

The Participation of Greece (Hellas)¹ in the First World War: Literary Representation

Konstantinos D. Karatzas

University of Zaragoza

Abstract: The article presents Greek novels about the country's participation in the First World War, a particularly interesting case, since Greece was an important secondary theatre of war. The author presents the turbulent and ambiguous historical background of the novels: Greece's forced entry into the war, and the failed intervention in Asia Minor in the final year of the war. Most of the novels under discussion were important events in the history of Greek modernism.

Keywords: First World War, Greece, war novel

The article explores the participation of Greece in the First World War. The analysis focuses on multiple aspects but mostly sheds light upon the problems that the country's involvement caused for its people.

The participation of Greece in the Great War had major short-term benefits. Being under Turkish occupation for centuries, Greece had lost its Hellenic identity and its status as a regional power. The new era for the country began after the successful war against the Ottomans in 1821, its independence and the establishment of the First Hellenic Democracy (Gallant 2016, xvi). This was the starting point for the formation of a Western-oriented state, with modern infrastructures, political and social reforms, along with the reinvention of the Greek national identity, which had been lost or utterly transformed after almost four centuries of Turkish influence.

¹ The official name of Greece (originates from the Latin, Graeci) is Hellenic Republic. While its citizens are called Greeks by the foreigners, the natives call themselves Hellenes and their country Hellas or Hellada.

The Balkan Wars (1912–1913) (Hall 2000, 1) had been a major step forward for Greece. The country had massively expanded its borders, once again conquering areas that had been acknowledged as Greek territory even from the ancient years. A victor of the Balkan conflict, Greece had almost doubled its size and population with the least casualties possible. In detail, the Treaty of Bucharest (August 10, 1913) (Anderson and Hershey 1918, 439) had reshaped Balkans and Hellas had been on the victors' side; the country increased its territory from 64,790 to 108,610 km² and its population from almost 2.7 to about 4.4 million people (Anderson and Hershey 1918, 440). Thus, Hellas regained some of its lost prestige and advanced its status as a key regional power.

The Great War resulted in the rebalance of powers within the Balkans; along with the fragmentation and the enfeeblement of the Ottoman Empire, it offered Greece aspirations for more political and economic influence on the region.

Despite Greece being victorious in the Balkan Wars, its status was shattered; the Great War was the beginning of a new period of controversies in the area. The defeated neighbors were targeting the new territories of Greece, previously part of their countries and continuously challenging the Hellenic sovereignty and territorial integrity (Leontaritis 2005, 120–140).

A possible violation of the Treaty of Bucharest would be devastating for the area because it would lead to a new period of conflicts. This time, Greece was in a defensive position. Its new borders seemed too broad to protect the Hellenic state. In addition, the extensive battles during the Balkan Wars had deeply affected the already limited military personnel and the inadequate armory; it had also burdened the already crippled economy; a possible reshaping of powers would have a negative impact on the country's territorial gains. The aspirations of the other parties of the Treaty, i.e. Romania, Montenegro, Serbia and Bulgaria, to regain their power over the region had been of major importance for the strategic steps taken by Greece. One of the first actions of the Balkan states was to target the remaining Greek communities in an effort to push Greece to retreat and release its new territories.

Greece was in the middle of impending turmoil and it could not remain neutral. Nevertheless, agreement on a strategy would prove to be highly problematic and would divide the country for decades. The two bases

of the political life of Greece, King Constantine and Prime Minister Venizelos, had different views on the issue.

The King wanted the country to remain neutral or ally with Germany if forced to choose sides; Constantine and his wife Sophia of Prussia were of Dano-German and German origin (Dimitrakis 2009, 155), respectively, and loyal to their houses; their support to the Central powers seemed certain. However, such a choice meant that Greece would be an ally with Bulgaria and Turkey, supporters of the Germans as well, but former enemies that were defeated by Greece during the Balkan Wars. This alliance would only have been for the benefit of the Germans but would by no means guarantee the winnings of the Balkan Wars for Greece.

