

Anglophiles in Balkan Christian States (1862–1920)*

Abstract: The life stories of five Balkan Anglophiles emerging in the nineteenth century — two Serbs, Vladimir Jovanović (Yovanovich) and Čedomilj Mijatović (Chedomille Mijatovich); two Greeks, Ioannes (John) Gennadios and Eleutherios Venizelos; and one Bulgarian, Ivan Evstratiev Geshov — reflect, each in its own way, major episodes in relations between Britain and three Balkan Christian states (Serbia, the Hellenic Kingdom and Bulgaria) between the 1860s and 1920. Their education, cultural patterns, relations and models inspired by Britain are looked at, showing that they acted as intermediaries between British culture and their own and played a part in the best and worst moments in the history of mutual relations, such as the Serbian-Ottoman crisis of 1862, the Anglo-Hellenic crisis following the Dilessi murders, Bulgarian atrocities and the Eastern Crisis, unification of Bulgaria and the Serbo-Bulgarian War of 1885, the Balkan Wars 1912–13, the National Schism in Greece. Their biographies are therefore essential for understanding Anglo-Balkan relations in the period under study. The roles of two British Balkanophiles (a Bulgarophile, James David Bouchier, and a Hellenophile, Ronald Burrows) are looked at as well. In conclusion, a comparison of the Balkan Anglophiles is offered, and their Britain-inspired cultural and institutional legacy to their countries is shown in the form of a table.

Keywords: Anglo-Balkan relations, Balkan Anglophiles, Balkans, Serbia, Hellenic Kingdom, Bulgaria, British Balkanophiles

According to the *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*, the word Anglophilia first appeared in 1896 meaning “unusual admiration or partiality for England, English ways, or things English”. The *Oxford English Dictionary* traces the word “Anglophile” back to 1867 and defines it as a person “friendly to England or what is English”.¹ Yet another and much older word with very similar meaning appeared in 1787 — Anglomania.² Anglophiles in the title of this paper therefore refer to those rare Balkan Christians (Greeks, Serbs and Bulgarians) who demonstrated this “unusual admira-

* A version of this paper was presented under the same title at a seminar of Prof. Robert Evans at Oriel College of the University of Oxford, on 10 June 2008. I would like to thank the Hellenic Observatory of the London School of Economics for its grant in 2010 that has helped me to expand the original paper. I am also very much indebted to Dr. Eric Beckett Weaver for his valuable suggestions and proofreading of the original text, and to the staff of the Gennadius Library, who could not have been more helpful.

¹ *The Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), vol. I, 467.

² *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* (Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster Inc., 2001), 45.

tion” for England and Britain. Two of the five Balkan Anglophiles covered in this text are Serbs: Vladimir Jovanović (Yovanovich) and Čedomilj Mijatović (Chedomille Miyatovich), two are Greeks: Ioannes Gennadius and Eleutherios Venizelos, and one is Bulgarian: Ivan Evstratiev Geshov. Four of them were ministers, two were prime ministers, two were presidents of their national academies, and two were ministers plenipotentiary to the Court of St. James’s.

There are several instances showing a British influence on Balkan Christians in the first half of the nineteenth century. There was an English party in Greece even during the Greek War of Independence, and it continued to exist throughout the reign of the first modern king of the Hellenes, Otto. In Serbia, the first British consul was able to induce a despotic Serbian ruler, Prince Miloš, to adopt a pro-British foreign policy as early as 1837, although it came to an end with the Prince’s abdication in 1839. Yet, rather than being instances of Anglophilia, these are instances of overlap of interests between some Balkan Christian notables and British foreign policy priorities.

For Anglophilia something more was needed — a congruity with British cultural patterns. It is not surprising then that real Balkan Anglophiles did not appear until the second half of the nineteenth century, when young men from the Balkans were given the opportunity to pursue their studies at British universities, or became acquainted with Britain through trade or through marriage with a British woman.

Anglophilia was also encouraged by British interest in Balkan Christians aroused at two separate periods of the nineteenth century. Initially focused on Greeks, later it shifted to South Slavs, Bulgarians in particular.

The emergence of independent Balkan Christian countries between 1804, when the First Serbian Uprising broke out, and the Balkan Wars of 1912–13, when the emancipation of Balkan Christians from the Ottoman Empire was completed, elicited different, even opposing, responses in Britain at different periods.

A historical look at British public opinion suggests that four distinctive periods may be identified:

- 1) Period of classical affection (late 1700s to 1832)
- 2) Period of sporadic interest (1832–76)
- 3) Period of Christian affection (1876–1914)
- 4) Period of British war interests (1914–18)

In the period of classical affection Greece was included in the English Grand Tour as a must-see stop, especially after the conquest in 1796 of the Italian lands by Napoleonic France. It had all begun in 1764 when the Society of Dilettanti, established thirty years earlier, mostly for the purpose of visiting Italy, sent an archaeological team to Greece which safely returned

two years later; but the real interest in travelling to the Ottoman Empire to visit Greece came with the gentlemen travellers of the late eighteenth century, the Levant lunatics as Byron called them, who used to set off from England with Pausanias' *Itinerary of Greece* in hand.³ Other Balkan Christians received considerably less interest from the British public. The First Serbian Uprising, for instance, went almost unnoticed even though it lasted nine years (1804–13). By contrast, the Greek War of Independence aroused a storm of support for the Hellenic cause among Western publics, and even inspired some 1,100 foreign volunteers to join the insurgents. More than a hundred of them were Britons, at least twenty-one of whom lost their lives.⁴

After the war, however, the installation in 1832 of a Catholic Bavarian dynasty in Greece and the domination of a French party in Athens contributed to the emergence in Britain of negative perceptions of modern Greeks. The main objection was the lack, from the Western point of view, of any substantial “progress”, i.e. modernisation of the Hellenic kingdom. Characteristic in this respect is the pamphlet of an MP, Alexander Baillie Cochrane. In 1847 Cochrane believes that Greece “cannot flourish under a cold and withering despotism, where great crime is the sure means of obtaining great place, and merit is supplanted by audacity” and, republishing the text fifteen years later (1862), observes that “the condition of the country has very little improved”.⁵

What happened with the British perceptions of Balkan Christians in this second period was amply summarised by George Macaulay Trevelyan:

During the fifty years between Canning's liberation of Greece and Gladstone's campaign of the Bulgarian atrocities the English people ceased to sympathize with national struggles for liberty against the Turks. [...]

