

# The Paradigm of Greek Romantic Prose Fiction (1830–1850): A reappraisal of A. Soutsos's *The Exile of 1831*

*Pieter Borghart*

Refuting the assumption that the first novels after 1830 constitute the advent of Greek realism, this paper intends to corroborate Tziovas's argument that these texts, drawing on the world construction of the Hellenistic and Byzantine adventure novel, constitute an idiosyncratic branch of European Romanticism. This will be evidenced through an analysis of A. Soutsos's *The Exile of 1831*, theoretically underpinned by Bakhtin's theory of the literary chronotope. A two-fold argument will be developed: *ex negativo* by opposing Bakhtin's view on literary realism to the traditional manner in which the diegetic world of *The Exile* is constructed, and *ex positivo* by arguing that the narrative structure of the adventure novel can be regarded as a logical choice in view of the hypothesis that tension between the diegetic world and contemporary reality is characteristic of Romanticism. In turn, a similar approach will allow for a more coherent interpretation than literary critics have formulated to date.

## Introduction

Ο Σούτσος δεν μπόρεσε να συγκεράσει το ιστορικό με το μυθιστορικό μέρος ή μάλλον να ενσωματώσει το πρώτο στο δεύτερο, ούτε να εξισορροπήσει τη σάτιρα και το κωμικό με τη ρομαντική έκφραση και το τραγικό. Έτσι τα δύο ζεύγη, ιστορία και κωμικό, μύθος και δράμα, πορεύονται σχεδόν παράλληλα, δίχως να συναντιούνται και δίχως να συνεργάζονται, παρά μόνο επιφανειακά. [...] Ο *Εξόριστος του 1831* παραμένει απόπειρα μυθιστοριογραφίας, δίχως να φτάνει σε κατορθωμένο αποτέλεσμα (Dialismas, 1996:79–80).

Soutsos was not able to blend the historical with the fictional part or rather to incorporate the first into the second, nor to counterbalance satire and comedy with the expression of romantic feelings and tragedy. In this way two pairs, history and comedy, fiction and drama evolve almost in parallel, with only superficial mutual links between them. [...] *The Exile of 1831* remains an attempt at writing a novel without achieving satisfactory results (my translation).

This quotation is symptomatic of the negative attitude generally expressed by contemporary literary criticism towards the first novels published in the newly founded Greek kingdom, especially Alexandros Soutsos's *The Exile of 1831* (1835).<sup>1</sup> Even though evidence clearly shows that during the nineteenth century both critics and readers approved of Soutsos's novel to a certain extent (Droulia, 1994; Varelas, 2006), it was the rather dismissive view of influential writers such as Alexandros Rizos Rangkavis and Angelos Vlachos (Droulia, 1994:52–53) — apparently mediated by the equally authoritative *History of Modern Greek Literature* by Dimaras (1949) — that gained general acceptance among modern scholars, a number of notorious exceptions notwithstanding (Mastrodimitris, 1992:375–82; Tziovas, 1997:17; Vagenas, 1997:49–52; Beaton, 2006). In addition to this remarkable disagreement on the aesthetic value of *The Exile of 1831*, there is also a debate going on about the novel's generic classification. Whereas Sakhinis holds that Soutsos's text, together with the bulk of romantic prose fiction up to the 1880s, clearly belongs to the historical novel on the basis of its extensive descriptions of a transitory but nevertheless important period in Greek political history, namely the successive governments of Ioannis Kapodistrias and his brother Avgoustinos (Sakhinis, 1958:50–51), others tentatively identify *The Exile of 1831* as well as most of the other novels written between 1830 and 1850 with the advent of Greek realism, pointing out that these narratives generally feature a more or less contemporary setting (Tonnet, 1991:98–105; Droulia, 1994:45; Vagenas, 1994:188–95; Veloudis, 1996:49). Finally, Dimitris Tziovas (1997) has recently invoked Bakhtin's theory of the literary chronotope to argue that the deep narrative structure of these first-fruits of Modern Greek prose fiction actually has more in common with the adventure novel from Hellenistic and Byzantine times than with their supposed European models.<sup>2</sup> Further elaborating on Tziovas's view, the present paper aims at demonstrating that a proper aesthetic appreciation of Soutsos's novel is highly dependent on a clear understanding of the narrative genre to which it ultimately belongs. At the same time, it will be argued that the generic model in question — which in fact constitutes the paradigm of Greek romantic prose fiction of the time (1830–1850) — is anything but an illogical choice given the European context of the romantic movement in which Soutsos and his contemporaries took part.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. a number of traditional historians of Modern Greek literature such as Dimaras (1949:364) and Sakhinis (1958:53), as well as — more recently — the introduction to the latest edition of *The Exile of 1831* (Droulia, 1994:46–49) and the presentation of A. Soutsos's literary career in the renowned series *Η παλαιότερη πεζογραφία μας* (Dialismas, 1996:79–80).

