

Monte-Christo in Modern Greek and the Ottoman context: The beginning of a journey

MATTHIAS KAPPLER (University of Venice Ca' Foscari)

Abstract

The version of *Le Comte de Monte-Christo* in Modern Greek (*Ο Κόμης του Μοντεχρίστου*), translated by the Constantinopolitan Greek teacher Ioannis Patroklos, and published between 1845 and 1846 in five volumes by the French printing-house Cayol in Beyoğlu, occupies a special place in the translation and adaptation history of Dumas's novel in the "East", as it was translated almost parallelly to the first publication of the original French work serialized in *Le journal des débats* (1844-46). It thus represents the very first "entry" of the novel to the multicultural Ottoman literary panorama, though it soon fell into oblivion being outpaced by another translation that appeared in the 1860s in Athens. The contribution tackles the reception of European prose literature among Greek readers in the Hellenic Kingdom and the Ottoman Empire during the nineteenth century, referring especially to the works of Alexandre Dumas père, it further presents the first Greek translation of *Le Comte de Monte-Christo* and its translator Ioannis Patroklos, and, eventually, it analyzes selected issues of language and cultural transfer related to the denotative concepts of "Greek". Patroklos's largely "faithful" translation can be put into a foreignizing and didactic framework corresponding to the educational background of the translator.

Key words: literary translation, modern Greek novel, Ottoman Greek society, Alexandre Dumas père.

0. Introduction

The Modern Greek version of *Le Comte de Monte-Christo*¹ is the first translation of this novel in a language of the Eastern Mediterranean area. It was published in Istanbul between 1845 and 1846 and thus has been translated almost parallelly to the first publication of the original French work serialized in *Le journal des débats* (1844-46). Other translations, printed in Izmir and Athens, follow in 1859 and 1865-67 respectively. The 1845 Greek version might therefore be seen as the beginning of the "journey" that the novel will then undertake throughout the various languages of the area.

¹ Although the current spelling of the French title is today *Le Comte de Monte-Cristo*, we apply here the spelling *Monte-Christo* according to the form used in the first feuilleton publication in *Le journal des débats* (1844-46), and the first book edition (Paris: Baudry et Pétion, 1845-1846).

The reason for the primary position of Modern Greek is rooted in its mediator role of European cultural and literary issues in the Ottoman (or post-Ottoman) polysystemic society, similar to that of other Ottoman minorities, such as Armenians or Jews. Translation, especially of the new genre “novel”, occupies, beyond the mere linguistic transposition, a prominent position in the context of Greek modernity and cultural mediation during the nineteenth century in both the Hellenic Kingdom and the Ottoman Greek society. Denisi (1995: 15) lists 750 translated novels, mainly from French (450 editions), but also from English, German, Italian, Spanish, and Russian, into Greek between 1830 and 1880. These fifty years spanning from the foundation of the Greek state on the ground of the struggle for independence in 1821 to a larger urbanization in the 1880s, and the institution of the so-called New Athenian School characterised by the use of a linguistic demoticism, are considered as the formation years of the Modern Greek novel. The contribution of translated literature was certainly decisive in this formation process. It is noteworthy that most of the Greek translations from French novels appear about the same time of their first publication in France, to bear witness to the enormous success and interest on behalf of the readership in the new-born Greek Kingdom and the larger cities of the Ottoman Empire, where an important portion of the Greek and Greek-speaking urban class continued to reside and produce. Another striking point is that among all translated French writers the undisputed first place is occupied by Alexandre Dumas père with 84 editions in the nineteenth century (followed by Eugène Sue with 33 editions; see Stryfon-Kyriakidou 1998: 20), and that, eventually, *Le Comte de Monte-Christo* presents a noteworthy translation diversity among all Dumas novels in Greek (three different and independent translations both within and outside Greece). This is well a valuable reason to put this novel as *exemplum comparationis* of literary and cultural mediation in the Greek world (not to speak of the wider Eastern Mediterranean area, as proposed in the present volume).

In the first section of my contribution I will try to provide a survey of the large literary translation activity into Modern Greek in the nineteenth century, focusing on Dumas’s texts. Subsequently, I will address the problem of readership and reception in the nineteenth century, in order to be able to trace a contextual framework of the period and the conditions which led to the success of adventure novels among Greek-speaking readers. The third section includes the presentation of the translated book itself and of the translator, as well as of the other known translations published in Izmir and Athens. The last section aims to propose some specific comparative analysis attempts, which I consider particularly relevant for the Greek case, on the base of the first chapters of *Le Comte de Monte-Christo*, and which should be systematically done for all the book, something we can obviously not carry out in the given framework.

1. The framework of translation activities in the Greek-speaking world

1.1. Translation and modernity in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries

It is a well-known fact that translation activities from European prose works into Modern Greek go back to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when primarily Italian authors,

such as Boccaccio, or Giulio Cesare dalla Croce, were translated, mostly in Crete and on the Ionian Islands, and then printed in Venice (Sfoini 2003: 33-42).

It is, however, only in the eighteenth century that the European novelistic genre definitely enters the Eastern Mediterranean area. In this, Greek occupies a pioneering position in regard to the other languages spoken in the Ottoman Empire. Although the main translated genre continued to be religious texts with a share of only 20,2% of literary editions within the whole translation activity during the eighteenth century, already in the years between 1801 and 1832 the percentage rises to 22,4%, comprising 101 editions of 77 different titles (Sfoini 2019: 27). Especially novels translated from European languages become more and more popular. As an ostensive example we can refer to a text which can be defined as the eighteenth-century “bestseller” in Europe: the didactic novel *Les aventures de Télémaque* by Fénelon (1699), which was printed in Greek translation for the first time in 1742 by the Venetian printing-house of Antonio Bortoli (Sfoini 2019: 360; Patsiou 1997: 182; Strauss 2003: 50). According to Ubinini’s *La Turquie actuelle* it was still very well known in the nineteenth century by the Greeks of the Istanbulite neighbourhood of Pera (Strauss 2003: 49-50). Another Greek translation, printed in Budapest in 1801, was reprinted several times, until the 1830s, in Venice, Paris and Bucharest (Sfoini 2019: 360; Denisi 1995: 43-44), but the novel continued to be reprinted until 1883 (Patsiou 1997: 182). Other Ottoman languages follow much later: Arabic in the Constantinople edition in 1812 (Meral 1975: 75); Armenian (*krapar*) in 1826 (by the Mekhitarists in Venice), then in 1850, while the first translation in Modern Armenian appeared in 1859 (Strauss 2003: 50); and finally in Ottoman Turkish in 1859 (printed in 1862) by Yusuf Kamil Paşa (Meral 1975: 89-91), a work that inaugurated the Turkish translation activity from French. A Turkish version in Greek alphabet (“Karamanlı”) followed in 1887 (Balta 1987: no. 78, Ayaydın Cebe 2016: 203-205).

In the first half of the nineteenth century, a genristic shift in the Greek literary élite, shaken between an imperial minority status and the new independent state, is perceptible, and can be exemplified in the translation of a number of classical novels from German, namely *Die Geschichte des Agathon* by Christoph Martin Wieland (*Αγάθων*, Vienna 1814) and Goethe’s *Werther* (Athens 1843) (Patsiou 1997: 187). These two books, the former as the typical European *Bildungsroman*, and the the latter, a *Sturm und Drang* product which came as a most convenient input on the flourishing Greek romanticism, illustrate well the changing panorama in the Greek readership. At the time when the Greek *Βέρθερος* (*Werther*) appeared, i.e. around the 1840s, we are facing a shift in the reception of European novels: whereas before didactic novels were the only reading material of Greek Ottoman readers, after 1845 the market gets overflowed by pure “entertainment” literature, a passage from the “useful” to the “delightful” (Denisi 1995: 14, Stryfon-Kyriakidou 1998: 195), and also to the commercial, which was very much criticized by some intellectuals. We will come back to this point when dealing with reception in chapter 2 below.

One of the most important genres of the new entertainment literature was the “adventure” novel which, at the beginning, was mainly represented by the French writer Dumas. However, an earlier novel of this kind made its fortune a few years before, namely *The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe of York, Mariner* by Daniel Defoe (London 1719). The translation into the languages of the Ottoman Empire of this eighteenth-century bestseller was undertaken with a very large delay, – though still pioneered by Greek: the first Greek translation seems to have been published as late as 1840 in Athens (Denisi

1995: 51) – simply because the readership was not yet ready for an adventure of that kind.² Interestingly enough, the novel was first translated from the original English, which was not as self-evident as it might appear today, since many translations at that time passed by French. Actually, only two years later a new translation of *Robinson Crusoe* was published, and reprinted in 1845, which was, like most of the more popular versions of the novel in the following years, a translation of an abridged version in French (Denisi 1995: 53, 55). The titles of the two translations refer indirectly to the originals: the 1840 version (translated from English) bears the title *Τα τεράστια συμβάντα του Ροβινσώνοϋ Κρούσου* ('The enormous adventures of Robinson Crusoe'), while the 1842 and 1845 translations (from French) are entitled *Ο Ροβινσών εν τη νήσω του* ('Robinson on his island'), from *Robinson dans son île, ou Abrégé des aventures de Robinson* (1832, translated by Ambroise Rendu for school usage). Also Şemseddin Sami's famous translation into Ottoman Turkish (1886) was done from that French version, although the novel had been translated from Arabic into Turkish already in the 1864 under the title *Terceme-i hikaye-i Robinson* (Meral 2013: 146; Strauss 2019: 87 fn 90), whereas the very first Turkish *Robinson* dates from 1853, in the graphically Greek shape of the Karamanlı version *Ροπινσών Κρούσου χικιαγεσί* (Balta 1987: no. 33, Berkol 1986). During the same years, other Ottoman minorities began to publish the novel as a *feuilleton* in their press, e.g. from 1859 onwards in the Bulgarian *Цариградску Вестник* ('The Journal of Constantinople') (Strauss 1994: 132). The success of *Robinson* in the Greek world and its influence on the local literature can be seen by a number of popular paraphrases and adaptations, such as *Ο Έλλην Ροβινσών* ('The Greek Robinson', 1882), or *Αποστόλης ο Θαλασσινός ή Νέος Ροβινσών* ('Apostolis the Sailor or the New / Young Robinson', 1884; cfr. Patsiou 1997: 185). An important factor which underlines the importance of translated prose literature is the local input on the formation of a genre that was just rising in the nineteenth century, providing thus models for the development of Greek novelistic literature (as of other literatures in the area³) as far as technique, language and forms are concerned (Patsiou 1997: 181). In the case of *Robinson Crusoe* the influence is concretized in local adaptations, – a kind of "domestication" (note well, not in the sense of domestication as a translation technique according to Venuti 2008, see section 4.2.1. below) – yet the impact must be considered equally strong on a more generic level, since not only a virtually new genre is established by imported models on the ground of formal, linguistic and thematic variables, but such models can then ignite modernistic trends in the local literary development. A further important aspect concerning modernity is the fact that with the fast

2 However, Sfoini (2019: 342) reports that Joachim Heinrich Campe's children adaptation *Robinson der Jüngere. Ein Lesebuch für Kinder* (Hamburg 1779) was translated into Greek and published in Vienna as early as 1792 under the title *Τον Νέον Ρομπινσών Συμβάντα* ('The Adventures of Young Robinson'), and reprinted, still in Vienna, in 1819. Patsiou (1997: 187) talks about another Vienna edition from 1812 with the slightly different title *Νέος Ροβινσών*, but this information could not be confirmed.