The very name of Hellas, like that of Italy in the next generation, had a strange power to move our apparently unemotional grandfathers. But when once the heirs of Athens had been freed, Serb, Bulgar, and Armenian appealed in vain for British sympathy, though the cause was the same of delivering ancient races long submerged under the stagnant water of Turkish misrule. The classical and literary education that then moulded and inspired the English mind had power to make men sympathize with Greece and Italy, more even

³ Hugh Tregaskis, *Beyond the Grand Tour. The Levant Lunatics* (London: Ascent Books, 1979), 1–9.

⁴ William St. Clair, *That Greece Might Still Be Free. The Philhellenes in the War of Independence* (London: OUP, 1972), 355–356.

⁵ Alexander Baillie Cochrane, M.P., *The Kingdom of Greece* (London: Harrison, 1862), iii and 29.

than Christianity had power to make them sympathize with the Balkan Christians.⁶

The third period was very much the work of a single Briton — William Ewart Gladstone — and it was initiated during the Eastern Crisis (1875–78). At first, the British Conservative government of Benjamin Disraeli (prime minister 1874–80) was not too concerned about the crisis. Only after atrocities against Christians had been committed in Bulgaria (1876) did it become an object of bitter debate in Britain. The *Daily News*, a newspaper loyal to Gladstone, the former prime minister (1868–74), published an article revealing horrible details about children massacred, women violated, and young girls sold into slavery. On 6 September 1876, Gladstone published his illustrious pamphlet *Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East*, which caused uproar in Britain and reached a circulation of 200,000 copies by the end of the month. That impressed neither Disraeli nor Queen and Empress Victoria who tersely stated her views on the Eastern Question in April 1877:

It is not the question of upholding Turkey: it is the question of Russian or British supremacy in the world.⁷

During the wars of Russia and Serbia against Turkey in 1877 and 1878 the anti-Turkish campaign reached its climax. Speaking of the importance of this issue R. W. Seton-Watson concluded:

The issue between Turk and Russian became a predominant issue, and for the time suspended personal intercourse between the warring factions and even divided families among themselves.⁸

Gladstone's sympathies for the Balkan Christians were at their peak in November 1879 and March 1880, during the famous Midlothian campaign which denounced Tory policies, and not only as regards the Ottoman Empire but also as regards their imperial designs. In a speech delivered 29 November 1879 in Edinburgh before an audience of 20,000, Gladstone advocated independence for all Balkan states, which should pass "to those who have inhabited them for many long centuries; to those who have reared them to a state of civilisation when the great calamity of Ottoman conquest spread like a wild wave over that portion of the earth, and buried that civilisation", and expressed his satisfaction with the fact that some Balkan Christian countries had already become independent: "Two million Ser-

⁶ G. M. Trevelyan, *British History in the Nineteenth Century and After: 1782–1919* (London: Penguin, 1968), 216.

⁷ R. W. Seton-Watson, *Disraeli, Gladstone and the Eastern Question. A study in diplomacy and party politics* (New York: The Norton Library, 1972), 171.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 175.

vians, once political slaves, are now absolutely free. Three hundred thousand heroes such as Christendom cannot match — the men of Montenegro — who for four hundred years have held the sword in hand, and have never submitted to the insolence of despotic power — these men have at last achieved not only their freedom, but the acknowledgement of their freedom, and take their place among the States of Europe.”

The Midlothian campaign made Gladstone the most popular Briton among both the Balkan Slavs and Greeks, and the British public became so sensitive to any incident against the Christians in the Ottoman Empire that the Foreign Office had to take the region into consideration. Those who supported Balkan Christians in this period — Gladstone and the Liberal Party, the Church of England, especially the High Church, and those journalists and MPs who openly sympathised with the cause of the Balkan Christians — became idols of Balkan Anglophiles.

Finally, during the Great War the period of British war interests began. Once it became clear that the war would not end quickly, it became vital to find allies among Balkan Christians. There was a widespread naïve belief in Britain that both Greece and Bulgaria owed their independence to Britain, and that therefore neither country would have any doubt as to which warring side to join. To Britain’s visible disappointment, however, Bulgaria joined the Central Powers (October 1915) and Greece remained neutral.

A. Anglophiles in Serbia

Anglophiles appeared in Serbia during the second period, the one marked by lack of British interest in the Balkans. The first prominent Anglophile was **Vladimir Jovanović** (1833–1922), a liberal politician and economist.⁹ His son Slobodan, prime minister of the royal Yugoslav government in exile in London during the Second World War who died in exile in London, observed that his father “was one of our earliest exponents of Anglomania among the Liberals. That which Čedomilj Mijatović was later to be among the Progressivists and Stojan Protić among the Radicals”.¹⁰ Thus each of the three leading political parties in nineteenth-century Serbia had an Anglophile. Vladimir’s father, a bankrupt furrier, had moved from the then Austrian province of Srem to the autonomous Principality of Serbia. In 1850, Vladimir Jovanović enrolled at the Philosophy Department of the Belgrade Lyceum, predecessor of Belgrade University. An excellent but needy stu-

⁹ In all his works in English Vladimir Jovanović spelled his surname as “Yovanovitch”.

¹⁰ Slobodan Jovanović, “Vladimir Jovanović”, vol. 11 of *Collected Works* (Belgrade 1991), 113.

dent, he was eager to obtain a state scholarship to continue his education abroad. Not in a position to choose, he accepted in 1853 to study agriculture in Hungary and later at Hohenheim, Germany, where he completed his academic education in 1855.

By 1857 he had already become known for his liberal economic ideas and his advocacy of the modernisation of Serbia's economy. In 1858 political factions emerged for the first time in the Principality of Serbia. Jovanović joined the liberal faction led by two former Parisian students, Jevrem Grujić and Milovan Janković. Their efforts in 1858–60 to introduce liberal laws, even a liberal constitution, failed. However brief, it was the first period in modern Serbian history that a liberal political group played a major political role. This experiment forced Jovanović into a brief exile in May 1860,¹¹ during which he visited London and Brussels. Upon his return to Serbia, he launched, together with two other young liberals, an opposition newspaper, *Narodna Skupština* (National Assembly), which was soon banned by the new Prince, Michael Obrenovich (1860–68), who chose to rule in the style of enlightened absolutism.

Both his theoretical inclinations and practical policies were chiefly inspired, at least from 1860 on, by British ideals. Hebert Spencer was his favourite philosopher, John Stuart Mill, the greatest political thinker, and William Gladstone, the greatest statesman.¹² Ten years after the publication of Mill's *On Liberty* (1859), Jovanović, inspired by the idea of liberty which he mostly embraced through Mill, even invented a name for his newly-born son: Slobodan (meaning "free"). It was during his second exile from Serbia. His younger child, a daughter, was also given an unusual name: Pravda ("justice"). In 1876 he published a translation of Mills's *On Representative Government*. He also began the publication of the first *Political Dictionary* in Serbian, with a clear liberal inclination. Four volumes published in 1870–73 covered about one-fifth of the planned contents. The rest has never been published.