<sup>2</sup> Tonnet (1994) was the first to point to this remarkable structural affinity, but only with regard to *The Orphan-girl of Chios* (1839) by Iakovos Pitzipios. Subsequently, Tziovas (1997) extrapolated this view to the bulk of romantic prose fiction prior to 1850, making use of Bakhtin's theory of the literary chronotope as a theoretical framework.

<sup>3</sup> As Roilos (2003:62, 65) rightly remarks, it goes without saying that the choice for a literary model that can be traced back to the Hellenistic and Byzantine eras perfectly fits in with the politics of Greek

## Bakhtin's theory of the literary chronotope

Before turning to an analysis of Soutsos's novel, I think it useful to briefly introduce the general outlines of Bakhtin's theory of the literary chronotope (1981, 1986). Different from sheer formalist or structuralist approaches to novelistic time and space, in Bakhtin's view these narrative categories constitute a fundamental unity. This inseparability of time and space is denoted by the term "chronotope" and refers to the "world construction" that is at the base of every narrative text, comprising a coherent combination of spatial and temporal indicators:

In the literary artistic chronotope, spatial and temporal indicators are fused into one carefully thought-out, concrete whole. Time, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history. The intersection of axes and fusion of indicators characterizes the artistic chronotope (Bakhtin, 1981:84).

Subsequently, Bakhtin states that the number of possible world constructions is not infinite at all, and that narratives written in the same period of literary history tend to display similar chronotopes. Although he devotes the lion's share of the two theoretical essays involved to a detailed description of a historical typology of chronotopes, the Russian scholar seems to highlight two basic types in particular: the ancient Greek adventure novel of ordeal and the chronotope of nineteenth-century realism. Being situated at the very beginning and at Bakhtin's personal apogee of the European novel respectively, these chronotopes constitute each other's opposite in every respect (Morson & Emerson, 1990:364).

The Greek adventure novel (Bakhtin, 1981:86–110; 1986:11–16) is characterised by a static world construction in which time, space, plot and protagonists are fused into a merely *mechanic unity*. Bakhtin terms the dominant time conception of this chronotope "adventure time", which means that time does not affect the regular course of the heroes' lives but forms a deviation from it between two adjacent biographical moments: the first encounter between the hero and the heroine and their subsequent marriage. Thus, even though in adventure time the protagonists are separated from each other for years, they hardly show any biological or psychological development, eventually marrying each other as if nothing has happened in between. Within such a world construction, the succession of diegetic events is characterised by a certain degree of reversibility: while the sum of ordeals that the protagonists have to go through serves to keep them separated throughout the central part of the story, the overall plot line features nothing but a chain of isolated episodes without any

---

Romanticism, which aimed at constructing a national past that "retrospectively could claim to have made the present existence and future aspirations of the nation inevitable" (Beaton, 1988:99). The present paper, by contrast, will explore the idiosyncratic incorporation of a common feature of the poetics of European Romanticism for thematic purposes.

inevitable logical or chronological order, ruled mainly by coincidence. Not surprisingly, space functions as a mere background for the heroes' implausible adventures, lacking every organic "attachment to a particular historical epoch, a link to particular historical events and conditions" (Bakhtin, 1986:15); consequently, from the point of view of the love story per se space could easily be replaced by another functional setting as well ("interchangeability").