On the other hand, Prime Minister Venizelos, possibly the most influential politician in the history of modern Greece, believed that the country did not have the option to remain neutral. He believed that Greece should join with the Allied forces; according to his perspective, this would assure that the country would remain on the side of the most powerful naval powers of the era, Britain and France (Paddock and Lomonidou 2014, 273). Greece, a country of exceptional geographical position between two continents, should ensure its status as an important naval force in Southern Europe and the South-Eastern Mediterranean. If Greece had supported the Central Powers, it would have meant that the Allied forces would alienate Greece from the Mediterranean. Venizelos could foresee that such an action would have been devastating for the country's economy and future.

Although Greece was a key player in the area, the Allies did not agree on their collaboration easily, because such an action would provoke Bulgaria and Turkey, which had remained neutral until then. Nevertheless, in January 1915 Britain asked Greece to support Serbia and take several areas in Asia Minor as an exchange (Clogg 2013, 92). However, Venizelos foresaw a new confrontation with Bulgaria and Romania, both of which had already refused his proposal for joint assistance to Serbia; in such a hostile environment, Venizelos regarded the support of the Allied forces as crucial for his country's survival.

Another weak point was the inability of Greece to comply with Britain's request for military support to Serbia, which was under attack by Bulgarian, German and Austrian forces in October 1915. The British expected the Greeks to fulfill their obligations under the Serbian-Greek pact (May 1913) (Gibler 2009, 277) and offer military support to Serbia. Greece had no excuse to remain

passive anymore; its Balkan neighbors had entered the war on the side of the Central Powers and it was certain that Greece would be a future target in their effort to fulfill their imperialistic aspirations.

The world was moving but Greece could not follow the changes. Venizelos and Constantine began an endless dispute that would deeply affect the country for decades. Greece did not support the alliance because Venizelos had already resigned and the head of the country was King Constantine, who would never turn against the German alliance.

On the other hand, Britain was eager to transform Greece into an active player and thus offered important concessions. Under the exigencies of war, Winston Churchill offered Greece the opportunity to unite with Cyprus as an exchange for supporting Serbia. Unfortunately, Constantine did not value the importance of the proposal (Stavridis 1996, 291) and lost a unique opportunity. A unification of Greece and Cyprus would have offered them more power and influence over the Mediterranean; above all, it would probably have saved Cyprus from the forced invasion in 1974 and the forthcoming painful partition.

Venizelos's and Constantine's different views on the participation of Greece in the Great War led to a clash that affected the country's status and socio-political stability for decades. Venizelos was convinced that the alignment of his country with the Allies would guarantee its independence and offer more lands, especially in Asia Minor, which was a dream of his, as the Greeks had been living in this area since the ancient times. However, Constantine was not convinced; he rejected Venizelos' proposal for the participation of Greece to the Dardanelles Campaign on Britain's side; the latter thought that the Allied forces would win and Greece would have the opportunity for further expansion. However, Ioannis Metaxas, a future dictator of Greece (1936–1941) (Thomopoulos 2012, 112), but a highly skilled military man, analysed the plan on behalf of the King and concluded that there would be no victory for the Allies. Fortunately, Greece did not participate; the campaign was a disaster for Britain but a victory for the Ottomans, who operated under the command of the future father of Turkey, Mustafa Kemal Ataturk (Del Testa 2013, 12).

In the spring of 1915, after the resignation of Venizelos, Constantine, as the head of the state, started negotiations with the Allied forces for the position of Hellas during the war. The allies demanded guarantees that, as long

as Greece did not support them, it would remain neutral and by no means support the Central powers.

However, Constantine's actions generated even more skepticism among the Allies. In May 1916, Greece unconditionally surrendered the border fortress of Rupel in Central Macedonia to the Bulgarians. The Allied forces became suspicious that Greece was supporting the Central Powers and that it would allow the latter's forces to use the northern part of the country as their base for taking over the Balkans. Indeed, Constantine's actions in Rupel allowed the Bulgarians not only to seize cities north-east of Hellas but also to forcibly ghettoize the local Greek population (Koliopoulos 2010, 81).

The Allies did not accept the neutrality of Greece and Venizelos, determined to oust Constantine from the country's political life, allowed them to occupy Thessaloniki (Salonika) in October 1915 (Mylonas 2012, 118). Venizelos and his foreign patrons had decided that Greece would definitely enter the war on the side of the Allied Forces; Constantine should be alienated, if not punished, for his disobedience.

