

*The Diaspora of
Greek Painting in the
Nineteenth Century:
Christou's Model
and the Case of
Marie Spartali-
Stillman**

Aris Sarafianos

University of Manchester

The recent republication of Nikos G. Svoronos's essay on the historical formation of the Greek nation has rekindled in Greece the controversy surrounding the question of nationalism.¹ The complex genealogies and legacies of nationalism still serve as privileged platforms for the conduct of highly charged battles over the current meaning of politics and radical social change, difference and co-existence in an increasingly de-territorialised and privatised world.² As Antonis Liakos recently put it, the currently intensified "ambivalence towards the future is frequently transformed into ambivalence towards the concept of nation".³ If, in spite of the odious historical functions of nationalism, the nation also frequently acted as a necessary – dynamic, progressive and highly textured – response to modernity's globalising excesses, then its renewed 'allure' today can not be conveniently dismissed as redundant or anomalous.⁴

Moreover, the recent migration of the study of nationalism from history proper to critical theory, cultural studies and anthropology has stimulated the scholarly study of the significance of culture – of senses and the emotions or narratives and images – in the historical making of national traditions.⁵ The role of intelligentsias in exploiting the resources of culture in order to consolidate national identity is increasingly emphasised.⁶ In Greece, more particularly, the international currency of some of its cultural traditions produced, with the help of such disciplines as philology, archaeology, philosophy and art criticism, an intricate fabric of national reference. It is in this context that, as Eugenios Matthiopoulos recently

put it, art history in Greece “had an indirect but substantial role to play in the formation of national identity”, in “nation-building” and “the cultural homogenisation of Greek society”.⁷ However, it is surprising how little the historiography of art history in Greece seems to have critically assessed its entanglement in the national project. Even more surprising is how art history has been routinely misrepresented by nationalist discourses as a ‘luxury’ discipline on the fringes of academic respectability. The term ‘luxury’ is significant here as it has been dismissively used to refer to those chapters of art history which “either did not directly contribute to or indirectly countered the ethnocentric ideology”,⁸ and is loaded with nationalist overtones. The history of European art, and for similar reasons, I would like to add that of nineteenth-century Greek art, represent exactly such chapters, chronically neglected because of their nationalist insignificance. However welcome the relatively recent growth of academic interest in these research fields is, it still generated problems of its own that deserve closer examination.

In this essay, I will specifically highlight the hazy way in which the art production of the international Greek diaspora in the nineteenth century has been appropriated by canonical discourses of ‘Modern Greek Painting’. This study by no means aims to be exhaustive or historiographical, in the strict sense of the terms. Instead I will specifically focus on two relevant case studies whose potential for critical discussion and useful extrapolations I view as substantial. On the one hand, as a characteristic specimen of the dominant topoi of the traditional historiography on the topic, I chose to deal with a specific book by Chrysanthos Christou, one of the founding figures of the history of Modern Greek and European art in Greece. His book *Greek Painting 1832–1922* represents a series of generally accepted views regarding the proper organisation and treatment of the history of this period. Christou’s contributions have recently been honoured by second and third generation art historians, making the critical discussion of his work all the more necessary.⁹ The other case study aims to raise the vital and complex, and yet, in art histories like Christou’s, curiously bypassed role of the Greek artistic diaspora in nineteenth-century painting. The recent inclusion in the national corpus of the Greek-born and British-bred Pre-Raphaelite painter Marie Spartali-Stillman (1844–1927) raises anew some pressing questions regarding the making of the present archive of national painting in the nineteenth century.¹⁰

Ultimately, this intervention intends to highlight the need for a more diasporic re-writing of the plural international histories and contexts of the Greek canon as it presently exists. I hope to show that this canon can be productively reshaped to offer a unique point of view into historical developments of international value and specifically current resonance.

Christou’s History of Greek Painting in the Nineteenth Century

Christou wrote his book *Greek Painting 1832–1922* (1981) in a period of intense interest in the modern history of Greek painting.¹¹ Christou had been trained as an archaeologist in Greece, working for a number of years as curator of classical antiquities in the south of mainland Greece before completing his PhD in Germany on a related subject. In 1965 he was elected to the first chair of Medieval and Modern Art in the West at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, introducing from this

position the academic study of European art history in Greece.¹² The novelty of Christou's research priorities is highlighted by the chronic lack of interest in these fields characteristic of the Greek academic establishment up to his time. Faithful to the standard nationalist strategy of telescoping history in pursuit of exceptional cultural markers, it was the art and literature of classical antiquity that dominated research and teaching during most part of the nineteenth century. Moreover, from the beginning of the twentieth century, another rich vein of unifying ethno-history was mined: Byzantine culture, literature and art.¹³ Both of these cultural repositories of national singularity set conditions particularly unfavourable to any direct engagement with the art history of Europe and Modern Greece. However, Christou's turn from the field of his professional expertise to European art history did not happen in a historical vacuum; rather, it responded timely to new national priorities and state policies. In 1962 Greece entered into official negotiations with the European Economic Community, concluding the process of full membership in 1981. The story of how educator-intellectuals and academic institutions and disciplines including art history responded by shifting the focus from the heterodox individuality of Greek national identity to the milder exploration of the 'connections' and 'contributions' to European culture has recently been told.¹⁴ Christou's focus on the study of European art in the 1960s and 1970s, and, from the 1980s onwards, on the history of nineteenth-century painting in Greece, has a related logic. The vital dependence of the academic study of Greek painting on the knowledge of European art history is clearly demonstrated by the fact that academic painting in nineteenth-century Greece was itself born as a state-sponsored process wholly reliant upon educational migration to Europe.

Consistent with the long-term changes that Christou's *Greek Painting* reflected, the book marked the beginning of a project to map different aspects of the art history of Modern Greece, and was followed by several related studies.¹⁵ The introductory chapter to *Greek Painting* thus acquires a programmatic tone, identifying some central methodological and practical problems associated with the field. Among them, Christou brought up the question of research delays in the field of the general history of nineteenth-century Greece as a crucial obstacle that precluded a thorough historical understanding of contemporary art production.¹⁶ For two reasons, this remark strikes a strange note. Firstly, the social, cultural or any other kind of general history of art has not been particularly relevant to the analytical positioning of Christou's books. Secondly, in the process of looking for the appropriate historical contexts of Greek painting in the nineteenth century, Christou should have brought up another more relevant problem, namely, the academic study of the history of the Greek diaspora on which the formation of the *corpus* of Greek painting in this period largely depends.¹⁷ This paradox is thrown into sharper relief by the fact that Christou's history is designed in a way that highlights its diaspora dependencies. The highly prosopographic system, the "art history of the Proper Name" that he uses to assemble the official canon of Greek painting is founded on artists' biographies, which rather reveal than repress the nomadic organisation of these artists' careers. Moreover, seven years later, Christou's book on more contemporary aspects of the same subject titled *Greek Artists Abroad* takes the notion of diaspora on as an independent category, offering a biographical survey of all "Greek artists living in foreign lands".¹⁸ That which is repressed in the analysis of the historical past is displaced in the present as a mapping exercise. It would thus seem that in Christou's work the problem of the diaspora is marginalised and yet omnipresent; methodologically and analytically absent, but thematically persistent.