Conversely, in the chronotope of the nineteenth-century historical and realist novel the four components of narrativity distinguished by Bakhtin make up an *organic unity*, being organised in such a manner that the resulting world construction can only be designated as dynamic. Its most important hallmark is the assimilation of "real historical time". Being the organising axis of this particular chronotope, such a time conception has far-reaching implications for the other narrative categories as well: space ceases to be mere background and becomes identifiable with a particular historical era to such an extent that "present, past and future [are] linked by a process of genuine growth, which means that change does not take place in an arbitrary fashion (not just anything can happen)" (Morson & Emerson, 1990:405). With regard to plot structure, the fusion of historical time and space significantly confines the range of narrative possibilities: as the fictional world is mainly ruled by social and historical factors, the heroes' radius of action is strongly dependent on the conditions of the epoch under consideration; in addition, the succession of single plot events not seldom becomes causally structured. It goes without saying that, in maintaining a strong interaction with the fictional world, the protagonists gradually undergo a genuine evolution. The setting of contemporary Capodistrian politics notwithstanding, a structural analysis of *The Exile of 1831* will show that such a dynamic world construction is still strikingly absent in Soutsos's novel.

### ***The Exile of 1831* and the adventure chronotope**

Even though the discourse ("récit") of *The Exile of 1831* is more sophisticated than would appear at first sight, the underlying story ("histoire") is quite simple: (1) *encounter* and *separation* of the young lovers: even before he has actually met the beautiful Aspasia, the hero — who is referred to as "the exile" throughout the narrative — generously refuses his father's marriage proposal as his best friend Nikistratos has fallen desperately in love with the girl. During their first encounter the exile is nevertheless struck by the heavenly beauty of Aspasia, who seems to reciprocate his love for her. Loyal to Nikistratos, however, the hero suppresses his deepest emotions and sets out on a journey to Europe; (2) *adventures*: having returned to Greece which is suffering severely under the government of Ioannis Capodistrias, the exile is not only informed that his best friend has passed away in the meantime, but also that a certain Avgerinopoulos is now trying to court Aspasia. Against the background of the Capodistrian period in Greek political history, the remainder of the story comprises a series of evil tricks by Avgerinopoulos in his attempt to prevent the exile from being

reunited with his beloved; (3) *reunion* of the lovers: having realised that Aspasia will never become his lawful wife, Avgerinopoulos cunningly decides to poison the girl, so that the unfortunate lovers are eventually reunited on Aspasia's deathbed...

As is apparent from the way in which this summary is organised, Soutsos has obviously derived the overall plot structure from the static world construction of the adventure novel of ordeal.<sup>4</sup> On the level of novelistic time, this is evidenced by the reversibility of adventures which comprise the major part of the story. Between the exile's return to his homeland and his eventual reunion with the dying Aspasia, he is forced to overcome three attempts by his opponent to eliminate him: Avgerinopoulos betrays the hero to the Capodistrian authorities on the ground of his revolutionary sympathies — hence the novel's title and the protagonist's epithet; he cowardly tries to shoot him down in a duel; and he hires an Albanian assassin to have his rival murdered. Apart from the poisoning of Aspasia at the end, Avgerinopoulos's evil plans do not exhibit an imperative logical or chronological order. Its major episodes being mutually reversible without substantially damaging the narrative logic, the central part of the plot is clearly structured by adventure time.

But what about the contemporary political setting of Soutsos's novel? There are a number of good reasons not to regard setting in itself as a decisive criterion for classifying *The Exile of 1831* as either a historical or a realist novel. Even if both textual and contextual evidence indicate that the chronotope of the Hellenistic and Byzantine romance — with its combination of adventure time in an abstract-alien world — more than likely served as a model for Soutsos and his contemporaries,<sup>5</sup> modern popular narratives such as comics, Hollywood movies and the like show that adventure time and the evocation of a historical or contemporary setting are anything but mutually exclusive. As we have seen, Bakhtin has rightly remarked that it is precisely the *organic unity* between historical time and space that is responsible for a narrative's dynamic world construction, rather than a familiar background which is disconnected from the other narrative components. That *The Exile of 1831* lacks such a unity is not only apparent from the novel's adventure plot and time, it is even acknowledged

<sup>4</sup> Tziouvas (1997:16–17) rightly ascribes the main deviations from the model — such as the contemporary Greek or European socio-political setting and the substitution of the happy end by the death of at least one of the protagonists — to the context of European Romanticism, without discussing, however, their thematic or ideological implications.