The theater of war was transferred to Greece; de facto, the country became an active combatant in the Great War. In June 1916, the Allies, responding to the Rupel incident, demanded Constantine to demobilize the Greek Army. The conflict escalated with the clash between the Allied and Central forces in northern Greece but Constantine did not comply with the ultimatum. Three thousand marines arrived in Athens to force him to surrender his army (Abbott 2008, 159). King's soldiers clashed with the marines; in response, the Allied naval forces bombarded areas around the palace. The locals forced the foreign soldiers to flee; the casualties of both sides were extensive (Leon 1974, 436) but the most important development took place over the next days. Despite the different opinions on whether the Venizelists supported the Allied forces in this conflict or not, the Royal forces began a barrage of massive imprisonments, executions and atrocities that divided the country even further. The Noemvriana (November Events), as the conflict is called, was a small-scale civil clash that highlighted the extreme polarization among the Greeks.

By the end of 1916, Venizelos illegally established a government that was recognized by France and Britain. Greece was officially divided into two parts: the one of Venizelos and that of Constantine. The Allies enforced a naval blockade and embargo in Athens for more than one hundred days, forcing Constantine to pass his authority to his son Alexander. In the end, Venizelos

became the unquestionable leader of the country, with the Great powers on his side. In July 1917, Greece officially declared war on the Central Forces.

Greece was on the victors' side but it was not a winner. The National Schism, the civil unrest and the division of Greeks between the King and Venizelos continued and led the country into deeper political and social downfall (Gallant 2016, 214).

Participation in the Great War offered the Hellenic leadership the aspiration that the country could regain its ancient power and glory; the naïve ambitions and the dream of a Great Greece that would include all the regions historically inhabited by Greeks in the Balkans and the Ottoman Empire continued the turmoil. The idea of 'Greece of Two Continents (Europe and Asia) and Five Seas (the Ionian, Aegean, Marmara, Libyan and Black seas)' (Heraclides 2010, 58) forced the country to enter a conflict with the Ottomans that eventually not only created major losses in both the pride of the Greeks and in human lives but also created a deeper schism that affected the country for decades; one might say forever.

The dawn of Turkish nationalism and the exorbitant hopes of Greek officials led to major territory losses in Asia Minor. After the end of the Great War, Greeks sought the territorial gains the Allied Forces had promised them. Thus, the government began a march into Ottoman lands, an action that would turn to be the greatest disaster of Modern Greek history. The Hellenic Army landed in Smyrna on May 15, 1919, with the support of British, American and French fleets (Nafziger and Walton 2003, 131) and for almost two years led a successful campaign in the Ottoman inland, Anatolia. The unexpected death of King Alexander, the intentions of Venizelos to banish the monarchy and transform Greece into a republic and his plan to continue a never-ending war in Asia Minor led to his defeat in the elections. Dimitrios Gounaris established a new government and prepared for King Constantine's return. Most of the officers, experienced veterans of the Great War, were replaced by amateur non-military personnel; the catastrophe was imminent. The Great Powers had already warned Constantine to stop the campaign; the Hellenic Army was abandoned while it was marching deeper into Anatolia, on its way to Ankara. Greek authorities believed that the Hellenes were superior; obviously they overestimated or did not value reality. In addition to the Greek army's problems after years of battles, the supply chain was cut off and the men were abandoned in the vast Ottoman inlands. The massively outnumbered Ottomans

received the support of the Soviet forces and pushed the Greeks back to the shores of the Aegean Sea (Smith 2016, 162).

In 1922, Greece experienced the most painful defeat in its modern history, a tragedy that altered the country forever. Turkey counterattacked and retaliated; Kemal led a successful campaign that left millions of Greeks, Armenians and Assyrians deported and murdered (Smith 2016, 307-311). In Greek collective memory, the destruction of Smyrna, the metropolis of Greek civilization in the area, is considered a massive catastrophe and genocide of the local Greek population (Hobsbawm 2004, 51). The severe rupture of Greek presence in Asia Minor, the complete loss of Hellenic properties, the profound refugee crisis, the rise of nationalism in Europe and the geopolitical game of constant political and military influence by the Great Powers, which takes place until nowadays, led to an everlasting controversy between the two countries.