3 One of the first original Modern Greek novels, *Πολυπαθής* by Grigorios Palaiologos, was published in 1839 in Istanbul. Its translation into Turkish written in Greek characters by Evangelinos Misailidis in 1871/72 was to become one of the best known books in the Karamanlidika production since for a long time it was considered as the first novel in Turkish language (e.g. Anhegger 1991). However, Şişmanoğlu Şimşek (2018) argues, on good grounds, that it should be considered as an original work constituting an instance of "rewriting". At any rate, this is a good example of how local literary development goes hand in hand with translation.

spreading of translated literature into the private sphere of family, a literate portion of urban women began to form a new and significant readership, and this is especially true for the large cities of the Ottoman Empire where many Greek-speaking families resided (Petropoulou 2007: 94). Apart from the gender issue, the general evolution of other literatures in the area, first of all of modern Turkish literature, during the second half of the nineteenth century has to be considered parallelly (see recently Çete 2019 for a comparative approach to the impact of translated literature in Greek and Turkish literatures), including the mediating contribution of Turkophone Christians and their translation activities to the integration of new elements into the literary texts of both Christians and Muslims (Tietze 1991).

1.2. Alexandre Dumas in Greek

With the notoriety of *Robinson Crusoe* the 1840s mark the starting point for the popularity of translated adventure novels. The dominant source language was undoubtedly French, as I have already mentioned in the introduction part (450 French editions from about 750 translated works), while the first and most translated author was Alexandre Dumas père. Until 1880 Denisi (1995) lists 82 works written by Dumas and translated into Greek; this number is corrected to 84 by Stryfon-Kyriakidou (1998: 20), though the latter includes several sequels of the *Comte de Monte-Christo* as if they were Dumas's works, such as *Ο Άρχων του κόσμου* ('The Lord of the World') published in Athens (1871-75) and in Cairo (1887), based on *Der Herr der Welt* by Adolf Mützelburg (Berlin 1856),⁴ or *Ο Υιός του Μοντεχρήστου* (Athens 1888), from *Le fils de Monte-Cristo* by Jules Lermina (1881) (Stryfon-Kyriakidou 1998: 60-61, 70, 71, who does not mention the original works).

The Greek translations were published in rapid succession and immediately after their release in French. It is true that most of Dumas's novels appeared in all translated languages very shortly after their first publication in French, however the quickness is impressing if we look, for example, at *Joseph Balsamo*, the first part of the tetralogy *Mémoires d'un médecin*, which appeared in French in 1846, while in the same year its Greek translation *Ιατρού Απομνημονεύματα* was printed in Izmir (Denisi 1995: no. 77,⁵ by the way being the second Dumas novel in Greek after the 1845 edition of the *Comte*). Some years witness a particularly intense production, such as 1868, when seven different Greek editions, five of them in Athens, are published in the same year for the apparently eager readership.

It was actually Athens where most of the editions were printed, a sign of the increasing importance of the young capital as a cultural and economic centre of the Greek-speaking world. Also other printing-places within the Hellenic Kingdom are mentioned, first of all Ermoupolis on the island of Syros (ten editions), which, particularly after 1866, became a

4 Note that this book has made its fortune also among the Turkophone Christians of the Ottoman Empire with the translation of the novel into Turkish written in Greek characters: *Ο Άρχων του Κόσμου, Μεσχούρ Μόντε-Χρίστο Χικαγεσινί Ζεϊλί ΛΟΡΑ ΧΟΠ*, Istanbul: Dim. & Ath. Nikolaidis, 1884. ('The Lord of the World, LORD HOPE, supplementary to the famous story of Monte-Cristo'). The title page indicates Alexandre Dumas as the author, as was the common practice in order to sell more quickly. The mention of the Greek title of the book (*Ο Άρχων του Κόσμου*) suggests that the book has been translated from Greek to Turkish. A comparative analysis will give answers to this question.

5 Denisi's list (1995: 43-141) provides all editions with continuous numbering; we therefore give herein-after the item number, without page number.

significant cultural spot in Greece, whereas other cities are also represented though in much smaller number (Patras, Zakynthos, and Chalkida, with one edition each). If we extend the period until 1900, other provincial towns, such as Chania, Larissa or Kalamata can be added (Stryfon-Kyriakidou 1998: 102). The Ottoman cities with a highly relevant Greek presence, namely Constantinople/Istanbul and Smyrna/Izmir, still play a reasonable yet declining role as printing-places: Denisi reports eleven Ottoman editions, six in Izmir and five in Istanbul (surprisingly not anyone in Salonica) between 1845 and 1880, while Stryfon-Kyriakidou (1998: 102, 121-122,) lists 16 editions in Istanbul and 15 in Izmir for the period 1845-1900 (but we have mentioned that her list contains also novels which presumably were not written by Dumas, moreover she includes Karamanlidika editions into the “Greek translations”). Egypt, as an important Greek diaspora place, is represented with one edition in Alexandria (plus the forementioned Monte-Christo sequel ‘The Lord of the World’ printed in Cairo).

Since my contribution focuses on the first Greek version of the *Comte*, which appeared in Istanbul, and aims to elaborate, among other things, its position within the Ottoman editorial context, we shall have a closer look at the novels which were printed in the Imperial capital. Two of the translations were *feuilleton* novels: *To μαύρον λείριον* (*La tulipe noire*, 1850) was serialized in *Τηλέγραφος του Βοσπόρου* in 1850 (Denisi 1995: no. 120), whereas one edition of the translation of *Les trois mousquetaires* (1844) appeared under the title *Οι τρεις Σωματοφύλακες* in 1868-69 as an appendix of *Επτάλογος* (Denisi 1995: no. 424). This case is noteworthy because the Istanbul *feuilleton* simply reprints the version by the same translator (G. Kambouroglou) previously published in Athens 1849-69 (Denisi 1995: no. 107, 402, 431); what is more, the same text appears again in Izmir in 1876 (Denisi 1995: no. 624). The multiple edition of the same text in the three major centres of Hellenism at that time is a clear sign of the need to satisfy a large readership beyond Greece, and of the commercial distribution and editorial networks between the Greek Kingdom and the Ottoman Empire. Some editors (e.g., Andreas Koromilas) maintained printing-presses both in Athens and Istanbul in order to satisfy the market (Stryfon-Kyriakidou 1998: 99).

In the 1870s three other novels appear in Greek translation in Istanbul: *Le Capitaine Paul* (1838) is printed in 1871 as *Ο πλοίαρχος Παύλος* at the Zelich printing-press (being the successor of the French typographer Cayol based in Istanbul, where the 1845 edition of the *Comte* was printed) (Denisi 1995: no. 481); *Ακτή, Μυθιστορία Ελληνορωμαϊκή* (‘Akte, a Greek-Roman Novel’) from *Acté* (1839) was published in the translation by Kl. Triandafyllos and G. Chavgiaridis in the Istanbul printing-house Voutyras in 1874 (in the same year an edition of this novel appeared also in Izmir; Denisi 1995: no. 536, 537); and *Οι Ουγενόττοι* (‘The Huguenots’, probably the first volume of the Valois Trilogy *La Reine Margot*, published in French in 1845) was edited by P. Sotiriadis in 1879 (Denisi 1995: no. 697).⁶

The intense printing activity in Izmir is characterized by a somewhat complicated edition process of the *Comte*, which we will examine closely below (section 3.2.); other Smyrnaean products are the forementioned *Mémoires d’un médecin*, first of all *Joseph Balsamo*

⁶ Stryfon-Kyriakidou (1998: 121-122) adds to these titles published in Istanbul the following works: *Μετά είκοσιν έτη* (*Vingt ans après*, 1869), *Φερνάνδη* (*Fernande*, 1872), *Τα διαβητά εγκλήματα* (*Crimes célèbres*, 1873), *Παυλίνα* (*Pauline*, 1890), *Ο Ευγενής Έρωσ* (1891). Also *Ροβινός Χοοδ ο Ευπατριδής* (*Robin Hood le proscrit*, 1889), which actually was not written by Dumas, is mentioned, as well as the Karamanli editions and the sequel novels by Mützelburg and Lermina.

(different volumes between 1846 and 1848; Denisi 1995: no. 77, 90, 99, 124); *Vingt ans après* (1845) as *Μετά είκοσιν έτη* in 1876 (previously published in Athens in 1869 [Denisi 1995: no. 430, 621], and a first 1851 edition according to Stryfon-Kyriakidou 1998: 122); *Le Vicomte de Bragelonne* (1848) as *Ο Υποκόμης της Βραζελόνης* between 1877 and 1878 (previously printed in Athens between 1852 and 1854; Denisi 1995: no. 143, 157, 166, 656, 685); *Histoire d'un mort raconté par lui-même* (short novel in *Souvenirs d'Antony*; 1835) in 1871 (previously Athens 1861; Denisi 1995: no. 276, 475; about this novel see also below section 4.1.); and *Ange Pitou* (1850-51) as *Ο Άγγελος Πιτού* in 1851 and 1882 (Stryfon-Kyriakidou 1998: 160), with a subsequent edition in Athens (1868; Denisi 1995: no. 413).⁷ The parallel or successive editions in both Izmir and Athens confirm what has been said about the cross-border book distribution and production between the larger cities of the Greek-speaking world.

2. Reception and readership

Stryfon-Kyriakidou (1998: 196) argues that, over the century and starting with 1845, the intellectual critics of Alexandre Dumas's novels in Greece changed from a moderately positive acceptance to total rejection, resulting in a kind of indifference at the end of the century. However, the discussion about his works must be seen in a more general context of the perception of literature and, eventually, paraliterature. In any case, the critics had, first and foremost, to deal with the new phenomenon of a mass readership, since, before 1845, the literary panorama was rather poor as far as the number of readers was concerned.