<sup>5</sup> Apart from the structural analogies already discussed, the contextual evidence for the revival of the adventure novel in the first two decades of newly independent Greece is primarily embodied by the figure of Adamandios Korais, who already in his long introduction to the 1804 edition of Heliodoros' *Aithiopika* made a plea for a return to the Greek roots of the novel (Tziouvas, 1997:10–12; Angelatos, 1997:193–99; Beaton, 1999:54–56; Beaton, forthcoming). As both Panagiotis and Alexandros Soutsos were students of Korais in Paris in the 1820s (Droulia, 1994:16–17), it is hardly surprising that they were the first to put their tutor's theoretical convictions into practice. Moreover, in the absence of an elaborate Modern Greek prose tradition, the republication of Hellenistic and Byzantine novels had become a common practice in Phanariot circles ever since the last decade of the eighteenth-century (Kechagioglou, 1991:58–59; Beaton, 1999:54).

by the narrator himself. On several occasions he explicitly distinguishes between two separate dimensions of his narrative, a tragic love story and a satirical depiction of contemporary politics:

Αλλ' εν τοσούτω, αναγνώσται μου τινές με στόμα χασμώμενον από νυσταγμόν με διακόπτουν λέγοντες. “Μη τόσον ερωτικός πάλιν, Κύριε συγγραφεύ του Εξορίστου. Δεν καταβαίνεις ολίγον από τα υπερώα της αισθητικότητος εις τα ήθη και εις τα συμβάντα της Ελλάδος; Δεν φαιδρύνεις και μίαν στιγμήν το μέτωπόν σου με το σατυρικόν γέλωτα, παριστών τα πρόσωπα και τα πράγματα του καιρού;” [...] Πάρα πολύ βιάζεσθε, Κύριοι. Το σύγγραμμά μου έχει ακόμη αρκετήν έκτασιν, και χάρις εις τους τόσους και τόσους πολιτικούς αγύρτας μας, δεν θέλετε μείνει αγέλαστοι και παραπονεμένοι. Αριστοφάνους σκηνάς με ζητείτε; Μη σας μέλη (Soutsos, A., [1835] 1994:123–24.21–2).<sup>6</sup>

But in the meantime some of my readers yawning sleepily interrupt me by saying: “Don’t be so erotic again, Sir author of the Exile. Won’t you step down for a while from the heights of aestheticism to the morals and events of Greece? Won’t you brighten up for a moment with a satirical laugh in presenting the characters and occurrences of the time?” [...] You make too much haste, Gentlemen. My book still has sufficient length, and thanks to the huge numbers of our political charlatans, you won’t keep being stern and complaining. You are asking me for scenes of Aristophanes? Don’t worry (my translation).

The static nature of the novel’s world construction is further evidenced by the finding that the protagonist hardly develops throughout the story and is not capable of leaving his personal mark on the political evolution of Greece. Though a convinced patriot who takes part in the opposition’s military action against the successive governments of Ioannis and Avgoustinos Capodistrias, in the historical episodes the hero is portrayed as a merely minor figure who in no way affects the course of history. When the exile suddenly realises that even the military victory of the constitutionalist party over the army of Avgoustinos won’t bring about any substantial improvement, he gives up his political ideals in disappointment and sets out to be eventually reunited with his beloved Aspasia:

Ο Εξόριστος, μη φρονών ακόμη απεγνωσμένην την σωτηρίαν της πατρίδος, περιέμενε να ιδή τας πρώτας πράξεις της Κυβερνήσεως. Η μόνη του ελπίς εθεμελιούτο εις την συγκάλεσιν Εθνοσυνελεύσεως. Αλλ’ όταν μετ’ ολίγον οι συμπληρούντες την Κυβέρνησιν Καποδιστριανοί και οι λεγόμενοι Μέροι ήρχισαν να ραδιουργώσι και να παρεμπυδίζωσι την συγκρότησίν της, απεφάσισε να φύγη πλέον από την πόλιν των σκευωριών (196.20–26).