The refugee waves almost devastated Greece; neither its economy nor its infrastructure were able to handle the 1.5 million refugees. Greece had to reorganize, focus on its internal affairs and abandon the Great Idea for a Greek empire. The new reality challenged Greece's social structure and political stability and, most of all, it transformed its identity. The Treaty of Lausanne, along with the establishment of the Turkish Republic, enforced the relocation of Muslims and Christians to their motherlands, Turkey and Greece, respectively. This process homogenized the population of Greece under the same national identity, religion and language for the first time after centuries of Ottoman occupation. Despite the problems and the alienation of the refugees from the native Greek population, the people from Asia Minor eventually became an inconsistent part of Greece (Dertilis 2015, 675). The influence of the refugees was essential in the formation of Modern Greek identity. Living in a foreign state, the Greeks of Asia Minor had already acknowledged, promoted and defended their Hellenic identity for a long time. The Ottoman shores of the Aegean Sea had been multicultural, international trade centers and the Greeks had been a substantial part of their elite. The Asia Minor Greeks affected the local economy by promoting a more international perspective and introducing trades that were unknown or underdeveloped in Greece. Their influence was so deep that among other parts, it changed the food culture enriching the country's cuisine with an internationally acknowledged taste. Their contribution to the Arts was so extensive that one might say that they offered Greek music its distinctive character (Bloustien 1999, 68). Despite

the massive problems, the bloody conflicts and the extensive loss of human lives and property, Greece experienced an essential cultural, social, economic and political transformation that completely altered its identity.

The participation of Greece in the Balkan Wars, the Great War and the Asia Minor War shaped the identity of its economy, as well. Greece, devastated by decades of conflicts succeeding the centuries of Ottoman occupation, was not considered the modern state that it wished to be; lack of infrastructure and an overall devastated economy had created unsolved problems in its social, political and civil organization. The only solution was to receive financial support through loans with unfair terms; the Greeks had no alternative and the Great Powers had the opportunity to keep the country dependent forever. For example, for the years 1914–1918, Hellas signed for 1.2 trillion drachmas of loans; it received only 110 million drachmas in the form of short-term loans. Only for the aforementioned years, without counting the Campaign to Turkey and with a moderate approach, Greece's expenditure was almost 2 trillion drachmas (Leontaritis 2005, 293–295).

Hellas did not achieve its primary territorial goals through the participation in the series of wars. Its involvement in the conflicts also generated political controversies on a political and social level with the Greeks being separated forever; King or Venizelos, later Democracy or Junta, Left or Right, Allied or Central Powers, Americans or Soviets, Europeans or descendants of the Ancient Greeks. Hellenes have been separated for centuries and always dependent on the Great Powers of each era. The legacy of its involvement in the Great War shaped the identity of Greece to a dependant state and negatively affected its legacy, identity, past and future. Hellas was not on the side of the defeated; however, by no means was it a victor (Dertilis 2015, 967–968).

Hellenic Literature and the Provisional Interpretation of WWI

The Great War has not been represented in Hellenic literature adequately. A significant aspect that deserves further examination is the way the novelists and poets depicted the participation of Greece in the Great War. Greek authors did not seem to focus sufficiently on the role of their country in this massive and violent battlefield. Despite the fact that Greece was in turmoil

for a long time due to its participation in the Balkan Wars and the Great War respectively, the literature did not produce as much work as it did during and after the Second World War.

While the Great War itself did not prove to be inspirational for Greek writers, the loss of Minor Asia was the turning point for them to work on the topic and, in a way, present a part of the Great War's aftermath; the tragedy was conceived as a highly dramatic moment for Greece on multiple levels. The social, economic, ethical, religious and historical aspect of the catastrophe offered the authors an endless source of inspiration. The pain from the uprooting of the Greeks from an area that had been inhabited by them for centuries created some of the most distinguished pieces of literature and introduced some of the most important novelists in Greece. The Greek people rediscovered the Hellenic presence in Asia Minor, remembered the area's history and reconnected with their nation's past. One might say that the authors formed part of the collective memory of the modern Greek people on the Hellenic presence in Asia Minor through their extensive and detailed reference to the topic.