As I mentioned above, in the 1840s the understanding of prose literature gradually shifted from “edifying” to “entertaining”, and this has also to do with the needs of booksellers and – makers. It is in fact interesting, that there were many books but very few readers in the 1830s and until the mid-40s. An anonymous reviewer of *Robinson Crusoe* in the influential philological periodical *Ο Εραμιστής* in the year 1840, after stating that books are increasing, especially in translation, and with them new ideas were circulating, goes on saying that “[t]he image is bright under this point of view, but let's reverse it: many writers and translators, but few readers.” (Denisi 1995: 16).⁸ Denisi remarks that this sentence makes clear that the adversaries of entertaining novels were not yet alarmed: there were no readers, so nothing to worry.

This changed dramatically in the second half of the 1840s, mainly due to the translations of books written by Dumas and Sue, which were enormously popular, as we have already seen, and therefore highly commercial. A fierce dispute develops among intellectuals, culminating in the 1860s.

7 For the period after 1880 Stryfon-Kyriakidou (1998: 122) adds the following Izmir editions: *Η Κόμισσα Σαρνύ* (*La Comtesse de Charny*, 1882), *Ο Ιπότης του Ερυθρού Οίκου* (*Le Chevalier de Maison-Rouge*, 1882), and *Το Περοδέριον της Βασίλισσας* (*Le Collier de la Reine*, 1882).

8 “Η εικών είναι λαμπρά υπό αυτή της την όψιν, αλλ' ας την στρέψωμεν και υπό την αντίθετον. Συγγραφείς και μεταφρασταί πολλοί, αλλ' αναγνώσται ολίγοι.” (The source [Denisi 1995] uses monotonic orthography; generally, in this contribution, Greek quotations are reported in monotonic or polytonic writing according to the source).

The discussion about, and the reception of the newly translated novels occur both in the young Kingdom of Greece, and in the Ottoman Greek society. We saw that most of the translations, – with a few exceptions (among them the *Comte*) –, were actually printed in Athens. All the same, the major part of the intellectuals who eventually participated at the debate were born in Istanbul or Izmir, or resided a part of their life there, or, at least, had family roots in the Ottoman Empire (or in Egypt), because almost no urban society existed in mainland Greece before the 1880s (except Salonica of course, but at that time the city was still under Ottoman rule, and is, due to editorial and cultural-historical reasons, out of the realm of the issue). As a consequence of urbanity, the Ottoman Greek society was widely imbued by European way of life and culture. For this reason, we should speak of a post-Ottoman élite we are dealing with here, and, as such, intrinsically tied to the intellectuals in Constantinople or Smyrna. All the same, there was still an ongoing dialogue between the new Greek intelligentsija and the Ottoman Greek community, with highly divergent opinions crystallizing on the two shores of the Aegean. Characteristic in this respect is a dispute which develops from an outraged anonymous reviewer who ardently attacks the new genre in a 1856 issue of the Athenian periodical *Αθηνά*, and ends in an article published in the Izmir paper *Φιλόκαλος Σμυρναίος* in the same year containing an equally passionate defense of the novel as a genre, arguing, significantly by quoting the introduction from Dumas's *Le Chevalier d'Harmental*, that “novel” and “bad novel” are not synonyms, and tagging the opponents to the genre with the new term “μυθιστοριόφοβοι” (Stryfon-Kyriakidou 1998: 200-201, 204), which we could inadequately translate as ‘novelophobes’. Another example is the Smyrnaen scholar Ikesios Latris, who lived in Athens, and “recommended books on ancient and Byzantine Greece ‘rather than the indecent and unnecessary books from abroad that corrupt the moral character of the people’” (in the Athenian periodical *Πανδώρα* [15, 1865], see Petropoulou 2007: 95).

According to the available sources on the literary discussion about entertainment novels, we can divide the disputants roughly into four groups (Denisi 1995: 18-20):

1. The puritans who reject the genre altogether, even the historical novels.
2. The nationalists who support only novels which serve the “nation”.
3. Supporters of the genre, but only in good “quality”, criticizing bad language and bad translations. This large group comments negatively against French writers in general, and against Dumas and Sue in particular, because of their triviality.
4. The unconditioned supporters.

Some fanatics apart, the opposition does not primarily lean against the novels in general, but rather against a great part of French literature, since it was considered as a part of a new form of “industrial literature”. This term coined by Sainte-Beuve in an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (“De la littérature industrielle”, 1839) with reference to the *romans feuilletons*, was later on adapted by the most fierce critics of paraliterature in Greece. On the other hand, although Dumas and Sue, in particular, were considered as “bad” literature, they served, at least in the early years preceding 1860, as a comparative criterion for measuring attractiveness in the readership (Stryfon-Kyriakidou 1998: 203). In this way, translated literature also became a parameter for the own production, for example the novel writer Lykourgos Nikolopoulos observes – not without a certain irony – in 1862:

[...] I abundantly read the delightful writers of the enlightened France, and always dreamt their glorious career with immense grief, since I was not born Sue or Dumas. (Denisi 1995: 20)⁹

Being the French the absolute market leaders, with the largest number of translated novels, the intellectuals of a new-born nation who had the responsibility and task to educate the “people”, feared a kind of “danger” for the masses especially for books translated from French (and, again, written by Dumas and Sue as the major representatives). Novels from other languages were usually more accepted by the élite: besides French literature there were books translated from English (Jonathan Swift, Sir Walter Scott, Ann Radcliffe), on the third place translations from German (Goethe, Lessing, Campe), fourth from Italian (Manzoni, Foscolo), and very few from Spanish and Russian (Denisi 1995: 21).

The only just acceptable kind of novel was, according to most of the critics of the time, the historical novel, since it combined the useful with the delightful. This goes with one of the criteria set by the critics: a “good” novel must not be a product of sheer phantasy, but must contain a plot related to reality, best of all if history. Other criteria an acceptable novel had to fulfill was the claim to be *ethical*, i.e. a novel must not “introduce foreign habits that could damage the Greek morality”; that it must be *useful*, and must not “waste the time of the youth and make them dream”; and, concerning *language*, that it must be translated into “beautiful” Greek, grammatically and stylistically, in order to enrich the linguistic skills of the reader, which is again an educating aspect. Additionally, and quite unrealistically, a novel must not be commercial, and neither a writer nor a printer or book-seller must take profit of the production of a book (Denisi 1995: 22). However, as we know the reality was very different: the phantastic, commercial, and sometimes not very ethical novels were devoured by the readers, and the writers, typographers and book-sellers made a huge profit with them.

As an example for the somewhat ambivalent reception in the second half of the nineteenth century I want to mention the writer and poet Dimitrios Vikelas (1835-1908), born in Ermoupolis on the island of Syros, and raised in Istanbul (and Odessa). In his memoirs, he refers several times to translated literature, and to Dumas in particular. Vikelas as an urban cosmopolitan educated in Istanbul who was destined to play a leading role in Greek cultural life (he was actually the co-founder of the International Olympic Committee in the occasion of the first Olympic games in Athens 1896), and himself translator of French literature (though certainly of a “higher” one: as a sixteen-year-old he published the versified translation of Racine’s *Esther*), was obviously aware of the shortcomings of the new novelistic literature arriving from France though admitting that “bad literature” had always existed, and, especially, that he *read* it in his youth:

I repeatedly read novels of all kinds – though not always of the best kind. Apart from the works of Dumas, George Sand, Eugène Sue, Soulié, and the other

9 “[...] ανεγίνωσκα απλέτως τα έργα των τερπνών συγγραφέων της πεφωτισμένης Γαλλίας και ωνειροπόλουν πάντοτε το ένδοξον στάδιόν των μετά ενδομήχου λύτης, διότι δεν εγεννήθην Σύης ή Δουμάς”.

French novelists who in those years caused a stir, opportunity was given to me, if nothing else would be available, to delve into some of the worst novels of the previous period. (Vikelas 1908: 165-166)¹⁰

Vikelas also admits that he read Dumas's works with immense pleasure. He reports to have met Alexandre Dumas in 1858 on a ship leaving from Ermoupolis (on Syros, where Vikelas was born):

[...] the oldest [of three Frenchmen on the ship; M.K.], the tall, long-legged, dark-skinned one, with the curly hairs of his greying mane, was Alexandre Dumas; Dumas, whose *Montecristo* I read with such an admiration, when my teacher Patroklos translated it; Dumas, whose novels – so many of them! – I devoured in Michalaki's¹¹ library! (Vikelas 1908: 342)¹²

Vikelas mentions here Ioannis Patroklos, the translator of the first Greek version of *Monte-Christo*, however we will come back to this issue in the following section.

Concerning the educational contribution, the sources reveal that discussion was not solely about formal aspects of literature, but also about the question how literature forms the readers and thus the society. In this respect, the supporters of the old school of the Enlightenment, though promoting modernizing European ideas and their circulation in the Greek society, criticized the European “way of living” if addressed with an exaggerated and unreflected approach (Stryfon-Kyriakidou 1998: 11). This is a discussion which was led not only in Greece, but also in the Ottoman society, where the excessive, and misunderstood, *alafanga* (‘Frankish’, i.e. European) mode of life was largely ridiculed by the intellectuals (compare novels such as *Felâtn Bey ile Râkim Efendi* by Ahmed Midhat [1875], which denounces the uncritical adoption of European life-style leading to tragicomic absurdities).

10 “Ανέγνωσα ἀλλεπαλλήλως μυθιστορήματα παντὸς εἴδους – ὄχι δὲ πάντοτε καὶ τοῦ καλλιτέρου εἴδους. Παρεκτὸς τῶν κατὰ τὰ ἔτη ἐκεῖνα πολυκρότων ἔργων τοῦ Dumas, τῆς George Sand, τοῦ Eugène Sue, τοῦ Soulié καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συγχρόνων μυθογράφων τῆς Γαλλίας, μοῦ ἐδόθη εὐκαιρία, οὐδέποτε ἄλλοτε παρουσιασθεῖσα, νὰ διέλθω τινὰ τῶν χειροτέρων μυθιστορημάτων προγενεστέρας ἐποχῆς.”

11 Michail Milas was Vikelas's cousin, and later (1891-1894) Mayor of Athens. Vikelas reports in his memoirs (1908: 165), that “Michalakis” had tried, in his youth, to translate Dumas's novel *Acté*, apparently not finishing it.