When, in June 1862, the city of Belgrade was shelled from its Ottoman-garrisoned fortress, animosities between Serbia and Turkey escalated and, in July 1862, a conference of the Great Powers on the Serbian question commenced in Constantinople, where Henry Bulwer, British ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, defended Ottoman interests quite fervently. That was an unhappy moment for Serbia's Liberals, and they urged Jovanović to go to Britain to defend the cause of Serbia and other Orthodox Christian nations. Jovanović intimately believed that a free country like England could not but

¹¹ For more detail on the activity of this faction see Gale Stokes, *Legitimacy through Liberalism* (Seattle and London: Univ. of Washington Press, 1975), 18–32.

¹² Jovanović, "Vladimir Jovanović", 113.

sympathise with a freedom-seeking nation, but the reality was different: the Foreign Office, concerned about the consequences of the possible disintegration of the Ottoman Empire, took an explicitly anti-Serbian position on Prince Michael's plan to have the Ottoman garrisons withdrawn from Serbia. Thus, in September 1862, Jovanović went to the cradle of liberalism to try to convince British opinion-makers that Serbia was worthy of British support. He arrived in London in November and soon was asked to coordinate his effort with Serbian senator Filip Hristić, and Princess Julia, wife of Prince Michael, who came to London in February 1863 to promote the Serbian cause.

It was a time when a number of distinguished Britons became interested in Serbia and voiced their support for her, notably Richard Cobden (1804–1865), the famous British “apostle of free trade” and MP, an Irish MP, Sir William Henry Gregory, the priest William Denton (1815–1888), and Dr. Humphrey Sandwith (1822–1881). It was them who created what may be termed the first Serbian lobby in Britain.

In London Jovanović met Gladstone, after being recommended to him by Giuseppe Mazzini, but was not able to win him over for the Serbian cause. Gladstone, chancellor of the Exchequer at the time, showed sympathies for the Orthodox Christian population in the Ottoman-held Balkans, but warned Jovanović that he was obliged to pursue the policy of “European power balance” and status quo regarding the Eastern Question. He advised against Serbia's doing anything officially, but suggested that she could use unofficial ways to support Serbs, and insisted that Serbs and Greeks should make an alliance. Even so, Gladstone left a lasting impression on Jovanović. Jovanović had yet another important meeting, with Archibald Campbell Tait (1811–1882), bishop of London (1856–68), subsequent archbishop of Canterbury.

While in London, Jovanović published a pamphlet, *The Serbian Nation and the Eastern Question*,¹³ which was positively commented on in the Liberal press and in the Church of England's publications, but negatively in the Conservative press.¹⁴ The pamphlet's obvious intention was to elicit Liberal sympathies for Serbia. Jovanović applied the Whig interpretation

¹³ Vladimir Yovanovitch, *The Serbian Nation and the Eastern Question* (London: Bell and Daldy, 1863). Just a few months earlier, the same publishing house issued two other books on Serbia: Rev. W. Denton's *Servia and the Servians*, and *The Case of Servia* by a Serb. It is interesting to note that in the very title of his booklet Jovanović used the adjective “Serbian” while the generally accepted English spelling until 1914 was “Servian”, with a “v”. To him as a Liberal even a spelling which could associate the Serbs with Latin *servi*, or English servitude, was completely unacceptable.

¹⁴ A very negative review appeared in *The Saturday Review* and was reprinted in *Glasgow Herald*, 11 April 1863.

of English history to the case of Serbs, the idea being “to demonstrate the ability of the Serbian nation for an intimate union with its liberal brethren, by proofs drawn from history, and from the political life of the Serbian people”.¹⁵ He sketched Serbian history from the seventh century on, emphasising repeatedly the distinctly Serbian institutions of self-government, which had been replaced by the Byzantine system, which in turn facilitated the Ottoman conquest of Serbia. But, even under Ottoman rule “nothing could destroy the Serbian spirit of freedom”.¹⁶ Jovanović offered a detailed account of Serbia’s nineteenth-century struggle for independence and then posed the central question:

It has been often said that the Christian races in the East have no claim to the considerations of the Western States. We would ask the leaders of English foreign policy why they are thus always opposed to the emancipation of the Eastern Christians from the Turkish yoke?¹⁷

He appealed to the English sense of morality:

Still less can such a policy be morally justifiable which forces the Eastern Christians to bear a yoke which the English would suffer anything rather than submit to, in their own case...¹⁸

In ideological terms, the book was meant to demonstrate to both the British and Serbian publics that Serbian institutions were *ab origine* liberal.¹⁹

Jovanović posed his question in March 1863, and a clear reply came only two months later, in the leader of *The Times* commenting on Gregory’s condemnation of Turkish tyranny. It admits that the Turkish administration “has always been, feeble, capricious, and corrupt” in every region under its control, and concludes that the inevitable withdrawal of Ottoman garrisons from Serbia is just a matter of time. Yet, the future of the rest of Turkey-in-Europe is seen as “dark, and we must admit, with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that, though the Turks have been as bad masters as ever ruined a country, and though they are not likely to be reformed, yet there is little use in declaiming against them, since we cannot turn them out, or even for the present find a substitute for them.”²⁰

¹⁵ Yovanovitch, *Serbian Nation*, 3.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 9.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 27–28.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 31–32.

¹⁹ For Jovanović’s ideological interpretation in his book see Branko Bešlin, *Evropski uticaji na srpski liberalizam u XIX veku* [European Influences on Serbian Liberalism in the 19th Century] (Novi Sad 2005), 496–499.

²⁰ *The Times*, 30 May 1863, p. 11C.