The perusal of *Greek Painting* facilitates the retrieval of a multiplicity of dormant artistic diasporas. First, there is a group of painters, who following the educational dictates of the newly formed Greek state, were encouraged to migrate to the art academies of Europe, mostly in Munich and later Paris. In this way, an artificial and circumstantial diaspora that took the specific form of a highly specialised pedagogical intelligentsia was constructed. The majority of these painters conformed to their original mission, returned to Greece and assumed leading roles in the cultural practices of the new state. There are many examples: Nikiforos Lytras (1832–1904), Konstantinos Volanakes (1839–1907) and Georgios Iakovides (1853–1932) stand out. However, in many cases, this repatriation was not so smooth. Pericles Pantazes (1849–1884) was not the only one who lived and died abroad. Some others like Aristeides Oikonomou (1823–1887), Ioannis Doukas (1841–1916) and Simeon Savides (1859–1927) belong to this populous category of artists, who built their careers abroad and simply “came back” like Doukas “in order to spend their final years and die” in Greece;¹⁹ more particularly, like Savides, “poor and sick”.²⁰

Christou’s canon also incorporated the artistic diaspora *par excellence*, a group of diaspora painters who were born in Europe, trained and laid out their careers abroad, and maintained even looser relations with the metropolitan ethnic centre. Here again variations abound. There are some neighbouring diasporas living in areas that shared borders with the Greek state, being for some time identified with the irredentist cause. Moreover, from Vasilios Ithakisios (1879–?) to Georgios Prokopiou (1870–1940) – or the younger Konstantinos Maleas (1879–1928) and Konstantinos Parthenis (1878/9–1967) – the arrival of these artists in Greece frequently took the form of a coerced, if not traumatic, ‘repatriation’. Others from Thalia Flora-Karavia (1871–1960) to Pericles Tsirigotes (1865–1924) and Odysseas Fokas (1857/65–1946) followed the opposite trajectory, detouring the metropolitan centre with impressive consistency, while operating within the broader grid of Greek diaspora communities. Indeed, the marks left behind by the numerous migrations of this group can be used to retrace the cultural map of the highly autonomous diaspora networks of economic and cultural exchange extending from Egypt to Central and Eastern Europe.²¹ Theodoros Rallis’s (1852–1909) case remains exemplary in revealing the full scope of profitable opportunities thus available to Greek artists. Moreover, Rallis’s astute exploitation of the *bitter cultural antagonisms of contemporary European nations* continues to beg the question: What does it mean in particular, for past and current ideological uses of Rallis’s painting by European art histories, that, in the same year, the painter was awarded both French citizenship and the Cross of the Saviour in Greece (1885), and then, fifteen years later, back in France, the *Légion d’honneur* (1900)?

Finally, Christou also registers in his canon a group of painters who were even more remotely associated with the history of Modern Greece; painters who, like Spartali-Stillman, were fully integrated into their local markets abroad and never claimed systematic professional relations either with the national centre or with the Greek diaspora. *Greek Painting* includes several such cases: Nikolaos Kounelakis (1829–1869) in Italy, and Archip Iwanovitch Kuindshi (1842–1910) and Nikolaos Cheimonas (1866–1929) in Russia.

What the brief overview above demonstrates is that the history of nineteenth-century ‘Greek painting’ as constructed by the present canon is a pluralistic history, *simultaneously* Greek, for-

eign and diasporic. In each case, it is dependent on complex processes of ethnic, professional, social and political determination whose multi-layered field of exploration is local and historically specific. The clarity with which this historical heterogeneity is retrieved will eventually determine the extent to which 'Greek painting' can reclaim the fullness of its historical meanings, something which is yet to be achieved.

Despite its limitations, Christou's national canon is, however, quite distinct in suppressing this plurality while at the same time expanding the inclusiveness of its scope. Indeed, for Christou, the registration of artists into the corpus of Greek painting does not depend on any single one of the usual national criteria. Neither the birthplace of these painters, nor the length of their residence abroad; neither the degree of their contribution to Greece's cultural development, nor the style that they chose, seem to have any binding or absolute value.²² His all-inclusive canon is not organised by necessary causes but rather by the implicit operation of the more flexible rules of 'sufficient reason'. Although this loose framework did little to further the growth of an adequately sophisticated socio-historical perspective on the study of Greek painting, I think that it had the beneficial effect of preventing his discourse from sliding down the kind of frequently hyperbolic ethnocentric narrative met in other types of histories of 'Modern Greek Art' published from the middle of the twentieth century onwards.²³

For these histories the work of the nineteenth-century Greek painters whom I have mentioned remained at best a puzzle; more frequently, it was either marginalised as foreign, or condescendingly praised for its swiftness in imitating its European models. From the writings of Fotos Gifyllis to those more recently by Stelios Lydakakis, there is a conspicuous national embarrassment towards the 'Westernised' and 'provincial' production of such diaspora painters as the so-called 'Munich school'.²⁴ It is from the same premises that scholars like Marinós Kalligas pressed for a disjuncture between the higher concept of 'Greek painting', and the more practical notion of 'Greek painters'.²⁵ Kalligas's conceptual division continues to prove influential, temporarily addressing the problem of the inconsistency between citizenship and visual production. It created, however, many more problems than it solved. Kalligas's writings sufficiently demonstrate how this quick fix ultimately reinforced equally reductive and speculative forms of visual and cultural nationalism. This is because it presupposed the existence in art of essential national characters sustained by a "chthonic aesthetic", which painters of the nineteenth-century diaspora supposedly failed to attain. Emphasis on environmental features (nature, colour and sunlight, order and harmony of landscape) had become particularly popular in Greece during the mid-war period.²⁶ Following broader epistemic pressures in European aesthetics and art history since the Enlightenment, this exercise in the visual diagnosis of national identity frequently fused with the concepts of physical sensibility, racial character and environmental forces, further naturalising national attributes in art.²⁷ Tony Spiteris and Pantelis Prevelakis, for example, frequently responded positively to such opportunities.²⁸ Prevelakis's early book on El Greco, however, clearly demonstrates that, unlike the less glamorous nineteenth-century Greek painting, whenever the national capital that diaspora painters represented was too high to be neglected, then these naturalising models could be bended to embrace the alleged national character of diaspora painting, while turning a blind eye to its international 'debts'.²⁹

As illustrated by Marilena Z. Kasimati, who follows through Kalligas's logic, this questioning of nineteenth-century painting may sometimes be understood as articulating useful critiques against crude and sentimental nationalisms that continue to conscript the work of diaspora painters as essentially Greek without asking any of the more difficult questions.³⁰ However, I would be more inclined to see this critique in the light of a conflict between two opposing types of historically specific nationalism: on the one hand, a nineteenth-century perception of national identity formed under the influence of the powerful intelligentsias of Greek diasporas, which viewed alignment with Europe and its neo-classical culture as an indispensable step for the retrieval of the classical lost core of national identity; and, on the other, a more introverted, indigenous and exclusionary version of Greekness represented by Kalligas that came as a reaction to the national catastrophes in Asia Minor, and the rapid, and frequently traumatic, decline of Greek diasporas in Asia, Africa and Europe.³¹ The study of nineteenth-century Greek painting has largely been squeezed between these two forces: for both, the multi-faceted historical specificity of the visual production of these painters remained unexplored. Although more pragmatic and discerning studies of nineteenth-century art have started to accumulate,³² it is still perplexing to note how, in such cases as Kasimati's, echoes of these old approaches continue to trouble the writing of art history. The question "how 'Greek' is Modern Greek Art" – and the subsequent answer that it is obviously not Greek at all; or, the rushed re-ascriptions of nationality – Gyzis now unambiguously declared 'German' – represent facile reversals of established wisdom and cannot lead historical appreciation beyond its past difficulties.³³

On this part, Christou's refusal to engage with these controversies is quite intriguing. His discourse is indeed not defined by any of the usual modern 'concepts of Greekness', keeping national value-judgements or racial and climatic explanations of style at a minimum.³⁴ It is, of course, centralised, positioned and written from within the national centre representing its new 'European' vision. Yet, in opposition to the art histories of 'Greek painters', his account does not question nor measure in terms of their style or their personal identity the degree of Greekness of the painters that he absorbs into the canon. On the contrary, it is more firmly governed by a type of taxonomic empiricism that is better explained by the archaeological methods of Christou's early studies. It reprocesses antiquarian practices associated with the long history of connoisseurship in Western Europe – biography, formal analysis, attribution, dating and classification, and a noticeable anti-theoretical sensibility. With these tools Christou weaves the fabric of *art-historical encyclopaedism* that marked in Greece the academic establishment of the history of art as an 'objective discipline'.