The Exile, who still didn’t think that the salvation of his fatherland was hopeless, waited to see the first actions taken by the Government. His only hope was grounded in the convocation of a national assembly. But when after a while the Capodostrians and so-called

<sup>6</sup> In a similar passage (186–87.26–9) the narrator even connects the two dimensions of the novel with two different narratees: a female reading public that is supposed to be touched by the love story (“Χαριτόβρυτοι Κυρίαί”), and a male audience more interested in contemporary politics (“Κύριοι Πολιτικοί”)!

Moderates who filled the assembly started to plot in order to prevent its formation, he decided to flee from the city of intrigues (my translation).

A final argument to sustain the hypothesis that the static chronotope of the adventure romance is at the base of *The Exile of 1831*, is of a purely narratological nature. In line with the two separate dimensions of the novel previously mentioned, the narrator not only explicitly marks the transition from one dimension to another by the recurrent formula “let us leave the love story for a moment and draw our attention to politics” or vice versa, he also makes use of divergent narrative techniques in the representation of both components. Whereas the tragic love story is chronotopically very well elaborated by the sporadic use of intradiegetic narration and internal focalisation,<sup>7</sup> the historical dimension lacks such an “experientiality”, as the well-known narratologist Monika Fludernik denominates the “the quasi-mimetic evocation of ‘real-life experience’” (1996:12). Being confined to mere “action report”, such episodes in her opinion can hardly be regarded as full-fledged narrativity but rather resemble traditional history (1996:26–27), as is evidenced by the following example:

Ἡ Ὑδρα, δια περιοδικού φύλλου, του Απόλλωνος, από τον Μάρτιον ἤδη μήνα εἶχεν ἀρχίσει να κηρύττει ελευθέρως ἀρχὰς εἰς τὸ ἔθνος καὶ να στηλιτεύη ἀναφανδὸν τὸ αυθαίρετον τῆς Καποδιστριακῆς Κυβερνήσεως. Τὸ Αἰγαῖον πέλαγος, ἐρεθισθὲν, ἐζήτησε δι’ ἀναφορῶν ἀπὸ τὸν Καποδίστριαν τὴν συγκάλεσιν ἐθνικῆς Συνελεύσεως. Ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς, πρὸς μόνην ἀπόκρισιν, ἠτοιμάσθη να σωφρονίσῃ τοὺς Αἰγαίοπελαγίτας δι’ ἐνόπλου δυνάμεως, καὶ διέτρεξε φήμη, ὅτι ὁ ἐθνικὸς στόλος παρεσκευάζετο εἰς τοιαύτην ἐκστρατεῖαν. Ἡ Ὑδρα ἐσπευσε να προλάβῃ τὰ σχέδια τοῦ Καποδίστρια, καὶ ὁ Μιαούλης μετὰ τοῦ Κριεζῆ κατέλαβεν εἰς τὸν Πόρον τὸν στόλον καὶ τὸ Νεώριον (80.4–12).

Through the newspaper Apollo, from March onwards Hydra had begun to proclaim the principles of freedom and to openly castigate the arbitrary character of Capodistrias's regime. The Aegean Sea, irritated, asked Capodistrias by means of petitions to convoke the national assembly. His only answer, however, consisted of making preparations to bring the inhabitants of the Aegean Sea to reason with the aid of armed forces, and rumour had it that the national fleet was prepared for such an expedition. Hydra hastened to prevent Capodistrias's plans, and Miaoulis together with Kriezis took command of the fleet and the dry docks at Poros (my translation).

This recurrent narrative pattern underscores the yawning gap between the narration of the story per se and the depiction of the contemporary political setting from a purely technical point of view as well.