This first co-ordinated effort of Serbia to influence British public opinion had some success since it promoted the Serbian cause in relevant sections of the public. It was obvious from Jovanović's visit to Britain that the Orthodox Christians in the Balkans could rely on two elements to promote their cause: individual liberal politicians and the Church of England. In British Parliament, Cobden spoke in support of Hristić and Jovanović, describing them as "the Serbian gentlemen, persons of eminence in their own country", but the Turcophile under-secretary for foreign affairs, Sir Austen Henry Layard, termed them "the clever and specious gentlemen".²¹

Jovanović's stay in England definitely strengthened his affection for the British system of government. A year after he returned to Belgrade he gave a lecture on the national economy at Belgrade's Great School: "Let us take a look at England whose name is so famed. Fortunate circumstances have made her a country where general progress of humanity has been achieved in the best way. There is no known truth or science that has not enriched popular consciousness in England... In a word, all conditions for progress that are known today are there in England."²²

A few years later, seeking to inspire the English-speaking world's solidarity with the project of the emancipation of Serbs and other South Slavs from the rule of the Ottoman Empire and Austria-Hungary, he published a book in English in Geneva, ending it with an appeal:

We conclude with the hope that the liberal States of Europe and the New World will compete with one another to give moral encouragement and support to the Serbs in accomplishing their double duty towards themselves as a nation and towards the other neighbouring and suffering nations.²³

Jovanović remained an Anglophile even later. He believed that the introduction in Serbia of the British parliamentary system of the Victorian era would be a perfect way to limit the power of the ruler, but he does not seem to have fully realised the significance of the considerable difference in social structure between Serbia and Britain. Some aspects of parliamentarianism were indeed incorporated into the Serbian Constitution of 1869, but it was much more conservative than the Serbian liberals had hoped for.

²¹ Stokes, *Legitimacy through Liberalism*, 55 (Hansard, 171:125, 43).

²² Vladimir Jovanović, *Za slobodu i narod pokušaji* [Endeavours for Freedom and the People] (Novi Sad 1868), 11–12.

²³ Vladimir Yovanovitch, *The Emancipation and Unity of the Serbian Nation* (Geneva 1871), 178. This book did not go unnoticed in England, and received at least one positive review: "The Servian Nationalities", *The Examiner*, 21 July 1871, and a sympathetic comment appeared in *The Northern Eco*, 17 July 1876, during the Bulgarian atrocities affair.

Jovanović was soon able to put his views into practice, since he was three times finance minister of Serbia. In that capacity he was in charge of the Serbian economy during Serbia's wars with Turkey in 1876/7 and 1877/8. He was probably aware of the huge gap between the national ideals of the Serbian people as he saw them and the limitations imposed by practical politics. His third term as finance minister was his last position of political prominence. Yet, he did not forget his affection for England and, after the Annexation Crisis of 1908/9, he appeared in London with two more texts warning of the "pan-German peril" and advocating a Balkan confederacy respectively.²⁴

It was not Jovanović, however, but his political opponent **Čedomilj Mijatović** (1842–1932) who left the deepest mark on Anglo-Serbian cultural and diplomatic relations. Mijatović (Chedomille Mijatovich, also spelled Miyatovich, Mijatovitch, Miyatovi/t/ch, Mijatovics) occupies an important place in Serbian history in many ways.

Mijatović was a European-trained intellectual, a person who enjoyed high esteem and achieved important accomplishments. He was six times finance minister and twice foreign minister of the Principality (and Kingdom) of Serbia, a diplomat of great experience, minister of the Kingdom of Serbia in London, Bucharest and Constantinople, and one of the leaders of the Progressive Party in the 1880s. This covers only his career as a politician and a high-ranking government official. In the field of culture, he was one of the most popular writers of his times in Serbia, a Serbian Sir Walter Scott as it were. He was a distinguished historian, a successful intermediary between Serbian and British cultures, the first London correspondent for a Serbian newspaper, a prominent translator from English into Serbian, a leading economic and financial expert, and a well-known spiritualist. He was the second president of the Royal Serbian Academy, and an honorary member of the Royal Historical Society in London.

His Anglophilia was largely inspired by his marriage in 1864 to an English lady, Elodie Lawton (1825–1908). Before coming to Serbia she had been very active in the abolitionist movement in Boston. In 1872 she published, in London, *The History of Modern Serbia* and thus became the first woman historian in Serbia.²⁵

²⁴ Vladimir Yovanovitch, *The Near Eastern Problem and the Pan-German Peril* (London: Watts and Co., 1909); and "The Balkan Confederacy", *The Near East*, vol. 2, no. 21, 5 January 1910.

²⁵ Elodie Lawton Mijatovics, *The History of Modern Serbia* (London: William Tweedie, 1872). She also published *Serbian Folk-lore, popular tales selected and translated by Madam Csedomille Mijatovics* (London: W. Isbister & Co., 1874); *Kossovo: an Attempt to Bring Serbian National Songs, about the Fall of the Serbian Empire at the Battle of Kosovo, into one Poem* (London: W. Isbister, 1881).

In 1881, Mijatović, in his capacity as Serbia's foreign minister, signed a secret convention with Austria-Hungary. It provided Serbia with Austro-Hungarian diplomatic backing, but she had to sacrifice her independent foreign policy to Austria-Hungary in return. In Serbia Mijatović was mostly remembered for this convention which his political opponents regarded as an act of treason.

Although he advocated close relations with Austria-Hungary in foreign policy, in cultural matters he was an obvious Anglophile and his favourite post therefore was not that of a Serbian cabinet minister, but rather that of Serbia's diplomatic minister in London. The Serbian Legation was established in London after Serbia had become a kingdom in 1882, and Filip Hristić, who had participated in the first Serbian mission to London in 1863, was appointed Serbia's first minister to the Court of St. James's in 1883. Mijatović was his successor, and he served three terms (1884–86; 1895–1900 and 1902–03). What his cultural aspirations and his social life were while serving as a diplomat in London can be seen from a vivid portrayal in a contemporary London newspaper:

Like many other educated foreigners — superior to little prejudices, and capable of discerning strength of character under insularity of manner — M. Mijatovich is a hearty admirer of England and English ways. His leisure time is devoted, with restless energy, to English literature, and, before the present crisis, he was constantly to be found at the British Museum.²⁶

In 1889, after his Progressive Party was subjected to persecutions by political opponents, he left Serbia and spent almost all the remaining years of his life in England.

He was the most prolific and most influential Serbian translator from English in the nineteenth century. The bibliography of his translations comprises about a dozen titles, most of them dealing with religious topics, notably the sermons of well-known British preachers such as Dr. Spurgeon, Canon Liddon and Dr. Macduff. He also translated Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* and Dr. Brown's *Commentaries to the Gospels*. Particularly influential in Serbia were the following two titles: *Travels in the Slavonic Provinces of Turkey-in-Europe* by Lady Georgina Mary Muir Mackenzie and Adeline Paulina Irby (English edition in 1867, Serbian translation: Belgrade 1868, commissioned by Prince Michael Obrenovich), and H. T. Buckle's *History of Civilisation in England* (English edition in 1857, Serbian translation: Belgrade 1871). While the former influenced the general public, the latter had a huge impact on the development of liberally-minded circles in Serbia. He was also the author or co-author of six books in English, four

²⁶ "Chat of the Gossips", *Penny Illustrated Paper*, 5 December 1885.

of them dealing with Serbia.²⁷ Mijatović was the first Serb to contribute to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. His first entries were published in the Tenth Edition, and the famous Eleventh Edition (1911) brought his lengthy article on Serbia, later republished in a special book. In the years round the Balkan Wars he became an unavoidable source of information on Serbia for interested persons in Britain.