This encyclopaedism is a complex phenomenon with its own politics of liberalism and its own milder national agenda, which, in the new world of European integration, allowed for a less judgemental approach towards 'Greek painting' in the nineteenth century. Yet, it also had its own moments of oblivion. Methodologically, insofar as nineteenth-century painting is tied up with the history of different formations of Greek diaspora, Christou's encyclopaedism continued to treat 'Greek painting' out of its proper contexts. In terms of the list of painters included, the Christou canon obeyed the discursive dynamic of his encyclopaedic methodology, filling out and endlessly generating its own gaps. The work of Marie Spartali-Stillman is one of these omissions. Though it is tempting to see her absence from Christou's canon as another function of

gender-specific prejudices and the chronically patriarchal organisation of art history in Western Europe, it is more likely that Christou did not know of Spartali-Stillman's existence, and would probably have included her if he had. Besides, Christou incorporates into his history a significant number of women painters of strikingly similar diaspora profiles to Spartali-Stillman's, including Kleoniki Aspriotou, Eleni Boukoura-Altamoura (1821–1900) and Thalia Flora-Karavia.³⁵ More likely, Spartali-Stillman's absence is, I would like to suggest, one of those blips generated by and necessary to the function of Christou's type of discourse. Indeed, there are no censuses without their own omissions, dictionaries of biography without their supplements, encyclopaedias without entries left on the editor's shelf. The power of Christou's historical encyclopaedism depends upon its incomplete nature and the indefinite supplementations that it thus demands. Consequently, the fact that the gap in the case of Spartali-Stillman was eventually filled in the context of another encyclopaedic enterprise, the *Dictionary of Greek Painters*, should not surprise us.³⁶ Moreover, the relevant entry replicates the theoretical priorities and the language specific to the Christou canon – the same exclusive focus on formalist analysis based on the same abstract categories of classification, many of which were established in Greece by Christou himself. Following Christou's model, this entry also reveals and eclipses the specific historicity of the diaspora community from which Spartali-Stillman emerged as a painter, replacing it with the neutral introductory phrase "Maria Spartali-Stillman, daughter of M. Spartali, Greek merchant, permanently based in London".³⁷

The registration of Spartali-Stillman in the canon is additionally puzzling because she belongs to the group of Greek diaspora painters who never associated themselves with metropolitan Greece and its culture. Even the issue of Spartali-Stillman's ethnic origins and identity, which could, very tentatively indeed, justify her inclusion in the national corpus, is far from straightforward. In the following section, I chose to deal with Spartali-Stillman's ethnic identity and its numerous cultural uses with special reference to one of her most celebrated works *Antigone Giving Burial Rites to Polynices*. (Figure 1) In this way I will probe into the unmanageable difficulties that different national traditions of art history including Christou's face in constructing their objects of study, underlining that such difficulties frequently go well beyond the Greek example.

Art Practices in the Diaspora and the Uses of Ethnic Identity: Marie Spartali-Stillman

The current reputation of Spartali-Stillman in the Anglo-Saxon world is related to the recent upsurge of interest in the work of women painters in feminist art history and gender studies. Although the question of the social formation of subjectivity in relation to Spartali-Stillman and her visual work has been thoroughly explored in the related bibliography,³⁸ the ongoing neglect of the complex ethnic dimension of the painter's identity in English-speaking art history curiously summons up Christou's lapses, and defies historical realities. Indeed, when Ellen C. Clayton offered, in 1876, the first contemporary map of the newly emerging community of women painters in the British art market, Spartali-Stillman's nationality was still a powerful concern. In the introduction to her essay on the painter, Clayton actually put this concern in a broader context, noting how "strange



Figure 1: Marie Spartali-Stillman
Antigone Giving Burial Rites to Polynices (oil on canvas), 1870.
 Simon Carter Gallery, Woodbridge, Suffolk

and ... perhaps somewhat mortifying [it is] to find that so few of our lady artists are of direct English descent. Like many of her artistic sisters, Mrs. Stillman is of foreign extraction.³⁹ Clayton's observation raises the point that Victorian notions of feminine respectability weighed perhaps less on women from such borderline communities of ethnic estrangement, thus allowing liberating possibilities. Spartali-Stillman in particular continued to be predominantly perceived as Greek by colleagues, acquaintances and the press throughout her life. By contrast, the way in which the *Dictionary of Art* and the *Dictionary of National Biography* today brand her as "English" or "British"⁴⁰ reflects a process that started immediately after her death with the *Times* obituary, which re-classified Spartali-Stillman as a member of the "cosmopolitan"-cum-"naturalised Anglo-Greek colony" in London.⁴¹ However, the active exploitation of Greek national identity by Spartali-Stillman was in line with the historical singularity of the Greek community in London to which she learned to belong, and hides subtler stories than these rash classifications allow.

The history of London's Greeks goes back to the late 1830s, when the famous Ralli and Ionides families, together with the Spartalis, set up trading businesses in London. This was a plutocratic community consisting of immigrant mercantile families from Chios, Constantinople and other areas of the Ottoman Empire, bearing all the marks of Ottoman persecutions in the wake of the Greek War of Independence.⁴² In typological terms, it maintained a situational and impermanent (as opposed to archetypal), and mobilised (as opposed to proletarian) character, only to become later anglicised and incorporated in the upper echelons of the British class system – another quite unique aspect of this group's history.⁴³ The symbiotic relationship between this highly specialised ethnic diaspora and the politics of the British Empire is proved not only by the profitable trading operations of these Greeks in the traditional areas of foreign trade in the Ottoman Empire,⁴⁴ but also by their role in the risky busi-

ness of reversing the then lamentable state of British imports and exports with the Ottoman Middle East.⁴⁵ Celebrating the upsurge in British commerce, in 1855 the Foreign Office prominently listed the activities of “Levantine merchants in London, especially the firms of Spartali [i.e. Michael Spartali, Marie’s father] and Lascaridi” among the principal factors in this success.⁴⁶

Diaspora without internal organisation and some sense of external reference to a metropolis cannot exist.⁴⁷ The newly found Greek state, on the one hand, offered a powerful symbol of emotional attachment, and, on the other, frequently interfered with the politics of the community.⁴⁸ The Spartali family played a leading role in the ethnic re-structuring of the community and its nationalist politics. More specifically, Michael Spartali served as Consul-General for Greece, played a vital part in building and managing the community’s first church (London Wall, 1849–1879),⁴⁹ in supporting the Cretan Insurrection (1866–1868), and founding the local Greek College (1870),⁵⁰ while he also actively advanced the highly regarded cause of Hellenism – “of the study of Greek language, literature, art and ... the history of the Greek race”.⁵¹ Spartali’s activities were all central to the preservation of ethnic continuity across second and third generation London Greeks like his daughter. His own arranged marriage to Euphrosyne Valsami – a member of a wealthy Greek family from Genoa – is exemplary of the closely knit ethnic politics of this group. Moreover, in the age before air travel and the popularisation of photography, painting played an important role in ethnic marriage arrangements as a purveyor of visual likeness. Not having met before their betrothal, the only visual evidence supporting Euphrosyne’s final decision as to Michael’s suitability, and vice versa, were the portraits they had exchanged in the meantime.⁵² For Marie Spartali-Stillman, similar relations between ethnic identity, status, desire and painting were to prove crucial.