<sup>7</sup> To give only one example: the story begins *in medias res*, and the reader is not informed until chapter four about the tragic events that plunged the protagonist into “adventure time”. Being imprisoned by Capodistrias, the exile then tells the story of his life to a fellow prisoner in the form of an extensive intradiegetic narration.

## Narrative substructure and symbolic interpretation

Apart from possible affinities with European Romanticism either on an intertextual level or more generally with regard to the presence of romantic topoi, the last part of the present study will be devoted to the question how the narrative substructure of *The Exile of 1831* fits in with the European romantic tradition, and what are the implications of such a view for an overall interpretation of Soutsos's novel? According to the German scholar Gerhard Plumpe (1995) — an adherent of Luhmann's so-called "system theory" — the common denominator of Romanticism can be found in a cognitive strategy whereby the tension between the world of art and the phenomenological reality is highlighted. This polarity between text and context ("System-Umwelt Differenzierung"; Plumpe, 1995:233) not only manifests itself in the romantic pursuit of outright artistic autonomy, but is also frequently thematised within the boundaries of the literary text itself through the presence of recurrent thematic oppositions (culture versus nature, city versus countryside, dull bourgeois versus artistic genius) or the use of particular world constructions (e.g. the idyllic chronotope; Keunen, 2001).

But what about the chronotope of the adventure novel that constitutes the underlying narrative structure of *The Exile of 1831*? To better understand the idiosyncratic manner in which Soutsos managed to convey this typically romantic polarity, a brief comparison with his intertextual model could be helpful. In the traditional adventure chronotope the protagonists initially depart from and finally end up in a familiar environment in which events — such as the encounter of the young lovers and their eventual marriage — irreversibly affect the course of their personal lives, that is "biographical time-space". In between these two adjacent moments they get involved in a series of adventures in an abstract-alien world which lack any biographical significance, that is "adventure time-space" (Beaton, 2000:182). As for Soutsos's novel, at the outset the hero finds himself on his home ground in an emotional deadlock: though deeply in love with Aspasia, he is unable to marry her because of his firm loyalty to his best friend Nikistratos. The protagonist's biographical time-space is thus from the very beginning equated with an intense romantic *spleen*. Correspondingly, when the exile at the end of the novel returns from adventure time-space to a world that according to the intertextual model is supposed to be a safe and familiar environment, he is plunged again into a sad reality full of personal misfortune, for his beloved Aspasia is about to take her last breath. Tired of these successive disillusionments, the hero ultimately withdraws from his biographical time-space and lives on as a hermit in his parental home in Constantinople. By consistently attributing an idiosyncratic semantic connotation to the biographical sphere of the adventure chronotope, Soutsos thematises the romantic aversion to everyday reality by evoking an ongoing conflict between the hero of the novel and reality as conceptualised within the fictional world of the text.



In a previous attempt to escape from his initial emotional spleen, moreover, the protagonist entered adventure time-space, which in Soutsos's version constitutes a static, alien but also strikingly concrete fictional world. For contemporary Greece is symbolically transformed into an adventure chronotope that is mainly ruled by chance and in which nothing ever changes, not even after such truly historical events as the murder of Ioannis Capodistrias or the victory of the constitutionalists over the army of his brother and successor Avgoustinos. Constantly being pursued by the Capodistrian authorities on the basis of his conflicting political convictions, the exile obviously does not feel at home in this alien environment either and eventually decides to abandon mainland Greece. Thus, within the boundaries of adventure time-space the hero's romantic *spleen* is temporarily replaced by genuine political *Weltschmerz*.<sup>8</sup> In view of the novel's bifurcation into a tragic love story and a (sometimes comic) historical dimension, the device of expressing the romantic polarity between text and context through a minimal but ingenious modification of the original adventure chronotope is further emphasised by the often satirical depiction of the contemporary political situation.