J. D. Bouchier, a correspondent for *The Times*, remarked that “he is generally regarded by his fellow-countrymen as the most learned man in Servia”. Journalist William Thomas Stead, who met him during the Peace Conference in The Hague, was utterly enchanted:

It was almost worth while creating the Kingdom Serbia if only in order to qualify Chedomille Miyatovitch for a seat in the Parliament of the Nations.²⁸

In 1903, Stead once again expressed his high opinion of Miyatovich as a diplomat: “He is far and away the best known, the most distinguished, and the most respected diplomatist the Balkan Peninsula has yet produced.”²⁹ The leading British daily *The Times* covered almost every step Mijatović took during the 1880s, especially through its Vienna correspondents. Never before had any Serbian minister or any Serb at all enjoyed such sympathies from *The Times* as Mijatović did in the 1880s and 1890s. When he resigned as president of the Serbian Royal Academy, the newspaper commented:

Of all the statesmen in Servia, M. Mijatovitch is probably the one who holds the highest character in foreign countries. He has filled the principal offices in Servia, not only those which are the rewards of party services, by those which are conferred by public consent, if not by public acclamation, on men whose abilities are not judged by mere party conflicts.³⁰

Like the other Balkan Anglophiles discussed in this paper, Mijatović was caught up in crisis situations which caused strain between their native countries and Britain. In his case, these were the Serbo-Bulgarian War and the May Coup. The peak of his activities in Britain during the 1880s and 90s

²⁷ Chedomille Mijatovich, *A Royal Tragedy. Being the Story of the Assassination of King Alexander and Queen Draga of Servia* (London: Eveleigh Nash, 1906); Chedo Mijatovich, *Servia and the Servians* (London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, 1908); Sir Donald Mackenzie Wallace, Prince Kropotkin, C. Mijatovich and J. D. Bouchier, *A Short History of Russia and the Balkan States* (London: The Encyclopaedia Britannica Company, 1914); Count Chedomille Mijatovich, *The Memoirs of a Balkan Diplomatist* (London: Cassel and Co., 1917).

²⁸ *The Review of Reviews*, vol. XIX (1899).

²⁹ *The Review of Reviews*, vol. XXVIII (1903).

³⁰ *The Times*, 12 Nov. 1889, p. 5.

took place in the period of British sympathies for Balkan Christians, which, however, were directed to Bulgaria rather than to Serbia. Apart from Arthur Evans, Serbia could not boast having influential supporters in the Isles in the 1880s, certainly no one as influential as Gladstone. So the worst thing that could happen to Mijatović's diplomatic efforts was to have the Serbs perceived as a barrier to Bulgarian emancipation. And that was exactly what happened in 1885.

Sympathies for the Bulgarians, kindled several years earlier by the Midlothian campaign, were still very much alive, and the Serbian attack on Bulgaria elicited widespread condemnation in Britain. Mijatović, Serbian minister to the Court of St. James's at the time, was appointed the sole Serbian negotiator in peace talks with Bulgaria in late 1885. *The Times* covered almost every step he made from the moment he left London in early January 1886 until the peace treaty was signed in Bucharest.

Instructions that Mijatović had received from King Milan in Belgrade were phrased in such a way as to allow him to find an excuse for declaring a new war on Bulgaria. Mijatović, however, aware of the bad impression Serbia had already made in Britain, was not willing to risk further deterioration of Serbia's position, and took a conciliatory approach instead. That it did not go unnoticed in Bucharest can be seen from *The Times* of 25 February: "Although M. Mijatovics in point of conciliatory disposition is thought to be somewhat in advance of his Government, it is believed that he will carry his policy."³¹

Mijatović negotiated peace terms with the Bulgarian representative Ivan Geshov, a leading Bulgarian Anglophile, whom he did not fail to mention in his *Memories*: "It was then the season for balls, social gatherings and entertainments. Bulgaria's delegate Ivan Geshov, and myself, cherishing admiration for the British people and their ways, entered at once into friendly relations."³² At one point during the negotiations, however, Geshov demanded compensation of twenty-five million leva from Serbia.³³ Mijatović had clear instructions from Belgrade to declare war should Bulgaria demand any compensation. Having warned Geshov that he would leave the conference immediately and that the war would soon be resumed, he got up and walked towards the door. The appeals of Medjid Pasha, chairman of the peace conference, brought Mijatović back to the table and he accepted the withdrawal of the Bulgarian demand as if it had never been

³¹ "The Eastern Crisis", *The Times*, 25 Feb. 1886, p. 5 a.

³² Mijatovich, *The Memoirs of a Balkan Diplomatist* (London, New York, Toronto and Melbourne: Cassel and Company, 1917), 62.

³³ Ivan Evstratiev Geshov, *Spomeni i studii* [Memories and Studies] (Sofia: P. Glukovu, 1928), 170–171.

made. Seconds before accepting it, he “remembered that that very morning the British chargé d’affaires, Mr. Francis Sanderson, told me he had had a letter from his brother Sir Thomas who sent his remembrances to me, adding that they all hoped I would succeed in making peace.”³⁴ Eventually, on 3 March 1886, the two Anglophiles concluded a peace treaty, one of the tersest in diplomatic history, as it contained a single article. This accomplishment of Mijatović’s was not forgotten in his lifetime. His obituary in the *New York Times* had the following title: “Count Miyatovitch, Serb diplomat dies: wrote ‘World’s Shortest Peace Treaty’ in 1886.”³⁵ Years later, Mijatović avowed:

In 1886 I, as Serbia’s delegate, and M. Ivan Gueshov, as Bulgaria’s delegate, signed the peace between Serbia and Bulgaria, that extraordinary and unique document in the diplomatic history of the world, consisting of only one article: ‘Peace is re-established!’ — of which phrase the true meaning was: ‘I hate you!’ Both M. Gueshov and I were sufficiently imbued with English notions of decency, and therefore, when signing the peace, we did not shake our fists menacingly in each other’s faces; but our nations did it behind our backs.³⁶

Another international peace conference attended by Mijatović was the first Hague conference, held from May to July 1899. It was during the conference that he and W. T. Stead befriended. Stead was fascinated by the Serbian diplomat: “Among the representatives of the minor States M. Miyatovitch of Servia stands conspicuous as the most fervent European of them all ... He is not merely a good European. He is a Cosmopolitan.” What particularly impressed Stead was Mijatović’s proposal that participants from Asia should be allowed to share in vice-presidencies of the sections. His proposal was rejected, but Stead did not fail to observe that “it was not for victory but for principle that the Servian delegate took his stand”.³⁷ There, as in Bucharest, Mijatović promoted some of his own pacifist ideas and was in favour of obligatory arbitration in certain international disputes. However, another member of the Serbian delegation, Prof. Veljković, took a much more cautious stand, and both the Serbian prime minister and the King were closer to his than to Mijatović’s position.³⁸ Anyway, Mijatović’s personal commit-

³⁴ Mijatovich, *Memoirs*, 65.