Culture, literature and art played a critical part in the social organisation and British integration of this community.⁵³ Spartali developed an alternative salon to the Ionides example, favouring more a combination of radicalism and nationalism rather than respectability and profit.⁵⁴ As late as 1927, the *Times* still remembered the “large and varied cosmopolitan group of artists, musicians, and exiled Cretan and Italian nationalists” that Spartali brought together.⁵⁵ Uniting avant-garde modernists like James McNeill Whistler, radical nationalists and political dissidents like Giuseppe Mazzini and Hermann Müller-Strübing,⁵⁶ Spartali’s salon undercuts any facile polarities between ‘good’ cosmopolitanism and ‘evil’ nationalism. In understanding the complex ethnic dimensions of Marie Spartali-Stillman’s art and identity, it is important to remember that she grew up in an ‘atmosphere of international culture’ characterised *both* by intense nationalist sentiment and by radical political sympathies to the principles of ethnic sovereignty, democracy and social emancipation.⁵⁷

Spartali-Stillman’s art education began in 1864 under the supervision of Ford Madox Brown, a distinguished member of early Pre-Raphaelitism. When Spartali-Stillman exhibited her painting *Antigone Giving Burial to Polynices* in the Dudley Gallery Exhibition of Water Colours in 1871, she was already a well-known artist of the second wave of Pre-Raphaelite painting. The picture describes a characteristic moment of Sophocles’s play: Antigone defies the king’s prohibitions and gives burial rites to her brother. While Antigone disperses the flocks of ravens swarming on her brother’s corpse, her sister Ismene looks fearfully towards the background at the feasting guards, a clear symbol of uncivilised brutality.

This seemingly straightforward story weaves together a broad range of references. First of all, Spartali-Stillman's picture extends the 'feminist project' of her previous painting by redeveloping into a more complex plot the popular pictorial type of single-costumed images of powerful women of letters, art, science and moral fortitude.⁵⁸ As in the case of *Antigone* or *Lady Prays-Desire* (1867), these figures were frequently fused with self-portraiture, autobiography and ample references to national identity, boosting Spartali-Stillman's profile as a painter. Moreover, as a model for famous artists and photographers of the time, Spartali-Stillman was cast in similarly empowering roles, with clear allusions to her Greekness, again indicating the pragmatic ways in which professional and social ambitions interwove with the painter's compound ethnic identity.⁵⁹

Yet, the ethnic aspects of *Antigone* go beyond these personal stratagems, actively engaging with national politics and contemporary historical events such as the Cretan Insurrection (1866–8) against Ottoman oppression. Much to the frustration of the British political establishment, the ultimate aim of the insurrection was nationalist, i.e. unification with Greece.⁶⁰ In the cosmopolitan company of nationalist radicals at Spartali's house, first-hand descriptions of the progress of nationalist struggle in Crete always found a hungry audience. The fiery reports came from William J. Stillman, Spartali-Stillman's husband-to-be. Stillman was acting as American Consular Officer in Crete from April 1865 and his active philhellenic role in the uprising in Crete became legendary, also securing him celebrity status in Greece.⁶¹ In September 1869, Stillman arrived in London to lobby further for the cause. Michael Spartali, Greek Consul-General, chairman of the local Greek relief committee throughout the insurrection and personally involved in transporting money, weapons and food supplies to the cause, became an obvious host.⁶² We get an idea of what Stillman's stories must have sounded like in his later chronicle of the insurgency. Official reports of civilian atrocities and gratuitous killings by Ottoman militias,⁶³ more organised campaigns of terror unleashed on the rural Greek population⁶⁴ as well as rough military justice on the battlefield⁶⁵ are frequently cited. The most sensational descriptions in Stillman's book relate the terror campaign that followed the affair at Vrysis, leaving the rural area around Chania in a state of desolation. In a passage that clearly served as the basis for Spartali-Stillman's picture, Stillman refers to "single bodies here, and groups there, by the roadside, in houses, and chapels, where they had taken refuge", and describes how naked bodies were left unburied at the mercy of further violence by the natural elements.⁶⁶ The culminating point in the narrative is reached when Stillman leaves behind the gory details of actual killing to describe its less noisy but more chilling aftermath. To give a better measure of the magnitude of the massacre, Stillman thus explains how for weeks on end "the immense flocks of ravens, accustomed to batten without disturbance on the offal thrown out on the shore [of Chania, where] the slaughter-houses with all the cattle and sheep for the use of the city and army" were based, had suddenly disappeared. Instead, they were only "to be seen in small flocks hovering amongst the olive-groves of the plain" where the massacres had taken place.⁶⁷

In *Antigone*, Spartali-Stillman chose to maximise the benefits to the nationalist cause by depicting exactly this scene: a sensational choice that cast Ottoman rule outside the boundaries of civilisation into the "sickening" realms of "barbarity".⁶⁸ This more abstract, yet more pregnant, moment of the action, permitted the deployment of a strategy of concealment, whose affective efficiency in painting was sanctioned by centuries of art theory.⁶⁹ Moreover, this choice of scene cleverly detoured Spartali-Stillman's insufficient training in the life class, which would not have allowed her to tackle the more

demanding poses involved in a fully-fledged battle scene from the Cretan Insurrection. Testifying to the painter's professional ambitions, this detour allowed her to intrude into and appropriate that most carefully policed field of male privilege – history painting. With the limited devices available to her due to gender-specific educational restrictions,⁷⁰ Spartali-Stillman managed to assemble a compositionally complex group of human figures in which the half-nude body of Polynices holds a prominent place. Accordingly, the picture was singled out from “the collection of 665 productions” exhibited in the Dudley Gallery as more important than the work of “better known and able men”, and was praised for its “ambitious subject”, “poetical character” and “excellent colour” by no less important a figure of the contemporary literary, artistic and pedagogical world than William Bell Scott of the *Spectator*.⁷¹

However, *Antigone* is history-painting in other more private senses, mixing together biography, personal affections, ethnic attachments and family ties. The romance that developed between Stillman and Spartali-Stillman haunted the imagination of contemporaries for years. Stillman was not only the purveyor of passionate liberalism and ethnic emancipation; he was also the herald of common creative work,⁷² a Pre-Raphaelite artist in his own right and a close friend of Ruskin with strong connections in the Pre-Raphaelite group.⁷³ During the lovers' prolonged courtship, Stillman also repeatedly appealed to Marie's sensitive sense of ethnic identity as his influential collection of photographs of the Parthenon, titled *The Acropolis of Athens*, shows.⁷⁴ In the autograph note of the complimentary copy that Stillman gave to Spartali, he paid his tribute “To the esteemed Miss Maria Spartali, native of this country”, while the official printed dedication run as follows: “To Miss Marie Spartali, worthy scion of the race which has given us the world's consummate art ...”⁷⁵ Apart from underlining the associations between ethnic and artistic identity that Marie cherished, Stillman's amplified vocabulary of “country” and “race” marketed and presented her sense of ethnic identity in terms of direct nationalist allegiance. Curiously enough, Michael Spartali's vehement opposition to this marriage did not use such nationalist language. In his letters to some of his daughter's professional colleagues, Spartali raised instead the issue of Stillman's practical suitability “physically, socially & Intellectually”, and evoked the emotional power of the “affection of Parents” (“26 years of parental love and Sacrifice”), and “filial duty” stemming from it. For Spartali, the affective ties of systems of kinship, and their implied ethnic frameworks, could not possibly be challenged by the provisions of civic “Law” and the urges of “Egotism”.⁷⁶

In *Antigone*, Spartali-Stillman rearranged these moral themes to her benefit. Antigone's defiance becomes co-extensive with Spartali-Stillman's disobedience, evoking as a moral duty the superiority of liberty and the law of the heart over ethnic authority and parental prescription. However, as the painting also demonstrated, marrying outside the tight ethnic group of London Greeks was a process conducted through a series of nationalist compensations designed to soften the tensions of the exit.