The significance of the specific theme lies in the fact that the authors became the connection between Greeks of the mainland and Greeks of Asia Minor. They belonged to the same nation but their numerous differences had been revealed after the forced migration; the two parties understood that their common nationality was not enough to unite them; the barriers that separated them were greater than the bridges that connected them.

Literature played a crucial role in redefining the Greek identity. The novels focused on multiple aspects and offered their readers the opportunity to acknowledge Asia Minor Greeks and their culture.

"Mikrasiates", as they are called in Greek,² were not accepted by the native Greeks when they first arrived in Greece. Mikrasiates were penniless, homeless and hopeless; often, the locals considered them as Turks or vagrants. The first problem was the language. The Greeks from Turkey had a distinguished way of expressing themselves through a mixture of Ancient Greek and Turkish languages but with many Arabic, Armenian, Hebrew, French

² The word "Mikrasiates" originates from the Greek words *μικρός* (*mikros*), that means small, minor, and the word *Ασιάτες* (*Asiates*), that means Asians; in other words "Greeks from Asia Minor".

and English influences. The novelists managed not only to exonerate their way of expression but also underline the strong roots with Ancient Greek and the ways these elements were preserved by the Mikrasiates. Through literature, modern Greek language adopted many Turkish words, which migrated with the Greeks from Turkey.

Furthermore, the authors explained to the native Greeks the different culture of the Mikrasiates. The latter were cosmopolitan in many ways because they were affected by the multicultural and financially prosperous environment of Asia Minor. In the long term, native Greeks adopted many of the habits that Mikrasiates had, but it was the novelists that in many cases highlighted their significance. For example, the food, the music and their excellent skills as internationally oriented entrepreneurs and merchants opened in Greece new ground for development. Religion had been a common ground but through the novels the Greeks learnt the difficulties of being a Christian in a Muslim country, the hardships of being a Greek in Turkey; thus, they valued Mikrasiates in a different way.

In many cases, the authors worked as historians and through their work they preserved the memory of a distinguished part of Hellenic history. They depicted life in Asia Minor, the fight to maintain the Greek identity, protect the language and safeguard the culture; this action had probably offered the most detailed description of any other group of people in Greece.

Elias Venezis (1904–1973), a native of Asia Minor, was an iconic author. He was one of the victims of the forced migration and his work, almost in its entirety, focused on the Greeks in the area. His most important accomplishment is that, in reality, his novels preserved the memory of the catastrophe and presented it to the Greek readers in the most vivid way. If it had not been for Venezis, many of the memories would probably not have passed to the next generations in such a detailed way.

Venezis presents many of the aspects of life such as the coexistence of the Greeks with the Turks, the difficulties during the Great War and the forced migration to Greece. In his book, *Aiolian Land* (1943), he refers to the pre-catastrophe era and his life as a boy. The novel is written in a simple but highly descriptive way; the readers mentally travel back to Aivali and experience the ideal, dreamy and free side of Asia Minor through the childhood memories of Venezis. In this book, the writer does not offer any political insight into the war. Although most Greeks have connected Asia

Minor to extreme violence and pain, Venezis dares to exclude politics and geopolitics and focus on the tranquility of life in Aivali.

On the other hand, his most famous and probably most powerful work is the book *Number 31328* (1931). This autobiographical work presents in the most vivid and descriptive way Venezis' experience as a captive of the Turkish Army after the catastrophe. In his iconic book, Venezis describes the life of people in Amele Taburu, the Turkish version of the labour battalions. Greek people were forced to conscript and marched into the vast mainland of Turkey. They were used as workers but in reality they were murdered, punished, tortured or left to die without food and water; the hardships were presented by Venezis in an engaging and breathtaking way. An important aspect is that apart from its value as a literary masterpiece, the book is actually a precious source of historical information; Venezis was one of the few out of thousands that survived Amale Taburu, as if he was meant to share the story of his life with the next generations.