12 “[...] ὁ πρεσβύτερος, ὁ ὕψηλός, μακροσκελής, μελαψός, ὁ μὲ τὰς οὖλας τρίχας τῆς λευκαζούσης κόμης, ἦτο ὁ Αλέξανδρος Δουμαῖς, ὁ Δουμαῖς, τοῦ ὁποίου μὲ τόσον θαυμασμὸν ἀνεγίνωσκα τὸν Μοντεχρίστον, ὅτε τὸν μετέφραζεν ὁ διδάσκαλός μου Πάτροκλος, ὁ Δουμαῖς, τοῦ ὁποίου τόσα καὶ τόσα μυθιστορήματα κατεβρόχθισα εἰς τὴν βιβλιοθήκην τοῦ Μιχαλάκη!” On the following page (343) Vikelas continues his account of the trip he spent with Dumas for the following ten days, through Piraeus, Marseille, until Paris, and describes also Dumas's two travel companions: a young, handsome and athletic Circassian, whom Dumas “brought to France in order to educate him, or perhaps as a proof that he was really returning from the Caucasus” (Dumas had reckoned the three of them to be Caucasians, when he first saw them on the shore of Ermoupolis), “the third one was a Parisian artist who accompanied the novelist”.

3. The Greek translations of the *Le Comte de Monte-Christo* in the nineteenth century

3.1. *Ο Κόμης του Μοντεχρίστου (Istanbul 1845-46): the book, the editor and the translator*

As mentioned above, *Le Comte de Monte-Christo* was first translated by Ioannis Patroklos and published by Henri Cayol in Istanbul in five volumes: Vol. I-III in 1845 (Denisi 1995: no. 69), and Vol. IV-V in 1846 (Denisi 1995: no. 82; see also Stryfon-Kyriakidou 1998: 40, and Rota 1986: 47). We do not know if the translation was carried out from the first French version serialized in *Le journal des débats* between 28.08.1844 and 15.01.1846, or from the first book publication (still with the *Christo* spelling) edited in Paris by Baudry et Pétiou in 1845-1846. However, notwithstanding that the translation process is known to be extremely quick, – for all languages, though even the first English translation appeared not before 1846 (Coward 2008: xxii) –, it seems unlikely that the first three volumes could be translated from the 1845 book edition in such a short spell. More arguments for the hypothesis that Patroklos translated from the serialized edition, and not from the book, will be given below.

Stryfon-Kyriakidou (1998: 40) argues that the Istanbul edition translated by Patroklos lacked a larger distribution in the Greek-speaking world, and especially in Greece. This opinion is supported by the information given by the translator of the 1865 Athens edition (in serialized form; see section 3.2. below), Aristeidis Vambas, in the introduction to the first portion of his translation in the periodical *Εθνική Βιβλιοθήκη*:

It [i.e. the novel; M.K.] was translated in Constantinople, we do not know by whom, since we did not see that translation, which accidentally fell prey to the flames with only a few copies saved.¹³ (*Εθνική Βιβλιοθήκη* 1 (1865), nr. 8, p. 59; see Stryfon-Kyriakidou 1998: 40)

To this information we might add Vambas's mention that the announcement of another (interrupted and lost) translation by Grigoris Kambouroglous (see below 3.2.) considers "the Constantinopolitan", i.e. Patroklos's version, as "unfinished" (*Εθνική Βιβλιοθήκη* 1 (1865), p. 59).¹⁴ The fact that the Istanbul translation is not mentioned in any other nineteenth-century edition of the novel might also be interpreted as a further evidence that this version has not left a significant impact, or that it really was, to a large extent, lost due to a fire. In any case, as Vambas also mentions, some of the copies have survived, since I saw one of them in the library of the Aristotelian University in Salonica (where the fourth volume is lacking though).

The front page of the first volume reads as follows:

Ο ΚΟΜΗΣ τοῦ ΜΟΝΤΕΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ, ΜΥΘΙΣΤΟΡΗΜΑ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ
ΔΟΥΜΑ, ΜΕΤΑΦΡΑΣΘΕΝ ὑπὸ Ι. ΠΑΤΡΟΚΛΟΥ. ΤΟΜΟΣ ΠΡΩΤΟΣ. ΕΝ

¹³ “Μετεφράσθη ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει δὲν ἠξεύρομεν παρά τινος, διότι δὲν εἶδομεν τὴν μετάφρασιν ταύτην, ἀλλ’ ἐγένετο τυχαίως παρανάλωμα τοῦ πυρὸς ὀλίγων διασωθέντων ἀντιτύπων.”

¹⁴ “[...] κατόπιν ἐπεχείρησε νέαν μετάφρασιν αὐτοῦ ὁ Κ. Γρ. Καμπούρογλους, ἐν τῇ ἀγγελίᾳ τῆς ὁποίας ὀνομάζει ἀτελεῖ τὴν τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως”.

ΚΩΝΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΥΠΟΛΕΙ. ΕΚ ΤΗΣ ΤΥΠΟΓΡΑΦΙΑΣ Ε. ΚΑΓΙΟΛ. Κατὰ τὸ
Σταυροδρόμιον. 1854.

(‘The Count of Monte-Christo, novel by Alexandre Dumas, translated by I. Patroklos. First volume. In Constantinople. From the printing-press of H. Cayol in Pera. 1845’).

The editor who figures on the front page as “Ε. Καγιόλ” is Henri Cayol, – sometimes also spelt Cailliaul –, (1805-1865) from Marseille who, together with his brother-in-law Jacques, founded in 1831 one of the first private printing-presses in Istanbul. Henri Cayol died of cholera in 1856, and the printing-press was carried forward by the Dalmatian Antoine Zelich (Strauss 1992: 310). Henri and Jacques Cayol are known to have introduced lithography in the Ottoman Empire, and their printing-house was in fact also called Τυπολιθογραφείον Καγιόλ, as can be seen from a Greek-Turkish song anthology named *Αρμονία*, and printed by Cayol in 1848 (Kappler 2002: 33, 43, 745). Cayol was situated close to the Tünel area, on the Western shores of the Bosphorus and in the quarter principally inhabited by Europeans; in fact, the indication “Σταυροδρόμιον” on the front page of *MonteChristos* stands for the modern denomination Beyoğlu (former Pera).

Page | [12]

Biographical notice about the translator Ioannis Patroklos is rather scarce. Fortunately, I found some information in the autobiography of Dimitrios Vikelas whom I already referred to in the previous section. From Vikelas’s memoirs about his childhood years in Istanbul we learn that Patroklos was his private Greek teacher giving repetition to the boy after a time of illness. Regrettably, we are not told the date when these lessons began, we only know that Vikelas entered the French school of “Monsieur Allard” when he was seven years old (Vikelas 1908: 69), i.e. in 1842, that illness interrupted his attendance, and that after his recovery he got repetition lessons by Patroklos (id. 72).

After that, Vikelas gives a surprisingly detailed account of his teacher (considering that he was only, let’s suppose, an eight- or nine-year-old boy, and that – as he informs the reader on p. 173 – he wrote this part of his autobiography in 1898, i.e. about 54 years later). I am going to quote the text in spite of its length, since it contains not only insight into Patroklos’s ongoing translation activity, but is also rich in incidental information about the Greek Ottoman society, going from the hellenization of Ottoman names to the difficult relations with Armenians:

My new teacher was known to be a pupil of Logadis.¹⁵ Where does his surname Patroklos come from? The hellenization of surnames was one of the many symptoms of the Greek renaissance. From those ending in -idis the ones which were not patronymics are simply translations of Turkish names ending in -oğlu [Turkish for ‘son’; M.K.]. Either because of the difficulty of translation, or because of excessive archaeolatry, many families have been re-

¹⁵ Nikolaos Logadis (1779-1835) was a teacher at the School of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate (Μεγάλη του Γένους Σχολή), as well as a scholar and author of mainly religious, but also linguistic works, and, as such, to state that Vikelas’s teacher was a pupil of Logadis meant to provide evidence of the former’s qualification. I am much indebted to my colleague and friend Eirini Papadaki (University of Cyprus) for this information.

baptised in a very Greek way. The nomenclature of Greek history and mythology provided an easy choice. This is how I suppose that my teacher acquired his heroic name. However, he bore it convincingly. He was a tall, athletic, and, altogether, handsome man. Concerning his knowledge I was not, at that time, the adequate judge. His only philological achievement was, I reckon, the translation of Dumas's novel, the Count of Montecristo. He published it as *fylladia*¹⁶ while I was his pupil, and hence he allowed me to follow, from week to week, the adventures of the legendary hero. Perhaps the scarce attention he paid to the teaching of his pupil can only be attributed to his increased dedication to the translation activity. After that I was at pains to unlearn systematical misspellings. Perhaps I wrongly burden him with the responsibility for this. He was certainly a good teacher, and a good man, gentle and kind in his manners. At that time rumours reached my ears saying that he had a close friendship with an Armenian woman, but I could not understand why exactly such relationships were considered blameworthy. Anyway, my lessons were not interrupted because of that.

I was taught French by Monsieur Verdet, an equally good man, maybe also capable in the profession he exercised, but much less well-kept than Patroklos in his clothing and concerning the cleanness of his hands. (Vikelas 1908: 74-76)¹⁷

Should Vikelas's admiration for Dumas, which he admitted *malgré tout* (see section 2 above), be caused by the enthusiasm of a handsome teacher with neat hands, who, due to his zeal for

¹⁶ Probably in the meaning of supplement to a periodical, see below.