These tensions are visible in Spartali-Stillman's subsequent production, especially in the way in which her cultural identity underwent crucial revisions after her marriage. After Stillman's first assignment in 1875 as the *Times* correspondent in the Balkans, the couple led a veritable nomadic life with multiple long-term residencies – Corfu (1878), Florence (1878–1883), Rome (1889–1896), and numerous trips to London and the Isle of Wight in between. If until the late 1870s Spartali-Stillman wavered between Greek and Italian themes, in Florence she discovered “an intellectual life and a serenity non-existent elsewhere, surrounded by the noblest art of the Renaissance”, which provided thematic continuity to

her painting.⁷⁷ Making another pragmatic decision related to her surroundings, Spartali-Stillman entered into a sustained dialogue with Italian cityscapes and domestic interiors as well as visual motifs from the Renaissance and intricate iconographic references to Dante and Bocaccio, all designed to appeal to an upper-class market in Britain. Though Stillman travelled regularly to Greece where he lived in Athens, frequently with their daughters, Spartali-Stillman never ventured there. She maintained instead a close relationship with the British art market, winning significant invitations to participate in prestigious shows like the Grosvenor Gallery exhibitions and later the New Gallery exhibitions,⁷⁸ demonstrating in the process a strong sense of professional solidarity,⁷⁹ and affiliation to socialist⁸⁰ and feminist politics.⁸¹

Moreover, it was, quite paradoxically, in Florence, where Spartali-Stillman entered another cosmopolitan community of taste consisting of British and American artists, literary figures and intellectuals, that she discovered the American identity to which she was entitled through her marriage. This coincided with an important historical event, the 1883 new tariff laws on art by the US government, which imposed an excessive increase on existing taxes on the import of works of art from abroad. As a measure of economic protectionism in the arts the thirty per cent tariff aimed at consolidating a new national school of art with native focus, an original and “true American art”.⁸² The public debate that followed reveals a complex picture that created realignments across political parties and economic interest groups.⁸³ No such ambiguity is to be noticed in the related responses of artists, who almost unanimously fought for the repeal of this ‘tax on civilisation’.⁸⁴ Although American artists – both native as well expatriate – were direct beneficiaries of the law because they were exempt from its provisions, they took a principled stance through numerous petitions and letters to the press.⁸⁵ The cosmopolitan arguments were strong. The petition that Spartali-Stillman signed starts with the line “We, the undersigned American artists, residing in Florence, Italy” and goes on to declare “that nationality should not be a consideration in admitting art into the USA”.⁸⁶ However, this spirit of disinterestedness was influenced by a deep awareness of the dominance in the arts of an interdependent international market, and by a fear of protectionist retaliations by host nations against expatriate American artists.⁸⁷ Spartali-Stillman’s participation in the Florentine petition did not only stem from a fair-minded idealism but also from professional prudence. The paradox of the active mobilisation of her American nationality in order to show the irrelevance of nationalism in cultural affairs rehearses the same contradictions of liberal nationalism adopted in the Spartali house in which she was brought up.

The Cosmopolitan Critique of Nationalism and the Art ‘Schools’ of ‘Small’ Nations: Hyphenated Identities. Conclusions

Similar tensions regarding the issue of nationalism in art dominated the public reception of the Paris Universal Exhibition of 1889. Coming in the wake of the flare-up of nationalist antagonisms produced by the 1883 tariff and the 1882 economic depression, the Paris Exhibition generated contrasting appreciations of the question. On the one hand, American media and artists recurrently aired largely unsubstantiated accusations of nationalist discrimination against American work in terms of display and distribution of awards.⁸⁸ On the other hand, more reflective approaches to the exhibition were also recorded, including Philip Gilbert Hamerton’s essays in *Portfolio*,⁸⁹ the British journal that had earlier launched Spartali-Stillman’s career.⁹⁰ Hamerton, the editor of *Portfolio* and one of the most influential writers on art in

Britain, accurately diagnosed a rift between the increasingly rigid definitions of nationality in the political and economic realms, and those in the artistic field: national descent and citizenship do not coincide with artistic descent and style.⁹¹ Hamerton thus questioned the accuracy of the “classification of artists by their nationality” as “the variety of artistic fashions or movements makes the contrast between artists in the same nation greater than that between artists who might be selected from different nations”.⁹²

Adopting a current philosophy of liberal cosmopolitanism, Hamerton, on the one hand, asserted that “the things of the mind ... cannot be confined by nationality; all the higher studies lift us above nationality into an atmosphere which refuses to be limited by frontiers”.⁹³ On the other, Hamerton reflected an accurate consciousness of the historical advances of this cosmopolitanism in the cultural markets of his time, underlining “the increasing tendency to cosmopolitanism in all matters of culture, which is a result of the more frequent intercourse between nations”.⁹⁴ However, it is crucial to keep in mind that this perspective does not deny national specificity; rather, it reduces it into a rarity, a striking singularity to be found in the minute details of artworks, rather than the rule, thus reversing the emphasis of nationalist grand narratives. Moreover, while Hamerton rejected the connections between visual style and national character, he nevertheless sanctioned the notion of national schools in the more practical context of art education, institutions and cultural policies. In this strictly sociological sense, France thus “takes the first place in painting”.⁹⁵

Interestingly, Hamerton also approached the question of national painting in lesser nations, turning to the national character of the Finnish, Swedish, American, and the Greek ‘schools’ of painting. Referring, for example, to the way in which Swedish painters are split between different French-style schools, Hamerton wondered “Is this really a Swedish school?”⁹⁶ He also brought up the central paradox of art history in Greece:

*Greece was represented by sixteen painters in oil, of whom six live in Paris and two in Munich; seven only out of the sixteen live at Athens. The foremost of Greek artists is probably M. Ralli, a Parisian; his pictures in illustration of Greek religious life were interesting and good.*⁹⁷

It would be wrong to assume that Hamerton’s criticisms question the inclusion of these painters in the national displays of the Exhibition. What seems to shock him is the *uncritical ease* with which these painters are conscripted to serve the national cause.⁹⁸ Similarly when he criticises the “American Exhibition” for being “American only in name and in the nationality of the artists”,⁹⁹ he signals his frustration at the casual way in which the foreign education, permanent residence abroad and cross-national fields of social engagement of these artists are entirely eclipsed by the higher necessity to nationalise their production.

In this context, the problems for Spartali-Stillman, who could claim “neither in name nor in nationality” to be plain Greek (or American, or even British, for that matter) were even more serious, as the painter herself knew very well. Indeed, according to the memories of her relative Chauncey Stillman, still fresh in his mind, forty years after their meeting in 1923/4, Spartali-Stillman used to describe “with amusement that she had found she was a woman without a country when she applied for a visa to come to the United States to visit her son. She had been born a Greek, married an American, lived long in Italy, and ‘forever since in England, so all of their consulates disclaimed me’.”¹⁰⁰ I would argue

therefore that reversing the Ralli model, the hyphenated ethnic identity of Spartali-Stillman led not to a series of different national inscriptions, but rather to an equally multi-faceted estrangement. While eventually Spartali-Stillman somehow managed to resolve the problem of her nationality and obtain a visa to the US, no such clear resolution of her identity has occurred within the *corpus* of the history of art of Modern Greece, where diaspora cases like hers still float in a historical limbo.¹⁰¹ Such cases underline the still existing difficulties of national classification across European art histories, difficulties which become all the more aggravated when the issue of ethnic identity is seriously investigated rather than swiftly bypassed or crudely predetermined.