³⁵ *The New York Times*, 15 May 1932, p. N5.

³⁶ Cheddo Miyatovitch, “Serbia’s True Case. Interests of the Allies”, *Daily Telegraph*, 13 Nov. 1915.

³⁷ William T. Stead, “Character Sketches: Members of the Parliament of Peace”, *The Review of Reviews* (June 1899), 533.

³⁸ Slobodan G. Marković, *Grof Čedomilj Mijatović. Viktorijanac medju Srbima* [Count Chedomille Miyatovich. A Victorian among Serbs] (Belgrade: Belgrade Law School

ment at the Conference did not go unnoticed, and four years later Stead recollected that “no delegate from any of the minor, or indeed of the major, States contributed more to secure the success of the Conference outside the walls of the House in the Wood.”³⁹

The greatest strain on relations between Serbia and Britain was put by the 1903 May Coup. In the early morning of 11 June 1903 a conspiracy of Serbian army officers murdered the royal couple, self-willed King Alexander Obrenovich and his unpopular wife Queen Draga, and threw their bodies out of a window. The new government, composed of regicides, appointed Peter Karageorgevich as Serbia’s new ruler. Britain and the Netherlands broke off diplomatic relations with Serbia. Mijatović was Serbia’s representative accredited to both countries. Appalled by the events in Belgrade, he decided to stay in London and was the only Serbian diplomat who resigned (22 June) in protest at the regicide, the act he was never forgiven for by some influential political circles in Belgrade.

What the British official and public reaction was may be inferred from the reactions that he met with in London before and after his resignation. He received threatening letters and faced widespread outrage at Serbia. His successor’s daughter, Lena Yovichich, who wrote a biography of her father, described the obstacles that Mijatović and her father, Alexander Yovichich, faced in London:

Since the news of the Obrenovitch tragedy had been received, he [Miyatovich] met with the cold shoulder wherever he went. Official doors were suddenly closed, and the circumstances of the murder put a strain even on personal friendship... To mention Serbia was enough to raise a wall of prejudice; English people could have no association with a race who had murdered their King. Every one of Serbian decent must be made to feel responsible for that terrible deed. They were beyond the pale of a Society whose principles were irreproachable; with the best of intentions Englishmen never lost an opportunity to proclaim the fact that moral feelings were very high in their country, that what had happened in Serbia could not be condoned and must be expiated by the entire nation.⁴⁰

The regicide made a strong impact on the Mijatovićs in more than one way. Being devout Christians, both he and his wife, a Wesleyan, were deeply shocked and shared British contempt for the regicides. Mijatović did con-

and Dosije, 2006), 220–222.

³⁹ W. T. Stead, “A Clairvoyant Vision of the Assassination at Belgrade,” *The Review of Reviews* XXVIII (July 1903), 31; The Hague Conference was held at the palace of Queen Wilhelmina known as Huis ten Bosch, meaning “the house in the wood”.

⁴⁰ Lena A. Yovitchitch, *The Biography of a Serbian Diplomat* (London: The Epworth Press, 1939), 190–191.

demn the regicide in his writings, but deep down he was tormented by a dilemma. As a Christian, pacifist and British-styled cosmopolitan, he believed that punishment of the regicides was a necessary prerequisite for Serbia's moral recovery. As a Serb, he was acutely aware that the severance of diplomatic relations with the largest and most powerful global empire would only harm Serbia. As in the case of other Balkan Anglophiles, cosmopolitanism and liberal nationalism inevitably contradicted one another. So he made a compromise. He decided to advocate the reestablishment of diplomatic relations following the punishment of at least some of the regicides.

In December 1908 his wife Elodie died. The same year he published the most popular of his books in English, *Servia and the Servians*, which saw three British and three American editions.⁴¹ After 1903 his reputation in Serbia suffered greatly as a result of the unfounded rumours about his being implicated in a conspiracy to bring Prince Arthur of Connaught, beloved son of Queen Victoria, to the throne of Serbia. In 1911, however, he met King Peter in Paris, and thenceforth was fully reconciled with the new regime in Serbia. It is not surprising then that he was considered as being an unofficial member of the Serbian delegation during the London Conference in December 1912.

Not even after his reconciliation with the new dynasty was the distrust of him fully overcome in Serbia; by contrast, his resignation boosted his reputation in Britain, as may be seen from the review of his book published in the highly reputable *Athenaeum* in 1908:

It may be remembered that he threw up his appointment rather than appear to accept the circumstances of horror in which a reign not regarded by him with favour was brought to a close. His life has been wholly honourable, and, however fierce may be the internal conflicts among the Slavonic parties of the Balkan Peninsula, all acknowledge the high character and the competence of Mr. Mijatovich.⁴²

As a diligent contributor to the leading religious journal in Serbia, *Hrišćanski vesnik* (Christian Herald), and translator of influential religious writings from English, and having become a widower, he was being seen, in 1914, as a serious candidate for the office of archbishop of Skoplje, part of Serbia

⁴¹ Chedo Mijatovich, *Servia and the Servians* (London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, 1908); the 2nd British ed.: London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, 1911, and the 3rd: London, Bath, New York and Melbourne: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, 1915. American editions: Boston: L.C. Page & company, 1908; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913; New York: Scribner, 1914.

⁴² "The Balkans", *The Athenaeum*, no. 4202, 9 May 1908, p. 569.

from 1913. This position involved the prospects of becoming the first patriarch in the Kingdom of Serbia once the Serbian Church was re-elevated to the rank of patriarchate. At first enthusiastic about the offer, he even gave thought to possible reforms: “I thought I could combine the most attractive qualities of the Anglican bishops with the best attributes of the Roman Catholic bishops, and inspire the Serbian Orthodox Church with the true spirit of Christ.”⁴³ As his possible appointment threatened to create strong opposition from Serbian bishops, in the end he declined, and instead accepted the post of manager of the Serbian Commercial Agency in London.