¹⁷ “Ο νέος διδάσκαλός μου ἐφημιζέτο ὡς μαθητῆς τοῦ Λογάδου. Πόθεν τὸ ἐπώνυμόν του Πάτροκλος; Ἡ ἐξελληνισίς τῶν ἐπωνύμων ἦτο ἐν τῶν πολλῶν συμπτωμάτων τῆς Ἐθνικῆς ἀναγεννήσεως. Ἐκ τῶν εἰς ἴδης, τὰ μὴ πατρωνυμικὰ εἶναι ἀπλῶς μεταφράσεις Τουρκικῶν ἐπιθέτων ληγόντων εἰς ὄγλου. Εἶτε διὰ τὴν δυσκολίαν τῆς μεταφράσεως, εἶτε ἐξ ὑπερβολικῆς ἀρχαιολατρίας, πολλαὶ οἰκογένειαι ἀνεβαπτίσθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ ἑλληνικώτερον. Τὴν ἐκλογὴν παρῆγεν εὐκόλον τὸ ὀνοματολόγιον τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἱστορίας καὶ μυθολογίας. Οὕτως ὑποθέτω ἀπέκτησεν ὁ διδάσκαλός μου τὸ ἡρωϊκὸν του ἐπώνυμον. Τὸ ἔφερον ὅμως εὐσχῆμως. Ἦτο ὑψηλὸς τὸ ἀνάστημα, εὐσαρκὸς καὶ, ἐν συνόλῳ, εὐμορφὸς ἄνθρωπος. Περὶ τῶν γνώσεών του δὲν ἤμην τότε ἀρμόδιος κριτῆς. Μόνον του ἔργον φιλολογικὸν ὑπῆρξε, νομίζω, ἡ μετάφρασις τοῦ μυθιστορήματος του Δουμᾶ, ὁ Κόμης τοῦ Μοντεχρίστου. Τὸ ἐδημοσίευσεν εἰς φυλλάδια ἐνῶ μὲ εἶχε μαθητὴν καί, κατὰ συνέπειαν, ἐπέτρεπε νὰ παρακολουθῶ ἀπὸ ἐβδομάδος εἰς ἐβδομάδα τὰς περιπετείας τοῦ μυθώδους ἥρωος. Ἴσως εἰς μόνην τὴν πολλὴν του ἀφοσίωσιν εἰς τὸ ἔργον τῆς μεταφράσεως πρέπει ν' ἀποδοθῇ ἡ ὀλίγη του προσοχὴ ὡς πρὸς τὴν διδασκαλίαν τοῦ μαθητοῦ του. Μετὰ κόπου κατόπιν ἀπέμαθα συστηματικᾶς ἀνορθογραφίας. Ἴσως τὸν ἀδικῶ φρονῶν ὅτι ἐκείνον βαρύνει ἡ εὐθύνη των. Ἦτο καλὸς ὁπωσδήποτε διδάσκαλος, καὶ καλὸς ἄνθρωπος, πρᾶος καὶ εὐγενὴς τοὺς τρόπους. Περιῆλθεν τότε μέχρι τῆς ἀκοῆς μου ψιθυρισμοὶ περὶ φιλίας του στενῆς πρὸς Ἀρμενίαν, ἀλλὰ δὲν ἠδυνάμην νὰ ἐννοήσω διατὶ ἀκριβῶς ἐνέγεντο αἱ τοιαῦται σχέσεις. Ἄλλως, δὲν διεκόπησαν ὡς ἐξ αὐτῶν τὰ μαθήματά μου.

Τὰ Γαλλικὰ μὲ ἐδίδασκεν ὁ Monsieur Verdet, καλὸς ἐπίσης ἄνθρωπος, Ἴσως δὲ καὶ ἱκανὸς διὰ τὸ ἔργον τὸ ὅποιον ἐπηγγέλλετο, ἀλλὰ πολὺ ὀλιγώτερον τοῦ Πατρόκλου περιποιούμενος τὰ τῆς ἐνδυμασίας του καὶ τὴν καθαριότητα τῶν χειρῶν του.”

From the subsequent passages of the memoirs we also learn that Ioannis Patroklos, while he was giving private lessons to Vikelas, had the idea to found a school together with Monsieur Verdet, the French teacher, though we do not know if the idea eventually was put into practice (Vikelas 1908: 76).

a translation he was apparently carrying out with great passion, sometimes neglected the teaching of Greek orthography? However that may be, what we learn from Vikelas's memoirs – and this has not yet been discovered so far –, is that Patroklos distributed his translation in *fylladia* (lit. 'booklet', but here probably intended as 'feuilleton') before giving the text into print as a book. It is likely that he translated the work parallelly to the publication of the French original, which ultimately confirms that his source text was the *Journal des débats*, since Vikelas's illness and absence from school, and therefore the necessity of a private teacher, falls, roughly speaking, between his seventh to ninth years of life, and, by consequence, Patroklos must have given the repetition lessons before or in 1844, i.e. when the first book edition of the *Comte* had not yet been published in France.

Where did Patroklos publish the first portions of his work, his *fylladia*, before the book appeared in 1845? We do not know it, but Strauss (2003: 43) reports serialized Greek *Monte-Christo* translations in the Istanbulite periodical *Ο Τηλέγραφος του Βοσπόρου*, providing the year 1843, which is, of course, impossible, because the novel had not yet been published in French by that time.¹⁸ However, putting the two pieces of information together, it cannot be excluded that in 1844 some of Patroklos's translations were serialized in *Τηλέγραφος* before being printed as a book by Henri Cayol, also because, as pointed out above, *Τηλέγραφος* did publish, as supplement, other translations from Dumas novels, such as a Greek version of *La tulipe noire* in 1850 (Denisi 1995: no. 120). An accurate exam of the issues of the newspaper published in those years will shed light on this question.

3.2. Two other translations: Izmir and Athens

The second Greek translation of the *Comte* appeared again outside Greece. A first volume of the novel under the title *Ο κόμης Μοντεχρήστος* is reported to have been published by the Smyrnaen printing-press Neos Planitis in 1859 (Denisi 1995: no. 228). Stryfon-Kyriakidou reports (from the "official" Greek bibliography by Gkinis & Mexas no. 7975) the initials "T.A." of an unknown translator, but she also mentions that the book is lacking in the library at the Iviron Monastery on Mount Athos, where Gkinis & Mexas had collocated it, who anyway described it as an "incomplete copy of 48 pages", for that matter (Stryfon Kyriakidou 1998: 45). However, the same volume seems to have been reprinted in Izmir by the typographer K. Prokidis in 1861 (Denisi 1995: no. 280, referring to Gkinis & Mexas no. 8795). A later Athenian translation by A. Vambas (see below) was reprinted in Izmir in 1875-76 according to Stryfon Kyriakidou (1998: 89).

The third, and most providential, translation was carried out by Aristeidis Vambas, who was a prolific translator of several popular nineteenth-century novels, for instance by Théodore Barrau or Maria Edgeworth, but also of other European works, e.g. of the *Histoire de Napoléon Ier* by L. Girault (Paris 1861, Greek translation Athens 1869).¹⁹ The title of

¹⁸ Strauss's source is just a notice by Sakellaridis in *Ο Φάρος της Ανατολής*, Istanbul 1901. Maybe the mistake originates from the fact that 1843 was the year of the first issue of *Τηλέγραφος*, which was the second Greek newspaper published in the Ottoman Empire (Stamatopoulos 2008). Its founder was Konstantinos Adosidis who, by the way, was the author of a Greek-Ottoman grammar printed in 1850 (cf. Kappler 2007: 82, and *passim*).

¹⁹ See the list of publications available at the National Library of Greece: <https://catalogue.nlg.gr/Search/>

Vambas's version of the *Comte* is *Ο Κόμης Μόντε-Χρίστος*, and was published firstly as supplements in the periodical *Εθνική Βιβλιοθήκη*, which was edited by himself. The novel appeared in twelve volumes, i.e. feuilletons, between 1865 and 1867 (Vol. I in 1865, Vol. II-VIII in 1866, and Vol. IX-XII in 1867 [Denisi 1995: no. 361, 384, 396; Stryfon-Kyriakidou 1998: 52]). It was then reprinted several times during the nineteenth century in book form, still in Athens, namely in 1874, 1875, 1884, and 1892 (Stryfon-Kyriakidou 1998: 82, and table 88-89), and is therefore the most diffused Greek translation of the *Comte* throughout the century, unlike Patroklos's unfortunate version. As mentioned above, according to Stryfon-Kyriakidou (1998: 89), it was also reprinted in Izmir in 1875-76 by the printing-house P. Markopoulos, and the editor Maxouris-Kapnisakis.

The first Athens volume (1865) is accompanied by a short prologue (*Εθνική Βιβλιοθήκη* 1, 58-59), which is interesting because it seems a reaction, or apology, to the discussion about the ethics and “usefulness” of the new novelistic genre coming from France, which was taking place at that time in Greece (see section 2 above). See the following excerpt:

This novel has been translated into almost all languages, and gained readers everywhere, because, beyond other advantages, it is highly ethical; on every page transpires the good deed, and gratitude; and malice is vividly depicted, as well as its sooner or later punishment. (Stryfon-Kyriakidou 1998: 53)²⁰

In his prologue, Vambas also mentions another translation attempt by the well-known translator Grigoris Kambouroglous, famous especially for his translation of *Les trois mousquetaires*; however, for whatever reason, his translation of the *Comte*, according to Vambas, was not achieved and “interrupted after two or three *fylladia*” (Stryfon-Kyriakidou 1998: 53).

4. Language and translation

4.1. *Katharévousa* and *dimotikí*

It is well-known that Modern Greek language planning in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is largely overshadowed by the so-called “language question” (*γλωσσικό ζήτημα*). Since Medieval Greek had developed into a diglottic direction with an archaic and a vernacular variety, in the nineteenth century fierce controversies over which variety of Greek was to be the official language of the new state were taking place, facing supporters of an archaizing language against demoticists. Given that a revitalization of Ancient Greek was not feasible (which was, nonetheless, continued to be promoted by the archaists), the “third way” through the creation of a purified variety (*καθαρεύουσα*) by Adamantios Korais in 1834 led to a complex situation subsequently characterized (first of all by Ferguson) as diglossia, that was to last until the 1970s (see Mackridge 2010). *Katharévousa* was standardized and remained the mainly used written variety in the nineteenth century, but with the foundation of the New Athenian School

Results?lookfor=Αριστείδης+Βαμπάς&type=AllFields (last accessed August 8, 2020).