Likewise, by exploring the disjuncture between the nineteenth-century ideology of national schools and the realities on the ground, Hamerton's cosmopolitanism, despite its obvious ideological aspects, fruitfully shifts current discussions of "centre and periphery" in cultural processes. For example, next to France's supreme cultural industry in the late nineteenth century, Hamerton's essay made even Britain look like a country of the periphery. Also, Hamerton's British viewpoint, the 'European' or 'Western' cultural space seemed less coherent and original than it is perceived from a Greek angle. Indeed much of the embarrassment with which nineteenth-century painting has frequently been treated in Greece is based on a reductive understanding of the centre/periphery scheme. Hamerton's strategic and subversive reference to the marked dependence of 'lesser' European nations like Greece on particular European centres has frequently been used in much cruder and judgemental ways. When, as Kasimati reminds us, Karl Krumbacher, the founder of the academic study of Byzantine history in Germany, attended the 1885 exhibition of the Parnassos Gallery, he mixed his admiration for the European quality of Greek painting with his obvious disappointment that it could not "of course warrant talk of a national Greek art. Without exception every Greek artist who has produced anything of any merit in Greece comes from German or French schools of art."¹⁰² Nobody would seriously deny the systemic dependence of Greek *academic* painting on numerous European institutions at the expense of so many other alternatives. Yet, the continuing unqualified endorsement of statements like Krumbacher's, as in Kasimati's case, overlooks the dynamic, ingenious and mixed systems of visual and historical references that this corpus has registered. Bemoaning the almost terminal derivativeness of nineteenth-century Greek painting against the supposed authenticity of either the 'European tradition' (an obvious over-generalisation) or of specific national schools (a perspective too narrow to register the diversity of nineteenth-century artistic markets in Europe) is no longer an adequate response. Spartali-Stillman and Hamerton's cases demonstrate that these polarised perceptions of centre and periphery are historically out of quilter with a large part of what was actually going on in the nineteenth-century art world. More importantly, numerous other cases of diaspora Greek painters require such changes in methodology that could reveal the diversity of visual discourses that sprang *in the many fault lines* between different centres and different peripheries across the European canvas. Within these parameters, the art history of Modern Greece in the nineteenth century facilitates useful insights into historical phenomena of international scope.

This paper argued that Christou's model is better equipped than other types of art history in Greece to embrace cases of diaspora painters like Spartali-Stillman. Her initial absence from the Christou canon was no more than a temporary blip explained by the encyclopaedic nature of his endeavour, and it has indeed recently been corrected through an affiliated discourse with a similar logic. However, this paper

also proposed that the inclusion of Spartali-Stillman, like so many other similar cases of diaspora painters, is far from self-evident. In making this statement, I do not wish to imply that the openness of the present corpus of Greek painting is misguided; on the contrary, this inclusiveness should actually be celebrated and intensified, but also, most importantly, micro-contextualised and critically processed. Taking one visual example from one painter of admittedly peripheral significance to the present corpus of Greek painting, my additional aim had been to reveal, by comparison, the neglected intricacy captured in more pivotal cases of diaspora painting. It is this vibrancy that has, in my view, been chronically under-exploited by different styles of scholarship in Greece, including Christou's less exclusionary approach. More decentralised, self-reflexive and nuanced approaches are thus required towards those painters, who shared with Spartali-Stillman similarly dispersed experiences and careers, but who, unlike Spartali-Stillman, have for a long time featured as indispensable chapters of the Greek canon. Combined with a change of angle from the national centre to the diasporic periphery and a more acute sensitivity to the *essentially differential* nature of the numerous nineteenth-century Greek diasporas – each marked by its own singular social and historical conditions of existence, and each differently calibrating the visual production of Greek painters –, such changes of approach are necessary to make the full academic potential of the present corpus of 'Greek painting' more palpable.

They also reveal the significant historical depth of phenomena of currently special importance, thus enabling valuable reconsiderations of present commonly held 'wisdom'. In a world increasingly shaped by international flows of capital, technology, information, and ideas, the study of the effects of diaspora artists on both their countries of origin *and* on the indigenous developments in their new places of settlement has taken a new significance, even when it comes to supposedly 'pure Western' categories like contemporary art. As Amelia Jones recently put it, "diaspora is a crucial – if also impossibly complex – signifier that pressures every aspect of the way in which contemporary art is made, displayed, marketed, and written about".¹⁰³ The corpus of nineteenth-century Greek painting – like that of many other national traditions on the European 'periphery' – forms a loaded and increasingly necessary genealogical point of reference for these urgent concerns of our time.

FOOTNOTES

* In British standard works of reference, from the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004) to *Macmillan Dictionary of Art* (London, 1996), edited by Jane Turner, the painter's name is variably spelled Spartali, emphasising ties of family and ethnic kinship, or Stillman, highlighting marital status. The political connotations behind each of these choices are complex but unmistakable. My decision to hyphenate the two parts of the painter's name – a standard treatment of double barrel names in Greek, but not so frequent in English – was influenced by the way in which this foregrounds a little more visibly the inalienable plurality of hyphenated identities of diaspora painters which the following essay aims to highlight.

The article is dedicated to the Panayi family in Bolton, Manchester who taught me so much regarding the affections but also the numerous impasses of the Greek diaspora in Britain, and Xanthi, in particular, who will, I think, read this article with an occasional sense of uncanny recognition.

1 Nikos G. Svoronos, *Το Ελληνικό Έθνος: Γένεση και Διαμόρφωση του Νέου Ελληνισμού*, Athens: Polis, 2004 and the "Νέες Εποχές" supplement to *To Vima*, 23 January, 6 and 20 February, 6 March and 3 April 2005.

- 2 These heated debates are vividly analysed in Gregory Jusdanis, *The Necessary Nation*, Princeton: Princeton UP, 2001, pp. 3–16, and in Antonis Liakos, *Πώς Στοχάστηκαν το Έθνος Αυτοί που Ήθελαν να Αλλάξουν τον Κόσμο*, Athens: Polis, 2005.
- 3 Liakos, p. 12.
- 4 Jusdanis, pp. 5–9, 102–33.
- 5 Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso, 1983 and Anthony Smith, *National Identity*, London: Penguin, 1991, pp. 71–98. See also Anthony Smith, “History and Modernity: Reflections on the Theory of Nationalism” and Eric Hobsbawm, “Mass-Producing Traditions: Europe, 1870–1914”, in David Boswell and Jessica Evans (eds), *Representing the Nation*, London: Routledge, 1999, pp. 45–60 and 61–86 respectively.
- 6 See, for example, Smith, *National Identity*, pp. 91–8.
- 7 Eugenios Matthiopoulos, “Η Ιστορία της Τέχνης στα Όρια του Έθνους”, in Nicos Hadjinicolaou and Eugenios Matthiopoulos (eds), *Ιστορία της Τέχνης στην Ελλάδα*, Heraklio: Crete UP, 2003, pp. 427 and 419–21.
- 8 *Ibid.*, p. 427; see also pp. 424–29.
- 9 The forthcoming festschrift for Christou features a broad range of independent essays on a variety of art historical topics, edited by the academic staff in Art History at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, will be published by University Studio Press (Autumn 2006).
- 10 Dora Komini-Dialeti and Eugenios Matthiopoulos (eds), *Λεξικό Ελλήνων Καλλιτεχνών: Ζωγράφοι, Γλύπτες, Χαράκτες, 16^{ος}–20^{ος} αιώνας*, 4 vols., Athens: Melissa, 1997–2000. See entry on “Σπάρταλη-Stillman, Μαρία”, vol. 4, p. 199.
- 11 See, for example, Stelios Lydakakis, *Ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής Ζωγραφικής*, Athens: Melissa, 1976, and Tony Spiteris, *3 Αιώνες Νεοελληνικής Τέχνης 1660–1967*, Athens: Papyrus, 1979. See also Chrysanthos Christou, *Η Ελληνική Ζωγραφική 1832–1922* [hereafter *Greek Painting*], Athens: National Bank of Greece, 1981, note 26.
- 12 Entry on “Χρήστου, Χρυσάνθος” in *Εκπαιδευτική Ελληνική Εγκυκλοπαίδεια: Παγκόσμιο Βιογραφικό Λεξικό*, vol. 9b, Athens: Ekdotiki Athinon, 1993.
- 13 For an analysis of how these traditions operated in specific relation to art history, see Matthiopoulos, “Η Ιστορία της Τέχνης”, pp. 419–75.
- 14 *Ibid.*, pp. 466–75.
- 15 For a list of these books, see Christou’s, “Προβλήματα Περιοδολόγησης στην Ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής Τέχνης”, in Hadjinicolaou and Matthiopoulos (eds), *Ιστορία της Τέχνης*, notes 10 and 11.
- 16 Christou, *Greek Painting*, 15–8.
- 17 Chasiotis’s book is a rare integrated study of the history of modern diaspora: Ioannis K. Chasiotis, *Επισκόπηση της Ιστορίας της Νεοελληνικής Διασποράς*, Thessaloniki: Vaniias, 1993.
- 18 Chrysanthos Christou, *Greek Artists Abroad*, Athens: Hellenic Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1988.
- 19 Christou, *Greek Painting*, p. 43.
- 20 *Ibid.*, p. 68.
- 21 Aristeidis Sarafianos-Bogiatzis, “Διασπορά και Εθνικές Ιστορίες της Τέχνης: Ο Θεόδωρος Βρυζάκης και ο Ελληνικός Ναός στο Μάντσεστερ”, in Hadjinicolaou and Matthiopoulos (eds), *Ιστορία της Τέχνης*, 2003, pp. 508–39.
- 22 Christou’s open history also allowed the inclusion of non-Greek artists, whose work is treated as methodically as that of their Greek counterparts.

