peoples of the empire, irrespective of their ethnic and linguistic differences. By contrast, Greek historians during the Enlightenment developed the history of a specific Greek nation with its own language and its own distinct ethnic personality, a history that began with ancient Hellas and looked forward (implicitly or explicitly) to the possibility of a Greek future of happiness on earth rather than heavenly bliss. The most abiding feature of the Greek Enlightenment was the Greeks' discovery that their ancestors were the ancient Hellenes. This discovery led to conflicting sentiments: both pride in their lineage and sorrow at the contrast between ancient civic virtue, liberty and the rule of law on the one hand, and modern misery and moral corruption under arbitrary tyranny on the other. The increasing awareness of the ancient past inspired in Greek

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0307013100007345 Published online by Cambridge University Press