20 “Τὸ μυθιστόρημα τοῦτο μετεφράσθη σχεδὸν εἰς ὅλας τὰς γλώσσας καὶ ἔτυχε πανταχοῦ ἀναγνωστῶν, διότι πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις πλεονεκτήμασιν αὐτοῦ, εἶναι καὶ ἠθικώτατον· εἰς ἐκάστην σελίδα διαλάμπει ἡ εὐποιΐα, καὶ ἡ εὐγνωμοσύνη· ζωγραφεῖται δὲ παραστατικώτατα ἡ κακία καὶ, ἡ ἀργὰ ἢ ταχέως, τιμωρία αὐτῆς.”

in the 1880s the vernacular (*δημοτική*) came back to influence literary, particularly poetic, production and public life. This situation is reflected in the language of the translated literature, too: until the 1880s the dominant variety used in the translations was *katharévoussa*, with a peak in the 1860s and 1870s, characterized by an extreme use of archaicizing elements (Stryfon-Kyriakidou 1998: 152-153). In some interesting cases we even have *katharévoussa* versions that have been linguistically simplified in later editions, e.g. the translation of *Acté*, with a first edition in 1874 and a second, demoticized version in 1892 (Stryfon-Kyriakidou 1998: 155). According to Stryfon-Kyriakidou (1998: 152-153), during the beginning of the translation period and about ten years as of 1845 there have been several translations using a “mixed” linguistic form, combining a *katharévoussa* structure with *dimotikí* elements. Patroklos’s *Montechristos* is one of the examples (while Vambas’s Athens edition of 1865 is clearly written in *katharévoussa*, as Stryfon-Kyriakidou’s [1998: 160-166] brief comparison of the two texts, together with the 1861 Izmir version, confirms). However, if one looks carefully at the translations showing up the “mixed form”, we see that these have been, prevalently, published outside Greece, and, what is more, not only in the decade 1845-1855, but even in the “hardcore” *katharévoussa* years. An instructing example is Dumas’s short novel *Histoire d’un mort raconté par lui-même* (contained in *Souvenirs d’Antony*), published in France in 1835, translated as *Ιστορία ενός τεθνεώτος διηγηθείσα υπό του αυτού* in Athens 1861 (Denisi 1995: no. 276), and as *Ιστορία νεκρού διηγουνένη παρά του ιδίου* in Izmir 1871 (Denisi 1995: no. 475). The two different varieties clearly result even from the titles (*katharévoussa* in the Athenian version vs. *dimotikí* elements in the Smyrnaen edition). It seems so that the Ottoman Greek translators have maintained a more vernacular form of writing (without saying, of course, that they used a completely *dimotikí* vernacular), whereas in Greece, at that time, a strict *katharévoussa* style was preferred. This must undoubtedly be seen in a wider diachronic perspective of the Ottoman Greek tradition, namely the large vernacular production of Phanariote literature (first of all poetry, but also prose) during the eighteenth century in Istanbul and elsewhere (see for this issue Mackridge 2017, and his analysis of eighteenth-century comedy and drama texts, both original and translated, reflecting the spoken language of their time), a literature from which the Hellenic and Hellenized élite in the nineteenth century in Greece made great efforts of dissociation.

4.2. Some analytical approaches

4.2.1. Translation and cultural transfer

When Lorenzo Venuti elaborates his framework theory for the two culturally and politically opposing approaches to translation – domestication vs. foreignization –, he states:

The aim of translation is to bring back a cultural other as the recognizable, the familiar, even the same; and this aim always risks a wholesale domestication of the foreign text, often in highly self-conscious projects where translation serves an appropriation of foreign cultures for agendas in the receiving situation, cultural, economic, political. Translation is not an untroubled communication of a foreign text, but an interpretation that is always limited by its address to specific audiences and by the cultural or institutional situations where the translated text is intended to circulate and function. (Venuti 2008: 14)

The translator has to take into account the cultural background of his/her readers, and has to decide if (s)he wants to present the foreign culture as such, or if (s)he wants to adapt, to appropriate the foreign, thus deleting it. Eugene Nida's much criticized concept of dynamic equivalence, on the other hand, aims to transform the text into the target language basically maintaining the message for the reader of the translation, so "that the response of the receptor is essentially like that of the original receptors" (Nida & Taber 1969: 200). Disregarding the fact whether such an equal response is possible or not, we have to consider the translated text as a new product pertaining to another system, and never like the source text (as Roman Jakobson made already clear in 1959 in his famous article 'On linguistic aspects of translation' relying on Saussure's distinction between *signifié* and *signifiant*). Interestingly enough for our temporal context, it is in the nineteenth century when the first attempts to grasp the cultural implication of translation take place, and namely in Germany. As early as 1813, Friedrich Schleiermacher envisaged two translation methods, one close to the source text or the author, and one close to the reader and his/her cultural perception, which Venuti characterizes as *foreignization* or *domestication*:

Schleiermacher allowed the translator to choose between a domesticating practice, an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to receiving cultural values, bringing the author back home, and a foreignizing practice, an ethno-deviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad. (Venuti 2008: 15)

Schleiermacher, in spite of his ideological background of nationalism, opted for foreignization, and this was seminal for the following decades all over Europe. Of course, we have to keep in mind that in times of romanticism, when most of the first *Monte-Christo* translations were carried out, eighteenth-century Orientalism still played an essential part, also and especially in the French source text (Salien 2000). In which measure have these different streams of thought influenced the translation activities in our area? It is unlikely that Patroklos was informed about the theoretical novelties developed at that time in Germany (but who knows?), in any case what we find in his product is a construct of educating and foreignizing strategies in order to dialogue with his target readership, but, at the same time, cases of cultural adaptation which might rather be characterised as domesticating efforts.

4.2.2. The education aspect

Taking the Istanbul edition (1845)²¹ translated by Patroklos as a basis for some analytical observations concerning translation techniques, first of all we notice a relatively large amount of notes to the text. As Stryfon-Kyriakidou (1998: 148) remarks, the period 1845-1854 is typical for footnotes added by the translator to explain points of the text which might not be part of the cultural baggage of the reader. In Patroklos's case, however, we encounter more often parenthetical notes instead of footnotes. These refer, primarily, to place names, special (e.g. nautical) terms, or other French expressions, and thus underline the didactic purpose of the translator (who, after all, was a teacher).

21 Henceforward quoted as *Ο Κόμης του Μοντεχρίστου*.

The beginning of the novel, which contains a lot of local place names, can serve as an example. All the evidences are related to Marseille, while universally known (and partly Greek in any case) names, such as *Smyrne*, *Trieste*, *Naples*, *Phocée* are, if we may say, “domesticated” appearing in their common Greek form. The erroneous spelling, including upper and lower case, of quite a number of such names probably accounts for the hasty printing process (we are dealing with an extremely commercial product that had to be thrown on the market as quickly as possible) rather than for the ignorance or inaccuracy of the translator. This results clearly from obvious typographical misprints, such as *Pomégne* instead of *Pomègue*:

Table 1: Place names

Ο Κόμης του Μοντεχρίστου (1845), p. 1-2	Le Comte de Monte-Christo (first serialized edition in <i>Le journal des débats</i>, 28.8.1844)
τῆς Παναγίας τῆς Φρουράς (Notre-Dame-de-la-garde)	de Notre-Dame-de-la-Garde
τὸν Πύργον Ἴφ ²² (Château d’If)	le château d’If
τοῦ ἀκρωτηρίου Μοργίου (Morgiou)	le cap de Morgiou
τῆς νήσου Ῥιόνος (Rion)	l’île de Rion
τῆς νήσου Καλασαρείγνης (Calasareigne)	l’île de Calasareigne et l’île de Jaros
καὶ Ἰαρὼ (Jaros)	
τὴν Πομέγκην (Pomégne)	Pomègue
ἀπέναντι τοῦ μυχοῦ τοῦ Ἀποκλείστου (Reserve)	en face de l’anse de la réserve

Page | [18]

The education aspect is even more visible when addressing nautical terms, which Patroklos often reports in French, as well. Apart from didactic issues, a second reason for this practice might be the translator’s insecurity about the proper translation of specific vocabulary, or because he deems the original French terms, which in some cases are paraphrased in Greek (see footnote 24), to be more precise:

Table 2: Nautical terms

Ο Κόμης του Μοντεχρίστου (1845), p. 1	Le Comte de Monte-Christo (first serialized edition in <i>Le journal des débats</i>, 28.8.1844)
ἀκτοπρωρεὺς (pilote côtier)	pilote côtier
τοὺς τρεῖς μόνον δόλωνας (hunier), ²³ τὸ τρίγωνον ἰστίον (foc) καὶ τὸ πλάγιον μέγα (brigantine) ²⁴	ses trois huniers, son grand foc et sa brigantine
οἱ πρότοννοι (haubans de beaupré)	ses haubans de beaupré

22 Lit. ‘the Tower of If’.

23 sic! (with “.” instead of “s” after *hunier*).

24 Note the following adaptations in the target text: the addition of μόνον ‘only’ to the three topsails (*huniers*), which is a procedure called expansion or amplification in translation studies; the adaptation of the term *foc* (foresail) as τρίγωνον ἰστίον ‘triangular sail’ and the accompanying reduction of “grand”; and the rendering of *brigantine* (spanker) as πλάγιον μέγα ‘big lateral [sail]’.

However, the parenthetical notes do not always reproduce the word of the original text. See the following instance:

Ἴδου ὁ λογιστῆς τοῦ πλοίου (contabile) Κ. Δαγγλὰρ ἐξέρχεται ἀπὸ τὸν θαλαμίσκον του (cabine) ... (Ο Κόμης του Μοντεχρίστου, p. 4)

The Italian *contabile* is used instead of the original French *comptable* (the source text from *Le journal des débats* reads “.. voici votre comptable M. Danglars qui sort de sa cabine ...”), probably because the Italian term seems to be better known to Istanbul Greeks in the nineteenth century than its French equivalent. In this case the note is not didactic, but serves better understanding, incidentally implying that the term *λογιστής*, today the most common word for ‘accountant’, was not in use in the nineteenth century, or less in use than in Standard Modern Greek.

Eventually, it should be remarked that the date when the *Pharaon* enters the port of Marseille – 24 February 1815 in the French source text – is postponed to 28 February in the Greek translation. This might well be another misprint resulting from the hurry of an inaccurate typographer, since there is little reason to believe that this date change happened deliberately on the part of the translator.

4.2.3. Cultural intersections

While the foreignizing strategies are evident in the transpositional principle of Patroklos’s translation technique, and in the use of parenthetical notes, some very interesting instances of cultural adaptation take place at those points where the original text makes direct or indirect reference to the target culture (Greek). I report here two meaningful examples from the fourth and the fifth chapter of the novel.