The inevitable conclusion that Soutsos in an idiosyncratic manner joined two romantic key concepts (emotional *spleen*, political *Weltschmerz*) by means of the narrative structure of the adventure novel, is finally underscored by the suggestion of a double causal connection: whereas the hero's escape from his initial amorous impasse brings with it political disillusion, his vain commitment to the constitutionalist opposition subsequently turns out to be the major cause of Aspasia's imminent death:

Ἐπεσεν εἰς τοὺς πόδας τῆς ὁ Εξόριστος, καὶ με σπασμώδεις κλαυθμούς, “ἐγώ, εἶπεν, ἐγώ εἶμαι ὁ αἰτιὸς τῶν συμφορῶν σου ὅλων. Αὐτός ὁ πρὸς τὴν πατρίδα ὑπέρμετρος ἔρως μου κατέστρεψε τὴν τύχην σου, καὶ σε καταβιβάζει νέαν εἰς τὸν τάφον” (204.18–22).

The exile fell at her feet and started to lament in great distress: “I, he said, I am the reason for all your misery. This immoderate love of mine for my fatherland has destroyed your good fortune, and brings you as a young girl to your grave” (my translation).

By taking into account the intertextual relations with the history of the Greek novel, I hope to have shown that *The Exile of 1831* undeniably deserves a more positive evaluation than its current reputation as a failure lacking any coherence whatsoever.

<sup>8</sup> As there is no point in condemning a political regime that has already been overthrown, Soutsos's political *Weltschmerz* should not be taken literally, but seems to symbolically express his general pessimistic attitude towards the political future of Greece.

## Bibliography

Angelatos, 1997

Δημήτρης Αγγελάτος, *Η “φωνή” της μνήμης. Δοκίμιο για τα λογοτεχνικά είδη*. Athens: “Νέα σύνορα” Εκδοτικός οργανισμός Λιβάνη.

Bakhtin, [1938] 1981

Mikhail Bakhtin, “Forms of time and of the chronotope in the novel: notes toward a historical poetics”. In *The Dialogic Imagination by M. M. Bakhtin*, ed. M. Holquist: 84–258. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, [1937–1938] 1986

Mikhail Bakhtin, “The bildungsroman and its significance in the history of realism”. In: *M. M. Bakhtin: Speech genres and other late essays*. Trans. Vern W. McGee, ed. C. Emerson and M. Holquist: 10–59. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Beaton, 1988

Roderick Beaton, “Romanticism in Greece”. In *Romanticism in National Context*, ed. R. Porter and M. Teich: 92–108. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beaton, [1994] 1999

Roderick Beaton, *An Introduction to Modern Greek Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Beaton, 2000

Roderick Beaton, “The world of fiction and the world ‘out there’: the case of the Byzantine novel”. In *Strangers to Themselves: the Byzantine Outsider*, ed. D. C. Smythe: 179–88. Ashgate: Aldershot.

Beaton, 2006

Roderick Beaton, “Ηρωες με πολιτικά φρονήματα: οι αδελφοί Σούτσοι, η ‘μυθιστορία’ και το νεοσύστατο ελληνικό βασίλειο”. In *Ο ελληνισμός στον 19ο αιώνα. Ιδεολογικές και αισθητικές αναζητήσεις*, ed. P. Voutouris and G. Georgis: 108–13. Athens: Καστανιώτης.

Beaton, forthcoming

Roderick Beaton, “Korais and the Second Sophistic: the Hellenistic novel as paradigm for a modern literary language”. In *Standard Languages and Language Standards: Greek, Past and Present*, ed. A. Georgakopoulou and M. Silk. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Dialismas, 1996

Στέφανος Διαλισμάς, “Αλέξανδρος Σούτσος”. In *Η παλαιότερη πεζογραφία μας: από τις αρχές ως τον πρώτο παγκόσμιο πόλεμο (τόμος τρίτος)*, ed. N. Vagenas, G. Dallas and K. Stergiopoulos: 64–87. Athens: Σοκόλης.

Dimaras, [1949] 2000

Κ. Θ. Δημαράς, *Ιστορία της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας: από τις πρώτες ρίζες ως την εποχή μας*. Athens: Γνώση.

Droulia, 1994

Λουκία Δρούλια, “Εισαγωγή στον Εξόριστο του 1831”. In *Ο εξόριστος του 1831*, ed. L. Droulia: 7–59. Athens: Ίδρυμα Κώστα και Ελένης Ουράνη.