Writing on various religious topics, Mijatović also addressed the question of union between the Church of England and Orthodox Churches. In reaction to a text of Oxford Professor Leighton Pullan (1865–1940), sympathetic towards the possibility of union, Mijatović stated that now that the question of union had been reopened, “it should not be abandoned until the final solution has been found”.⁴⁴

During the Balkan Wars and throughout the First World War he supported Serbia in various British journals, this time with more success than in any other period, since the two countries were allies in the Great War. In 1916 he campaigned for Serbia in the USA and Canada, in company with the famous British suffragette Emmeline Pankhurst, who became a dedicated supporter of Serbia’s aspirations. It was shortly after Mijatović returned from the tour that Anglo-Serbian relations saw one of their brightest moments. In June 1916, a Kosovo Committee headed by Robert William Seton-Watson commemorated Kosovo Day with the participation of the highest state and church officials and amidst a nationwide display of sympathies for Serbia.⁴⁵ Sadly for Mijatović, that was also a clear sign that a group of Serbian intellectuals who had come to Britain during the Great War had taken over key roles in Anglo-Serbian relations.

Mijatović’s cosmopolitanism was strengthened in London, as may be seen from a letter of 1912 to his friend, journalist Pera Todorović: “I am an old man indeed, but it seems that there have never been in my heart livelier and more generous sympathies not only for the interests and progress of our Serbia, but also for the interests and progress of the world. In London a man cannot but feel like ‘a citizen of the world’, cannot fail to see higher, broader

⁴³ Mijatovich, *Memoirs*, 150.

⁴⁴ Č. M., “Pitanje o sjedinjenju crkava” [The question of church union], *Hrišćanski vesnik* XXVI, no. 5 (May 1909), 321–330.

⁴⁵ On the celebration of Kosovo Day in Britain and the USA see Slobodan G. Markovich, “The Celebration of ‘Kosovo Day’”, *The South Slav Journal*, vol. 28, no. 1–2/107–108 (Spring–Summer 2007), 85–96.

and wider horizons.”⁴⁶ Such views led him to become a sincere advocate of a Balkan federation. In a letter to *The Times* in 1908 he expressed his hope and belief “that the Providence which shapes history is leading the Balkan nations towards the formation of the United States of the Balkans”,⁴⁷ and only two months later he anticipated a United States of Europe.⁴⁸ Mijatović lived in London until his death in 1932.

Apart from ten books he translated from English into Serbian, Mijatović was the author of some twenty economic, historical and fiction books in Serbian. Almost all of his writings reveal how deeply influenced by Britain he was. His fiction was undoubtedly inspired by the Gothic novel and Sir Walter Scot. His most popular and least scholarly work in economics, *On conditions for success*, a booklet on how to become a millionaire while remaining a moral person, was chiefly influenced by Samuel Smiles and Scottish Calvinism. His theological contributions were very much inspired by the sermons of Dr. Spurgeon and Canon Liddon. In politics he was also inspired by William Ewart Gladstone and Salisbury, and he wished to introduce the British style of budgetary debate in Serbia. Moreover, encouraged by William Stead, he showed interest in spiritism, quite fashionable in Victorian and Edwardian Britain. All this made Mijatović a lonely Victorian among nineteenth-century Serbs.⁴⁹

B. Hellenic Anglophiles

Of all the Balkan Christian countries the Hellenic Kingdom had the most extensive economic and cultural relations with Britain, and gratefully remembered the British philhellenes' contribution to its independence. After the War of Independence, however, their relations deteriorated and in the late 1840s fell to their lowest ebb. On the Orthodox Easter Sunday (4 April) of 1847, the Athenian house of the rich merchant Don David Pacifico (*ca* 1783–1854), a British subject of Jewish origin, was looted and his private papers stolen. After the repeated appeals for compensation that the British minister in Athens made on behalf of the Palmerston government failed to produce any result, the British prime minister, who felt personal dislike of King Otto and his rule, imposed a naval blockade on Athens between Janu-

⁴⁶ Belgrade, Archives of the Serbian Academy of Sciences, No. 9792/13, Č. Mijatović to P. Todorović, July 7th[20th] 1902.

⁴⁷ Chedo Mijatovich, “The New Era in Turkey”, *The Times*, 4 Aug. 1908, p. 6 f.

⁴⁸ Chedo Mijatovich, “The Agram Trial and the Servian Nation”, 4 Oct. 1908, p. 6 f.

⁴⁹ Cf. Slobodan G. Marković, “Čedomilj Mijatović: a Leading Serbian Anglophile”, *Balcanica XXXVIII* (2007), 105–132.

ary and early May of 1850.⁵⁰ On the other hand, it was Palmerston who, in 1864, did an unprecedented service to the Hellenic Kingdom by ceding, on Gladstone's advice, the Ionian Islands to Greece to mark the accession of the new king of Hellenes, George I. As Trevelyan observed: "Hellenic sympathies and Liberal principles were the motives of an action which has few analogies in history."⁵¹

So, Anglo-Hellenic relations reached one of their most glorious moments at the time when Anglo-Sebian relations were at their lowest. Only seven years after the cessation of the Ionian Islands, however, they entered a most serious crisis. It was then that another Angloophile, this time from Greece, entered the scene of Anglo-Balkan relations: **Ioannes Gennadios** (1844–1932). Gennadios came from an intellectual family. His father George (1784–1854) was a founder of the University of Athens and responsible for the establishment of the National Library of Greece. The home of George and his wife Artemis was described as "the intellectual centre of Greece at that time".⁵² His death, when Ioannes was ten, left the family with debts as a result of his numerous orders placed with booksellers. Ioannes and his siblings shared their father's love of books and became dedicated bibliophiles. Ioannes's mother Artemis (1811–1884), who came from the old and influential Athenian family of Benizelos, was connected with Britain in a most peculiar way. Her father Prokopios was in 1818 sentenced to death and sequestration of his Athenian property by Ottoman authorities, but the ship that was to take him to Constantinople was forced to dock at the port of Chios, where Benizelos was rescued by the British consul, and later he lived in hiding in Constantinople under the protection of the British embassy.⁵³

One of Ioannes's godfathers, Dr. John Henry Hill of the American Episcopal Church, for some time chaplain to the British legation at Athens, suggested to his widowed mother Artemis to enrol Ioannes and his younger brother in the English Protestant College at Malta, quite popular among well-to-do Greeks.⁵⁴ On his days at the College Gennadios noted:

⁵⁰ For the latest and most complete study of Don Pacifico Affair and Don Pacifico's biography see Derek Taylor, *Don Pacifico. The Acceptable Face of Gunboat Diplomacy* (London, Portland OR: Valentine Mitchell, 2008).