The first example uses the word *grec* in the metaphorical meaning of ‘smart’, according to the cultural cliché that depicts Greeks as clever, but also of ‘malicious’ (*malin*), and ‘two-faced’, probably deriving from the domain of Mediterranean trade, where Greeks were stereotyped as clever though unreliable commercial partners one should watch out for. The original passage reads as follows:

[...] et voilà Danglars qui est un finot, un malin, **un Grec**, qui va vous prouver que vous avez tort. (*Journal des débats*, 29.8.1844)

In this conversation, Caderousse, who is already in a sozzled state, describes Danglars as a smart and clever man who will resolve Fernand’s problem, i.e. Mercédès’s relationship with Dantès, without the need of killing the latter. The reader, who already can guess the approaching dramatic conspiracy (which is also the title of the chapter), gets, by the use of these three colourful adjectives (*finot*, *malin*, *Grec*), an efficient image of one of the most negative characters of the novel. The metaphorical meaning of *Greek* as ‘smart, malicious’ cannot be found in many languages, much less in Greek, and thus cannot be transposed as such. However, there have been examples of attempts to maintain the image of the “clever and fallacious Greek”. Thus, while English and German versions use more or less equivalent adjectives or sayings without referring to the concept of *Greek* (“[...] a wide-awake, clever, deep fellow”, Oxford: University Press 2008, p. 27; “[...] ein pfiffiger, mit allen Hunden gehetzter, geriebener Kopf”, Berlin: Aufbau Verlag 2010, p. 36), the Italian translation by

Lanfranco Binni (Milano: Garzanti 2011) maintains the original metaphor (“[...] è furbo, maligno, **un greco**”, p. 30). Although there is no such meaning in Standard Modern Italian, *greco* was used in some Italian varieties depicting deceitful, double-faced persons, e.g. the Venetian expression *l'è un grego*, which Boerio's dictionary (1867: 316) explains as “Uomo doppio, fallace, che ha due lingue, Che ha bella apparenza e poca sostanza”. The meaning of untrustworthiness is also present in some idioms, such as “Chi si fida di greco, non ha il cervel seco” (‘Who trusts a Greek is not in his right mind’), comparable to similar sayings in other languages, like the English expression “Beware of Greeks bearing gifts”.

How did Patroklos resolve the question, which, in his case, is particularly tricky since the nationality / cultural identity of his target readers is directly involved? He chose to simply eliminate the incriminating word, though leaving a trace of the omission by inserting three dots:

[...] ὅμως ὁ Δαγγλάρ εἶναι πανούργος, εἶναι κατεργάρης, εἶναι.... καὶ θὰ σ' ἀποδείξει ὅτι ἔχεις λάθος. (*Ο Κόμης του Μοντεχρίστου*, 1845, p. 37)

(‘but Danglars is cunning, he is astute, **he is a ...**, and he will prove you that you are wrong’)

The reason for the use of the placeholding dots is unclear. The reader cannot grasp the allusion without knowledge of the source text, but (s)he might assume, or imagine, an invective or swearword for which very often such dots actually stand. This shows implicitly that Patroklos was aware of the negative connotation of the word *grec*, but it still remains obscure why he simply did not choose another Greek expression for the concept of maliciousness or fallaciousness. The fact that he neither chooses to leave two adjectives only, and that he repeats instead the third copular verb, leaving thus a visible gap, proves that he willingly wanted to underline a missing element or an unspoken curse.²⁵

Our second example concerns a description of Mercédès, Edmond Dantès's fiancée, taken from the fifth chapter (the translation of its title from *Le repas des fiançailles* (‘The espousal’) into *Το συμπόσιον* (‘The symposium’) can be considered as a cultural appropriation itself!):

Mercédès était **belle comme une de ces Grecques de Chypre ou de Céos**, aux yeux d'ébène et aux lèvres de corail. (*Journal des débats*, 31.8.1844)

Patroklos's translation reads as follows:

Ἡ Μερσεδὴ ὁμοίαζεν **ὠραίαν ἑλληνίδα** ἔχουσα μέλανα, ὡς ἔβενον, ὀφθαλμοῦς, καὶ προφυρᾶ, ὡς κοράλλιον, χεῖλη. (*Ο Κόμης του Μοντεχρίστου*, 1845, p. 46)

(‘Mercédès looked like a **beautiful Greek woman**, with black eyes like ebony, and crimson lips like coral’)

²⁵ The Turkish version in Greek characters (Karamanli), printed in 1882 in Istanbul (cf. Şişmanoğlu Şimşek 2022), which could be compared because of the common cultural and religious Greek-Orthodox background of the readership, has “χεριφ σὺεϊτάν κηήδηρ” (*herif şeytan gibidir*; ‘the man is like the devil’, p. 41), i.e. a very much abridged characterization of Danglars with a significant semantic change.

In this case of a highly positive attribute, Patroklos obviously maintained the image of *Greek*, though reducing again the text by omitting the islands of Cyprus and Kea. In spite of the apparent allusion Dumas makes here to Aphrodite / Venus, the Cypriot goddess from Paphos (and perhaps mentioning Kea because the history of the island is related to the myth of Apollon), Patroklos conceals the reference to Venus, leaving Mercédès as an image of “pure” Greekness. On the other hand, he expands the text in the second part of the sentence by adding the attributes (black-red) borrowed from the vehicles of the metaphor (ebony and coral), which are unspoken in the source text, thus bringing the metaphor more closely to a simile. Also the Karamanli version (1882, p. 49), which relies on the Ottoman Turkish translation by Teodor Kasap (1871), omits the two islands (and even changes the metaphor of the lips from “coral” to “ruby”, because of its very well-known connotation to the lips in traditional Ottoman poetry – a case, for that matter, of domestication), but, what is more interesting, this version omits also the comparison of Mercédès to a Greek.²⁶ In this regard, an analysis of the description of “the beautiful Greek” Haydée, especially in the chapter of the same title, would be a further step in the comparison of Patroklos’s and the other Greek translations with the French original, in order to relate to Dumas’s attribution of female beauty to “Greekness”.

4.2.4. The role of the Greek language in the novel

More cases related to the notion of *Greek* could be added, first of all how Dumas includes the learning and knowledge of Modern Greek – by both Dantès and Abbé Faria – into the strategy of his plot. During their conversation in the sixteenth and seventeenth chapters (*Un savant italien* and *La chambre de l’abbé* respectively), Dantès’s competence of foreign languages (“il savait déjà, d’ailleurs, l’italien et un peu de romain, qu’il avait appris dans ses voyages d’Orient”; chapter 17) is confronted with Faria’s polyglossy (“Je parle cinq langues vivantes, l’allemand, le français, l’italien, l’anglais et l’espagnol ; à l’aide du grec ancien je comprends le grec moderne ; seulement je le parle mal, mais je l’étudie en ce moment” chapter 16).²⁷ In their dialogue Modern Greek functions as the protagonist of the languages in question: Dantès is surprised that Faria is learning it, who, in turn, explains at length his method and aim (“je me ferai comprendre à merveille et cela me suffit”). The Greek language in its vernacular form, actually a major *lingua franca* of the Mediterranean, and therefore spoken by the mariner, who will, thanks to this knowledge and under the Abbé’s instruction, soon speak three more languages, is actually depicted as part of the

²⁶ The whole sentence reads as follows: “Μερσεδεσίιν ίσε χεμ ὀ καρά κιοζλερή, χεμ ὀ λαλ δοδακλαρι κιολουμσεμεκ οὐζερέ ιδι” (*Mersedesin ise hem o kara gözleri, hem o la dodakları gülümsemek üzere idi*; ‘Mercedes’s black eyes as well as her ruby lips were about to smile’).

²⁷ The whole dialogue sounds as follows (Dumas 1998: 376-377):

- Mais vous savez donc plusieurs langues ?
- Je parle cinq langues vivantes, l’allemand, le français, l’italien, l’anglais et l’espagnol ; à l’aide du grec ancien je comprends le grec moderne ; seulement je le parle mal, mais je l’étudie en ce moment.
- Vous l’étudiez ? dit Dantès.
- Oui, je me suis fait un vocabulaire des mots que je sais, je les ai arrangés, combinés, tournés et retournés, de façon qu’ils puissent me suffire pour exprimer ma pensée. Je sais à peu près mille mots, c’est tout ce qu’il me faut à la rigueur, quoiqu’il y en ait cent mille, je crois, dans les dictionnaires. Seulement, je ne serai pas éloquent, mais je me ferai comprendre à merveille et cela me suffit.

protagonist's future plans to become a cosmopolitan Count. Dumas chooses two different forms for the denomination of the language: "romaique" (chapter 17) and "grec moderne" (chapter 16), translated by Patroklos in both cases as καθομιλούμενη Ελληνική ('colloquial Greek'; *O Kόμης του Μοντεχρίστου*, 1845, p. 214 and 196). But Patroklos increases the focus on Greek, already present in the original text, with a very simple addition: while Dantès's reaction to Faria's statement that he is learning Modern Greek in the French text is just an echo question ("Vous l'étudiez ? dit Dantès"), the Greek translator adds another question which emphasizes Dantès's surprise and curiosity: "Τὴν σπουδάζεις; εἶπεν ὁ Δαντῆς· **καὶ πῶς;**" ('You learn it? said Dantès; **and how?**', *O Kόμης του Μοντεχρίστου*, p. 196). With this subtle expansion strategy Patroklos achieves a more focussed view on the fact that the Abbé, a sophisticatedly learned man (and a "Westerner", which might be relevant for an analytical approach to the East-West subtext), who is well educated in Ancient Greek, is – what a surprise! – so interested in vernacular Greek. I would even argue that Dumas's lexical choice of *romaique* referring to the language spoken by Dantès, as opposed to *grec moderne* in relation to Abbé Faria is not accidental, since *romaique* here probably denotes a low variety of vernacular Greek:²⁸ the colloquial lingua franca of the simple sailor in contrast to the modern form of a noble ancient language learned by an erudite. In this case, Patroklos either did not grasp this subtle difference, or he willingly did choose not to transfer a term which, in his eyes, might have negative connotation after Vilaras's pamphlet (see footnote 28) which Patroklos as a teacher of Greek interested in language presumably knew. The Greek language and, specifically, the use of the term *romaique* has, however, also a technical function within the plot of the novel, since Greek is the communication / secret language between the Count and Haydée. Thus *romaique* vs. "Greek" plays a role when Albert de Morcerf and Franz in Rome talk about the Count (chapter 35) referring to the latter's speaking "Romaic" to the "Greek girl", and where *romaique* is presented as a non further identified and incomprehensible dialect with a "mixture of Greek words", and thus different from "Greek".