Moreover, in his book *Tranquility* (1939), Elias Venezis describes the difficulties of the refugees from Fokaia area in Greece. Through his heroes, the writer presents the lack of support and the inadequacy of infrastructure along with the hunger and the thirst of the newcomers. The psychological, emotional and ethical breakdown of the people, along with the denial of the new conditions, is at the core of the book, as well. Venezis, a preserver of memory and history, offered Greek people in the best way a part of their national heritage and their collective memory through individual recollections. He said:

My life was connected with these events and sealed my fate as a writer: my main books were time and dedication to the drama of Asia Minor [...]. My intention was to deposit my testimony for our children, for whom this season is no longer mythical. (Venezis 1974, 2).

Another significant writer was Stratis Doukas (1895-1983). He did not write many novels but the excellent *A War Prisoner's Story* (1929) remains one of the best works on the aforementioned topic. The hero of the book is Nikolas Kozakoglou, a Greek prisoner of war from Anatolia, who escapes captivity and survives by pretending to be a Muslim. While the readers "watch" Nikolas's efforts to save his life, they understand that the novel is not about heroism, hatred or revenge but about survival and fear of moral and physical

humiliation. The novel is a powerful statement against war; it does not focus on nationalities, but it underlines the similarities between the Turks and the Greeks in order to present the destructive power of war: it can even dehumanize communities that have lived together for centuries.

On the other hand, Stratis Myrivilis (1890–1969) probably contributed the most relevant work to the Great War novel of the era in Greece: *Life in the Tomb* (1923). Myrivilis shares his own experience in the Macedonian battlefield through his hero's voice; the book refers to the life of Sergeant Kostoula, whose diary reveals life in the trenches. While his platoon proceeds ever deeper into trench warfare, Kostoulas writes letters to his girlfriend expressing his thoughts, his fears and his doubts about the meaning of life and death, war and peace. The writer argues about the real meaning of life, underlining the significance of everyday moments that people should value more and which in reality constitute life. The book also reveals the mistakes of the Greek authorities and blames them for not organizing the army properly in order to achieve their goals and for not saving the soldiers' lives. Myrivilis's analysis was so accurate that the publication of the book was banned during the two dictatorships in 1936 and in 1967, respectively.

Another significant writer was Dido Sotiriou (1909–2004). She was born in Asia Minor and almost all of her work focused on the aforementioned topic. Her iconic book, the novel *Farewell Anatolia*,³ describes a lost paradise through the story of two friends, a Greek and a Turk. Through the development of the story, Sotiriou reveals the characters of Greek and Turkish people, their close and friendly relationship along with the political responsibility of both the Greek and the Turkish leaderships; the unwillingness of the Great Powers to help in connection to the extreme polarization that created a deadly combination. The author offered a masterpiece; she did not only contribute to the preservation of memory, but also managed to present the political and economic aspects of the catastrophe through her own experiences. Sotiriou, a native of Anatolia, devoted her work almost in its entirety to the representation of life in Asia Minor. However, her source of inspiration was the pain of the uprooting; the following quote from her book *The Dead Are Waiting* (Sotiriou 1979) is the quintessence of her work:

³ The Greek title of the book is *Bloody Earth*. See: Dido Sotiriou. *Bloody Earth*, Athens: Kedros, 1962. Greek Version.

There is a tragic time in the life of a man, when he thinks that he would be lucky to abandon his hometown and his past, and flee, run so fast that he would run out of breath only to find certainty somewhere else (Sotiriou 1979, 133).

The Great War was not as essential for Greek authors as it might have been in other countries. Hellenic intellectuals focused on the Greco-Turkish War due to its massive effect on the country's life. The literature probably focused on what Greeks considered as significant, namely their country; another example of the provisional interpretation of the Great War. Despite its magnitude all over Europe, the Greek writers along with the Greek population limited their view geographically to their immediate neighboring countries and to the implication for their relations. The Greek perspective seems to have limited the participation of the country in the Great War mostly to the Balkan and the Greco-Turkish Wars, even though WW1 took place between 1914 and 1918. The waves of violence in Asia Minor and the mayhem after the end of WW1 were so severe and extensive for the country that the Greek people and the authors focused on the specific events. Thus, it seems that the literature focused on what seems to be conceived as an extended version of the Great War, the outcome of which was the Asia Minor catastrophe—probably the most painful loss of the modern Hellenic Democracy.