- 23 Matthiopoulos, "Η Ιστορία της Τέχνης", pp. 454–66, and Sarafianos-Bogiatzis, "Διασπορά και Εθνικές Ιστορίες της Τέχνης", pp. 498–503. The ambivalent term Νεοελληνική Τέχνη (Neo-Hellenic art) is currently used to signal both the objective field of the 'Art of Modern Greece', but also the more loaded nationalist vision of 'Modern Greek Art'. Research into the use of such terms in art history over the last century should provide interesting insights. See below for some related implications.
- 24 The Munich diaspora of which Theodoros Vryzakis and later Nicolaos Gyzis were members is an exemplary case in point. See Fotos Giofyllis, *Ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής Τέχνης, 1821–1941*, vol. 1, Athens: Elliniko Biblio, pp. 171ff; Stelios Lydakis, "Θεόδωρος Βρυζάκης, το έργο και η εποχή του", in *Οι Έλληνες Ζωγράφοι*, Athens: Melissa, 1974, pp. 74 and 76–7.
- 25 Marinos Kalligas, *Νεοελληνική Τέχνη*, Athens: Credit Bank, 1980, pp. 9–11, and Νικόλαος Γύζης: *η Ζωή και το Έργο του*, Athens: National Bank of Greece Cultural Foundation, 1981.
- 26 Similar developments occur in the history of literature sufficiently traced in Dimitris Tziouvas, *Οι Μεταμορφώσεις του Εθνισμού και το Ιδεολόγημα της Ελληνικότητας στο Μεσοπόλεμο*, Athens: Odysseas, 1989, pp. 73–82, 116–7, 130–1 and 140–52.
- 27 David Bindman, *Ape to Apollo: Aesthetics and the Idea of Race in the 18th Century*, Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2002; Lucian Boia, *Weather in the Imagination*, London: Reaktion, 2005, pp. 41–92; Mary G. Morton, "Art History on the Academic Fringe: Taine's Philosophy of Art" in Elizabeth Mansfield (ed.), *Art History and its Institutions*, London: Routledge, 2002, pp. 215–28; and Aris Sarafianos, "Pain, Labor and the Sublime: Medical Gymnastics and Burke's Aesthetics", *Representations* 91:1 (2005), pp. 58–83.
- 28 Tony P. Spiteris, *Introduction à la Peinture Néo-Hellénique*, Athens: n.p., 1962; Pantelis Prevelakis, "The Art of Modern Greece", *The Studio*, 115:541 (1938), pp. 175–94, esp. 175–6.
- 29 See Pantelis Prevelakis, *Dominikos Theotokopoulos (El Greco)*, Athens: Eleutheroudakis, 1930. For an insightful critique of the impoverishing effects of the diverse projects of national appropriation of El Greco's work across different European countries, see Nico Hadjinicolaou, "Εθνικιστικές Διεκδικήσεις στο Έργο του Δομνίκου Θεοτοκόπουλου" in Jose Alvarez Lopera (ed.), *Ελ Γκρέκο, Ταυτότητα και Μεταμόρφωση. Κρήτη-Ιταλία-Ισπανία*, Milan: Skira, 1999, pp. 61–87.
- 30 Marilena Z. Kasimati, "Πόσο "ελληνική" είναι η Νεοελληνική Τέχνη;" in Hadjinicolaou and Matthiopoulos, *Ιστορία της Τέχνης*, pp. 477–96.
- 31 I have analysed these phenomena elsewhere: Sarafianos-Bogiatzis, "Διασπορά και Εθνικές Ιστορίες της Τέχνης", pp. 504–7.
- 32 The following is a representative, but by no means exhaustive, list of related examples: Marina Lamb-raki-Plaka (ed.), *Εθνική Πινακοθήκη. Τέσσερις Αιώνες Ελληνικής Ζωγραφικής*, Athens: National Art Gallery and Alexandros Soutzos Museum, 1999; Nelli Misirli, *Ελληνική Ζωγραφική 18^{ος}–19^{ος} αιώνας*, Athens: Adam, 1993; Elias Mikoniatis, *Νεοελληνική Γλυπτική*, Athens: Ekdotiki Athinon, 1996, and Eugenios Matthiopoulos, *Η Τέχνη Πτεροφμεί εν Οδύνη: η Πρόσληψη του Νεορομαντισμού στο Πεδίο της Ιδεολογίας, της Θεωρίας της Τέχνης και της Τεχνοκριτικής στην Ελλάδα*, Athens: Potamos, 2005.
- 33 Kasimati, pp. 484–5.
- 34 Nicos Hadjinicolaou, *Εθνική Τέχνη και Πρωτοπορία*, Athens: Oxima, 1982, pp. 30–42.
- 35 Christou, *Greek Painting*, pp. 96–7, 30–1, 104–6.
- 36 "Σπάρταλη-Stillman, Μαρία", *Λεξικό Ελλήνων Καλλιτεχνών*, p. 199.
- 37 Ibid.
- 38 See Deborah Cherry, *Painting Women: Victorian Women Artists*, London: Routledge, 1993, pp. 88–9 and 197–9 and *Beyond the Frame*, London: Routledge, 2000, pp. 167–72. See also Jan Marsh and Pamela Gerrish Nunn, *Women Artists and the Pre-Raphaelite Movement*, London: Virago, 1989, pp. 98–106, and

Pre-Raphaelite Women Artists, Manchester: Manchester City Art Galleries, 1997.