5. Perspectives

For the time being, it seems that Patroklos' translation is not only relatively "faithful" as far as equivalent transposition of the source text into the target text is concerned, but also largely lacks domesticating or familiarizing strategies. However, in order to provide an overall picture of this translation and its related texts, much more research has to be undertaken,

²⁸ Today *Romeika/Romeyka/Romeka* is the self-denomination of several Greek dialects outside Greece, namely Cypriot *Romeika* spoken by Muslim Cypriot Greek speakers (Ioannidou et al. 2019), and Pontic Greek (Sitaridou 2013). The term comes from the Ottoman word *Rumca* which covers all Greek varieties spoken in the Ottoman Empire, and is still used in Turkish as an umbrella term for Greek outside Greece (e.g. Cypriot Greek or Istanbul Greek). However, in the nineteenth century during the discussions in the framework of the "language question" it was also used by Greek intellectuals as a label for colloquial demotic Greek vs. archaic Greek, first of all by the Istanbuliot official Dimitrios Katartzis (1730-1807), who was a well-known advocate of the colloquial Greek language, which he called ρωμαϊκά. The Epirote physician and poet Ioannis Vilaras (1771-1823) published, in 1814, his famous and controversial pamphlet *Ρομεϊκη γλωσσα* which (already in the spelling of the title) underlines his radical ideas about vernacular language and phonetic orthography.

which in the present preliminary approach to the Greek translation of *Le Comte de Monte-Christo* could not be achieved. Precisely, a systematical comparison not only of the first Greek version fulfilled by Ioannis Patroklos in 1845-46 with the French source text of 1844-46, but also of the various nineteenth-century Greek translations among them should be embarked. Besides that, a confrontation of the various Greek translations with the 1882 Turkish version in Greek characters composed for a Turkophone Greek-Orthodox readership will be extremely fruitful, although that version is a freer adaptation of Dumas's novel having its source, as has been said above, in the Ottoman Turkish translation by Teodor Kasap (1871; cf. Şişmanoğlu Şimşek 2022). When dealing with Greek translation history of the nineteenth century we very often encounter a trend to overstress the cultural backdrop of the translations within the framework of the formation of the Modern Greek novel in the Hellenic Kingdom, considering less the complex relationship of the translators and authors with the Ottoman world and its socio-cultural dynamics in the years between 1830 and the end of the century. The two-sided interaction between the literary circles within the Hellenic Kingdom and an urban class of Istanbul Greeks who determine the intellectual life in the new Greek state, as well as the mobility of the so-called Post-Phanariotes from Greece back to their home-town Istanbul after the Tanzimat reforms and their investiture into key positions of the "Ottoman commonwealth" (Kuneralp 1988: 45), especially in the diplomatic service, entail a rich cultural ground on which the translations into Greek blossom.

References

- ANHEGGER, Robert. 1991. "Das Temaşa-i Dünya des Evangelinos Misailidis (1871/72) als Quelle zur karamanischen Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte". In BALDAUF (et al., eds.) 1991: 1-38.
- AYAYDIN CEBE, Günil Özlem. 2016. "To Translate or Not to Translate? 19th Century Ottoman Communities and Fiction". *Die Welt des Islams*, 56: 187-222.
- BALDAUF, Ingeborg, Klaus KREISER, and Semih TEZCAN (eds.). 1991. *Türkische Sprachen und Literaturen: Materialien der ersten deutschen Turkologen-Konferenz, Bamberg, 3.-6. Juli 1987*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- BALTA, Evangelia. 1987. *Karamanlidika. Additions (1584-1900). Bibliographie Analytique*. Athènes: Centre d'Etudes d'Asie Mineure.
- BERKOL, Bülent. 1986. "133 Yıl Önce Yunan Harfleri ile Türkçe (Karamanlca) bir Robinson Crusoe Çevirisi". *Sosyoloji Konferansları Dergisi / İstanbul Journal of Sociological Studies*, 25: 135-38.
- BOERIO, Giuseppe. 1867. *Dizionario del dialetto veneziano*. Venezia: Reale tipografia di Giovanni Cecchini.
- BOESCHOTEN, Hendrik, and Heidi STEIN (eds.). 2007. *Einheit und Vielfalt in der türkischen Welt – Materialien der 5. Deutschen Turkologenkonferenz, Universität Mainz*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- BOOTH, Marilyn (ed.). 2019. *Migrating texts. Circulating translations around the Ottoman Mediterranean*. Edinburgh University Press.
- ÇETE, Aslı. 2019. "Η μετάφραση ως μετακένωση της Δύσης στην ελληνική και την τουρκική λογοτεχνία". *Synergheion – Rivista internazionale di studi greci*, 1.1: 56-63.
- COWARD, David. 2008. "Introduction – Note on the Text". In DUMAS 2008: ix-xxii.

- DENISI, Sofia (Ντενίση). 1995. *Μεταφράσεις μυθιστορημάτων και διηγημάτων 1830-1880. Εισαγωγική μελέτη και καταγραφή*. Athina: Εκδόσεις Περίπλους.
- DUMAS, Alexandre. 1998. *Le Comte de Monte-Cristo*. Préface de Didier Decoin. Paris: L'Archipel.
- . 2008. *The Count of Monte Cristo. Revised translation, with an Introduction and Notes by David Coward*. Oxford: University Press.
- FRANGOUDAKI, Anna & KEYDER, Çağlar (eds.). 2007. *Ways to Modernity in Greece and Turkey. Encounters with Europe, 1850-1950*. London / New York: I.B. Tauris.
- GEORGAKOPOULOS, Thanasis [et al.] (eds.). 2017. *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Greek Linguistics. Vol. I*. Berlin: Edition Romiosini.
- IOANNIDOU, Elena & RALLI, Angela & NEOKLEOUS, Theoni & ANDREOU, Marios. 2019. "Greek in Enclave Communities: Language Maintenance of the Varieties of Cypriot Romeika in Cyprus and Cretan Greek in Cunda, Turkey". *Mediterranean Language Review*, 26: 157-85.
- JONES, Mari C. & OGILVIE, Sarah (eds.). 2013. *Keeping Languages Alive. Language Endangerment: Documentation, Pedagogy and Revitalization*. Cambridge University Press.
- KAPPLER, Matthias. 2002. *Türkischsprachige Liebeslyrik in griechisch-osmanischen Liedanthologien des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag.
- . 2007. "Konflikt und Ideologie in den griechischen Grammatiken des Osmanischen im 19. Jahrhundert". In BOESCHOTEN & STEIN (eds.) 2007: 80-93.
- KUNERALP, Sinan. 1988. "Les grecs en stambouline". In VANER (ed.) 1988: 41-46.
- MACKRIDGE, Peter. 2010. *Language and Identity in Greece, 1766-1976*. Oxford: University Press.
- MACKRIDGE, Peter. 2017. "Some literary representations of spoken Greek before nationalism (1750-1801)". In GEORGAKOPOULOS (et al., eds.) 2017: 17-41.
- MERAL, Arzu. 1975. *Western Ideas Percolating into Ottoman Minds: A Survey of Translation Activity and the Famous Case of Télémaque*. [Unpublished Phd dissertation]. Universiteit Leiden.
- . 2013. "A Survey of Translation Activity in the Ottoman Empire". *Osmanlı Araştırmaları / The Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 42: 105-55.
- NIDA, Eugene A., and Charles R. TABER. 1969. *The Theory and Practice of Translation: with special reference to Bible translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- PATSIU, Viky (Πατσιού). 1997. "Η μεταφραστική πεζογραφική παραγωγή της περιόδου 1830-1880". In VAGENAS (ed.) 1997: 181-90.
- PETROPOULOU, Ioanna. 2007. "From West to East: The Translation Bridge. An Approach From a Western Perspective". In FRANGOUDAKI & KEYDER (eds.) 2007: 91-112.
- ROTA, Maria S. (Ρώτα). 1986. "Εκδόσεις του Α. Δουμά στα ελληνικά". *Διαβάζω*, 147: 47-53.
- SALIEN, Jean-Marie 2000. "La subversion de l'orientalisme dans Le comte de Monte-Cristo d'Alexandre Dumas". *Études françaises*, 36.1: 179-90.
- SFOINI, Alexandra (Σφοίνη). 2003. *Ξένοι συγγραφείς μεταφρασμένοι ελληνικά 15ος-17ος αιώνας. Ιστορική προσέγγιση του ελληνικού μεταφραστικού φαινομένου*. Athina: EIE / Κέντρο Νεοελληνικών Ερευνών.
- . 2019. *Ξένοι συγγραφείς μεταφρασμένοι ελληνικά 1700-1832*. Athina: EIE / Ινστιτούτο Ιστορικών Ερευνών.
- ŞİŞMANOĞLU ŞİMŞEK, Şehnaz. 2018. "Karamanlıca Temaşa-i Dünya ve Cefakâr u Cefakeş'te Zaman, Mekân ve Kapanış: Polipathis'i Yeniden Yazmak". *Bilig*, 84: 69-93.

- . 2023. “Le *Comte de Monte-Cristo* in Karamanlidika: In the Footsteps of Teodor Kasap“. *Die Welt des Islams*, 2022 (Online): 1-26. doi.org/10.1163/15700607-20220014.
- SITARIDOU, Ioanna. 2013. “Greek-speaking enclaves in Pontus today: The documentation and revitalization of Romeyka”. In JONES & OGILVIE (eds.) 2013: 98-112.
- STAMATOPOULOS, Dimitrios (Σταματόπουλος). 2008. “Ελληνικός Τύπος της Οθωμανικής Κωνσταντινούπολης”. *Encyclopaedia of the Hellenic World, Constantinople*. <<http://www.ehw.gr/l.aspx?id=11035>> (last accessed, Oct. 10, 2020).
- STRAUSS, Johann. 1992. “Zum Istanbuler Buchwesen in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts”. *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, 12: 307-38.
- . 2003. “Who Read What in the Ottoman Empire (19th-20th Centuries)?” *Arabic Middle Eastern Literatures*, 6.1: 39-76.
- . 2019. “What was (Really) Translated in the Ottoman Empire? Sleuthing Nineteenth-century Ottoman Translated Literature”. In BOOTH (ed.) 2019: 57-94.
- STRYFON-KYRIAKIDOU, Anastasia (Στρώφον-Κυριακίδου). 1998. *Ο μυθιστοριογράφος Αλέξανδρος Δουμάς-πατέρας και η παρουσία του στα ελληνικά γράμματα του 19ου αιώνα*. [Unpublished PhD dissertation]. University of Athens.
- TIETZE, Andreas. 1991. “Ethnicity and Change in Ottoman Intellectual History”. *Turcica*, 21-23: 385-95.
- VAGENAS, Nasos (ed.). 1997. *Από τον Λέανδρο στον Λουκή Λάρα. Μελέτες για την πεζογραφία της περιόδου 1830-1880*. Iraklio: Πανεπιστημιακές Εκδόσεις Κρήτης.
- VANER, Semih (ed.). 1988. *Le différend gréco-turc*. Paris: L’Harmattan.
- VENUTI, Lawrence. 2008. *The Translator’s Invisibility: A history of translation*. Second edition. London/New York: Routledge.
- VIKELAS, Dimitrios (Βικέλας). 1908. *Η Ζωή μου – Παιδικαί αναμνήσεις – Νεανικοί χρόνοι*. Athenai: Κατάστημα Συλλόγου Προς Διάδοσιν Ωφελίμων Βιβλίων.