However, one should mention that the majority of the authors did not focus on blaming the Turkish people for the catastrophe. While there are references to the apathy or the active role of many of them in the catastrophe, the authors, as well as the people who survived the attack, praised the friendly coexistence of the Turks and the Greeks. In most of the aforementioned books, there are references to Turkish people who even warned the Greeks of the imminent attack of the Turkish army and tried to protect them in any way possible; however, the attack was so brutal and bloody that there was no other option for them other than fleeing Asia Minor.

The political aspect is present in many novels, as well; there are references to the apathy of the Greek, Turkish and European political elite and to the incompetence and unwillingness to use diplomatic means to prevent the disaster. However, the Hellenic literature mostly worked on analyzing the Greek perception of the catastrophe through the presentation the survivors' personal accounts. In conclusion, the Greek war literature was essential in shaping

the modern Hellenic identity, connecting people with their past, teaching them a significant part of their history and most of all preserving the nation's individual and collective memory.

Works Cited

- Abbott, G. F. 2008. *Greece and the Allies 1914–1922*. London: Methuen.
- Anderson, Frank M., and Amos S. Hershey. 1918. *Handbook for the Diplomatic History of Europe, Asia and Africa 1870–1914*. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Clogg, Richard. 2013. *A Concise History of Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Del Testa, David W. 2013. *Lives and Legacies, Government Leader, Military Rulers and Political Activists*. New York: Routledge.
- Dertilis, George B. 2015. *History of the Greek State, 1830–1920*. Heraklion: The Crete University Press.
- Dimitrakis, Panagiotis. 2009. *Greece and the English: British Diplomacy and the Kings of Greece*. London: I. B. Tauris Academic Studies.
- Doukas, Stratis. 1977. *A War Prisoner's Story*. (Greek Version.) Athens: Kedros.
- Gallant, Thomas W. 2016. *Modern Greece: From the War of Independence to the Present*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Gibler, Douglas M. 2009. *International Military Alliances 1648–2008*. Washington D.C.: CQ Press.
- Hall, Richard C. 2000. *The Balkan Wars: 1912–1913: Prelude to the First World War*. New York: Routledge.
- Heraclides, Alexis. 2010. *The Greek-Turkish Conflict in the Aegean: Imagined Enemies*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. 2004. *Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914–1991*. London: Abacus Books.
- Koliopoulos, John S., and Thanos M. Veremis. 2010. *Modern Greece: A History since 1821*. Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Leon, G. B. 1974. *Greece and the Great Powers*. Thessaloniki: Institute of Balkan Studies.
- Leontaritis, George B. 2005. *Greece and the First World War: From Neutrality to Intervention*. Athens: National Bank of Greece Cultural Foundation.

- Mylonas, Harris. 2012. *The Politics of Nation-Building: Making Co-Nationals, Refugees, and Minorities*. Cambridge University Press.
- Myrivilis, Stratis. 2016. *Life in the Tomb*. (Greek Version.) Athens: Estia.
- Nafziger, George E., and Mark W. Walton. 2003. *Islam at War: A History*. Connecticut: Praeger.
- Paddock, Roy, and Elli Lemonidou. 2014. *World War I and Propaganda*. Leiden: Brill.
- Smith, Michael Llewellyn. 2016. *Ionian Vision: Greece in Asia Minor, 1919–1922*. London: Hurst & Company.
- Sotiriou, Dido. 1962. *Bloody Earth*. (Greek Version.) Athens: Kedros.
- Sotiriou, Dido. 1979. *The Dead Are Waiting*. (Greek Version.) Athens: Kedros.
- Stavridis, Stavros Terry. 1996. 'Greek-Cypriot Enosis of October 1915: "A Lost Opportunity?"' *Balkan Studies* 37(2): 289–307.
- Thomopoulos, Ellaine. 2012. *The History of Greece*. California: Greenwood Press.
- Venezis, Elias. 2006. *Aiolian Land*. (Greek Version.) Athens: Estia.
- Venezis, Elias. 1974. *Ave Asia Minor*. (Greek Version.) Athens: Estia.
- Venezis, Elias. 2011. *Number 31328*. (Greek Version.) Athens: Estia.
- Venezis, Elias. 2010. *Tranquility*. (Greek Version.) Athens: Estia.