- 39 Ellen C. Clayton, *English Female Artists*, vol. 2, London: Tinsley Bros, 1876, pp. 135.
- 40 Entry on "Stillman, Marie", in H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (eds), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004 and "Spartali, Marie", Jane Turner (ed.), *Dictionary of Art*, vol. 29 (34 vols.), London: Grove, 1996.
- 41 "Mrs Stillman" (Obituary), *Times*, 8 March 1927.
- 42 Christos Hadziiossif, "Greek Merchant Colonies and Independent Greece. Problems and Interpretations", in Lily A. Macrakis and Nikiforos P. Diamandouros (eds), *New Trends in Modern Greek Historiography*, Hanover, New Hampshire: Modern Greek Studies Association & Anatolia College, 1982, pp. 78–82; Theodore Edward Dowling and Edwin Fletcher, *Hellenism in England*, intro. Joannes Gennadius, London: Faith, 1915, and Timotheos Catsiyannis, *The Greek Community in London*, London, 1993, pp. 23–44, make multiple references to the traumatic memory of the community.
- 43 John A. Armstrong, "Mobilized and Proletarian Diasporas", *American Political Science Review* 70:2 (1976), pp. 393–408, and Richard Clogg, "The Greek Diaspora in the Twentieth Century. The Historical Context", in Richard Clogg (ed.), *The Greek Diaspora in the Twentieth Century*, London: Macmillan, 1999, p. 14.
- 44 Chasiotis, pp. 80–5.
- 45 Charles Issawi, "British Trade and the Rise of Beirut, 1830–1860", *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 8 (1977), pp. 91–101.
- 46 *Ibid.*, p. 97.
- 47 Antonis Liakos, "Ελληνισμός η Ελληνικό Έθνος," *To Vima*, 2 March 1997.
- 48 For the multiple nationalist political activities of the community and Greek state's politics of interference, see Vasos Tsimbidaros, *Οι Έλληνες στην Αγγλία*, Athens: Alkaios, 1974, pp. 120ff. For a broader historical perspective, see Hadziiossif, "Greek Merchant Colonies and Independent Greece" .
- 49 Catsiyannis, pp. 367–79.
- 50 *Ibid.*, 452–71.
- 51 "Rules of the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies", *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 1 (1880), p. ix. Michael Spartali had been one of the founding members of the Society and its affiliated journal.
- 52 David Elliott, *A Pre-Raphaelite Marriage: The Lives and Works of Marie Spartali Stillman and William James Stillman*, Woodbridge: Antique Collectors Club, 2005, pp. 10–12.
- 53 There is no space here to tell the story of the influential and complex intellectual politics of this community. See Julia Ionides, "The Greek Connection: The Ionides Family and Their Connections With Pre-Raphaelite and Victorian Art Circles", in Susan P. Casteras and Alicia Graig Faxon (eds), *Pre-Raphaelite Art in its European Context*, London: Associated University Presses, 1995, pp. 160–74; Cosmo Monkhouse, "The Constantine Ionides Collection", *Magazine of Art* (1884), pp. 36–44, 120–7, 208–14; and Gleeson White, "An Epoch Making House", *The Studio* (November 1898), pp. 102ff.
- 54 Elliott, pp. 12–33.
- 55 "Mrs Stillman" (Obituary), *Times*, 8 March 1927.
- 56 Charles Hallé, *Notes from a Painter's Life*, London: John Murray, 1909, pp. 71ff and Elliott, p. 15.
- 57 On these synergies among nationalist politics, mid-19th century radical Jacobinism, and liberalism, see Jacques Attali, *Karl Marx ou l'Esprit du Monde*, Paris: Fayard, 2005, Jonathan Sperber, *The European Revolutions 1848–51*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005, and Tom Nairn, "History's Postman", *London Review of Books* 28:2 (26 January 2006).

Interventions

- 58 For this early visual topos of Pre-Raphaelite women painters, see Elizabeth Prettejohn, *The Art of the Pre-Raphaelites*, London: Tate, 2000, pp. 67–84 and Cherry, *Beyond the Frame*, pp. 159–73.
- 59 Cherry, *Painting Women*, pp. 88–9, 197–9 and *Beyond the Frame*, pp. 159–73.
- 60 William J. Stillman, *The Cretan Insurrection of 1866–7–8*, New York: Holt, 1874, pp. 112–3, 144ff and 179–86.
- 61 Elliott, pp. 55–6.
- 62 Michael Spartali's involvement would later in the 1880s land him into serious trouble with the Greek government and press as a result of the way in which his name became caught up in the savage politicking between Charilaos Tricoupis and Theodoros Deligiannis. See Tsimbidaros, pp. 140–44 and Elliott, pp. 138–9.
- 63 Stillman, *Cretan Insurrection*, pp. 64, 86–7, 107–8.
- 64 *Ibid.*, pp. 124–5, 143.
- 65 *Ibid.*, pp. 86 and 125.
- 66 *Ibid.*, pp. 65.
- 67 *Ibid.*
- 68 *Ibid.*, p. 125.
- 69 I refer here to Timanthes's *Sacrifice of Iphigenia* and the painter's trick of amplifying Agamemnon's grief by veiling his face (Pliny XXXV.73).
- 70 Cherry, *Painting Women*, pp. 53–64.
- 71 *The Academy*, 15 February 1871, p. 133.
- 72 William Stillman to Marie Spartali, Schaffer Library, Union College, Schenectady, 393.
- 73 For Stillman's landmark contributions in American art, criticism and photography, see Elliott, pp. 34–60.
- 74 William J. Stillman, *The Acropolis of Athens*, London: Ellis, 1870.
- 75 The page with the autograph note was in the British Museum copy of the album, but has now curiously been removed.
- 76 Michael Spartali to Ford Madox Brown, 7 and 12 March 1870, National Art Library, V&A, London, 1995/14/105/69 and 70.
- 77 William Stillman, *The Autobiography of a Journalist*, vol. 2, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1901, p. 661.
- 78 Christopher Newall, *The Grosvenor Gallery Exhibitions. Change and Continuity in the Victorian Art World*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.
- 79 Spartali–Stillman followed the Pre-Raphaelite group in its angry exodus from the Grosvenor in 1887. See *ibid.*, pp. 36–8.
- 80 Cherry, *Beyond the Frame*, p. 206 and Elliott, p. 148.
- 81 Cherry, *ibid.*, p. 153–4, and Marie Spartali Stillman to Vernon Lee, 9 November 1906, Somerville College Archive, Oxford.
- 82 William J. Barber, "International Commerce in the Fine Arts and American Political Economy, 1789–1913", in Neil De Marchi and Craufurd D. W. Goodwin (eds), *Economic Engagements with Art*, Durham: Duke UP, 1999, pp. 217–9.
- 83 Albert Boime, "The Chocolate Venus, 'Tainted' Pork, the Wine Blight, and the Tariff: Franco-American

- Stew at the Fair", in Annette Blaugrund (ed.), *Paris 1889: American Artists at the Universal Exhibition*, New York: Abrams, 1989, pp. 67–92, esp. 82–5.
- 84 Kimberly Orcutt, "Buy American? The Debate over the Art Tariff", *American Art* 16:3 (2002), pp. 82–91, esp. 85–90.
- 85 See for example Boime, pp. 79–80.
- 86 Elliott, p. 127.
- 87 Boime, p. 80, and Barber, pp. 219–20. The *Nation*, the periodical to which Stillman had been contributing art reviews from Europe and archaeology reports from Greece, warned that Italy was considering a stiff export tax on the works of American artists in Italy in order to counter the American import tariff. See "Italy and the Art Tariff", *The Nation*, 1883.
- 88 Boime, p. 80, and Orcutt, p. 86.
- 89 Philip G. Hamerton, "National Supremacy in Painting", *Portfolio* 21 (1890), pp. 225–32 and 248–53.
- 90 William Michael Rossetti, "English Painters of the Present Day-Marie Spartali", *Portfolio* 2 (1870), p. 118.
- 91 Hamerton, p. 225.
- 92 *Ibid.*, p. 231–2.
- 93 *Ibid.*, p. 225.
- 94 *Ibid.*, p. 227.
- 95 *Ibid.*, p. 253.
- 96 *Ibid.*
- 97 *Ibid.*
- 98 *Ibid.*, pp. 225–6 and 251–2.
- 99 *Ibid.*, p. 253.
- 100 Chauncey Stillman, "An Impression of Marie Spartali-Stillman in 1923 or 1924", p. 3 (unpublished manuscript, courtesy of William Ritchie).
- 101 From the beginning of the twentieth century, Spartali-Stillman exhibited and sold quite regularly in the US, becoming the first Pre-Raphaelite painter "to do any painting" and "spend any considerable amount of time" there. See Rowland Elzea, "Marie Stillman in the United States", *Journal of Pre-Raphaelite and Aesthetic Studies* 2:1 (1989), pp. 56–72, esp. 56–7.
- 102 Kasimati, pp. 494–5.
- 103 Amelia Jones, "Writing Contemporary Art into History, a Paradox?" in Amelia Jones (ed.), *A Companion to Contemporary Art since 1945*, London: Blackwell, 2006, pp. 9–11. This new interest in diasporic artists is related to the systematic study of the discursive formation of subjectivity and identity initiated by post-structuralist theory. It also stems from post-colonial studies and the need for a more insightful understanding of the active role of the non-Western world in the process of modernisation. It is also frequently focused on the specific relationship between women, globalisation, and the articulation of diasporic and migrant identities in art. See "Diasporic Futures: Women, the Arts and Globalisation", Conference, Victoria and Albert Museum, July 2006.