Fludernik, 1996

Monika Fludernik, *Towards a “Natural” Narratology*. London/New York: Routledge.

- Kechagioglou, 1991  
 Πώργος Κεχαγιόγλου, “1790–1800: Γέννηση, αναβίωση, ανατροφοδότηση ή επανεκτίμηση της ελληνικής ερωτικής πλασματικής πεζογραφίας”, *Σύγκριση/Comparison* 2,3:53–62.
- Keunen, 2001  
 Bart Keunen, “The Plurality of Chronotopes in the Modernist City Novel: The Case of *Manhattan Transfer*”, *English Studies* 82,5:420–36.
- Mastrodimitris, 1992  
 Π. Δ. Μαστροδημήτρης, *Πρόλογοι νεοελληνικών μυθιστορημάτων (1830–1930)*. Athens: Δόμος.
- Morson and Emerson, 1990  
 G. S. Morson and C. Emerson, *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Plumpe, 1995  
 Gerhard Plumpe, *Epochen moderner Literatur: ein systemtheoretischer Entwurf*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Roilos, 2003  
 Panagiotis Roilos, “The Poetics of Mimicry: Iakovos Pitzipios’ *Ο Πίθηκος Ξουθ* and the Beginnings of the Modern Greek Novel”. In *Modern Greek Literature: Critical Essays*, ed. G. Nagy and A. Stavrakopoulou: 62–78. Routledge: New York.
- Sakhinis, 1958  
 Απόστολος Σαχίνης, *Το νεοελληνικό μυθιστόρημα: ιστορία και κριτική*. Athens: s.n.
- Soutsos, A., [1835] 1994  
 Αλέξανδρος Σούτσος, *Ο εξόριστος του 1831*. Athens: Ίδρυμα Κώστα και Ελένης Ουράνη.
- Soutsos, P., [1834] 1996  
 Παναγιώτης Σούτσος, *Ο Λέανδρος*. Athens: Ίδρυμα Κώστα και Ελένης Ουράνη.
- Tonnet, 1991  
 Henri Tonnet, “A propos des premiers romans et nouvelles néo-helléniques”, *Μήτις* VI, 1–2:9–114.
- Tonnet, 1994  
 Henri Tonnet, “Roman grec ancien, roman grec moderne, le cas de l’*Orpheline de Chio* (*Η ορφανή της Χίου*) de J. Pitsipios (1839)”, *Revue des Etudes Néo-Helléniques* 3,1:23–39.
- Tziouvas, 1997  
 Δημήτρης Τζιόβας, “Από τη μυθιστορία στο μυθιστόρημα”. In *Από τον Λέανδρο στον Λουκή Λάρα. Μελέτες για την πεζογραφία της περιόδου 1830–1880*, ed. N. Vagenas: 9–30. Iraklion: Πανεπιστημιακές Εκδόσεις Κρήτης.
- Vagenas, 1994  
 Νάσος Βαγενάς, “Οι αρχές της πεζογραφίας του ελληνικού κράτους”. In *Η ειρωνική γλώσσα. Κριτικές μελέτες για τη νεοελληνική γραμματεία*, ed. N. Vagenas: 187–98. Athens: Στιγμή.
- Vagenas, 1997  
 Νάσος Βαγενάς, “Ο ουτοπικός σοσιαλισμός των αδελφών Σούτσων”. In *Από τον Λέανδρο στον Λουκή Λάρα. Μελέτες για την πεζογραφία της περιόδου 1830–1880*, ed. N. Vagenas: 43–58. Iraklion: Πανεπιστημιακές Εκδόσεις Κρήτης.

Varelas, 2006

Λάμπρος Βαρελάς, "Ο Εξόριστος του 1831 του Α. Σούτσου και οι 'τύχες' του στον 19ο αιώνα", *Μικροφιλολογικά* 19:6-11.

Veloudis, 1996

Γιώργος Βελουδής, "Εισαγωγή στο Λέανδρο". In *Ο Λέανδρος*, ed. G. Veloudis: 9-72. Athens: Ίδρυμα Κώστα και Ελένης Ουράνη.