⁵¹ Trevelyan, *British History*, 322.

⁵² Dr. Th. Livadas, *Artemis G. Genadius. Biographical Reminiscences* (London 1890), 20 (originally published in Greek in 1884).

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 12.

⁵⁴ Donald M. Nicol, *Ioannes Gennadios, The Man. A Bibliographical Sketch* (Athens: American School of Classical Studies, 1990), 3.

I remained there for about three years, perfecting my knowledge of English and obtaining that insight into English character and habits which stood me in good stead, later, when I had to devote my energies to the service and the promotion of the interests of my country.⁵⁵

He continued his education in Athens, but before he turned nineteen he gave up his university studies and went to London, where he found employment with the company of the wealthiest Greek family in the Isles — Ralli Brothers. Similarly to Jovanović, he appeared before the British public with a series of four letters in a liberal newspaper, the *Morning Star*, seeking to change the prevailing impression in Britain that Greece was not advancing properly. But the turning-point in his life ensued after an incident in Greece caused huge outrage in Britain.

In April 1870 the so-called Dilessi or Marathon murders took place. A group of Greek brigands kidnapped four aristocrats, three of them British, in the Boeotian village of Dilessi, and brutally murdered them after the Greek government's poorly planned rescue attempts failed. Romilly Jenkins sums up the European perceptions of Greece after the Dilessi murders: "Abroad, in Austria, in France, and in Turkey, the expectation that English troops would occupy Athens was universal: and such was the unpopularity of the Greek cause in those countries that most people also hoped they would."⁵⁶ In June 1870 *Notes on the Recent Murders by Brigands in Greece*, a pamphlet in some two hundred pages, was published anonymously in London. In fact, it was written by Gennadios "with a style and a facility nearly unexampled in a foreigner."⁵⁷ The strong resentment against Greece that the incident had fuelled in Britain compelled Gennadios to lament:

Our whole nation was vilified and dragged into the gutter; we were loaded with infamy, accused of all crimes, and made responsible for a murder committed by a band of malefactors; our past was cursed, our present imprecated, our future damned.⁵⁸

The pamphlet made Gennadios a national hero in Greece, and even though it cost him his job with the Ralli Brothers, his diplomatic career in Greece was secured. In 1870 he was invited to accept the appointment as attaché in Washington, but it seems that he never went. A year or two later he became secretary to the Greek legation in Constantinople, the key post for a Greek

⁵⁵ John Gennadios, "Autobiographical Notes"/Αφιέρωμα στον Ιωάννη Γεννάδιο, *The New Griffon* 4 (2001), 17.

⁵⁶ Romilly Jenkins, *The Dilessi Murders: Greek brigands and English hostages* (London: Prion, 1998), 87.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 122.

⁵⁸ Quoted after Jenkins, *Dilessi Murders*, 123.

diplomat. In 1875 he returned to London as secretary to the Greek legation, and his term as *chargé d'affaires* from 1876 to 1880 coincided with the Eastern Crisis which rekindled British sympathies for Balkan Christians.

At the annual general meeting of the Association of Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom held 26–28 February 1878, I. Gennadios, Greek *chargé d'affaires*, made a toast and confidently remarked: "It finds in us echo all the more ready as the two nations, great Britain and little Greece, have both attained to the highest position amongst the people of the earth, at different epochs, it is true, but by the identical pursuits of commerce and the same love of civilisation and progress..." He also found himself obliged to reply to the usual objection "that Greece has disappointed expectations of her friends":

Well, the drawback of over-sanguine friends is, that they always form unwarranted expectations; and our misfortune has been that the matchless beauty and god-like grandeur of ancient Greece, which, viewed from the distance of centuries, crushes and minimises our best endeavours, has led our impatient and enthusiastic friends to expect that, in one generation, after four centuries of debasing slavery, we should have resuscitated the age of Pericles, and that the sons of those who enjoyed liberty in no other form than that of taking to the mountains, would at once have acted as if endowed with the wisdom of Solon and the virtues of Aristides...⁵⁹

Shortly afterwards Gennadios was sent to Germany to assist the Greek delegation at the Congress of Berlin, and in 1879 he settled the problem of loans the Greek provisional government had taken from British creditors in 1824. This was an important diplomatic victory for Greece but, instead of being rewarded, he was recalled from his London post in 1880. However, Gennadios was soon reappointed as *chargé d'affaires* and served for one year, 1881/2. He became *chargé d'affaires* in London again in 1885 and, at long last, was rewarded by being appointed as minister resident to the Court of St. James's. He held that position until 1890, when he became envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary in London, but only for a year, because in 1891 the government of the Hellenic Kingdom for diplomatic reasons recalled its representatives from many European capitals.

Gennadios apparently had poor relations with Trikoupis, a prominent Greek politician serving too many times as prime minister in the late nineteenth century. In the 1890s Gennadios battled with financial problems, but in 1904 he married a wealthy British woman, Florence Laing Kennedy. In

⁵⁹ *Miscellanea*, Hellenic Committee London, no. V (London, 1878?), 29–31; also published in the *Eighteenth Annual Report of the Association of Chambers of Commerce* (London: Dr. Johnson Press, 1878), 173–177.

July 1910 he was accredited as Hellenic minister in London for the third time. He was almost seventy-five when he offered, 16 October 1918, his resignation due to his age. On 18 November 1918 a dinner in his honour was given at the Carlton Hotel by Hellenic prime minister, E. Venizelos. Gennadios gave a speech:

To Constantinople and Vienna, to The Hague and Washington I was sent in succession, as well as to various international Congresses; but to this country I always returned — the country I admire and love so well, the country to which I feel bound by the dearest of ties, those of my wife, who although an Englishwoman, is the most patriotic of Greek women.⁶⁰

By the time of his retirement, Gennadios had gained the highest reputation in Britain for his diplomatic ability, his knowledge and his scholarship. A journalist who interviewed him in 1920 listed his many achievements:

Our discussion of administration led us insensibly to the question of education. There is no need to remind readers of *The Treasury* that in such a matter Dr. Gennadius joins to the authority of the diplomat that of the scholar and the antiquary. To him is due in part the foundation of the Society of Hellenic Studies, which gave birth in turn to the British School of Archaeology in Athens, and all the important work of that school. It is now nearly forty years since the University of Oxford gave him, as no merely formal compliment to diplomacy, a doctor's degree; Cambridge and St. Andrews have since followed the example of Oxford.

and summed up his contribution to furthering Anglo-Hellenic relations:

Certainly both Greece and England have been singularly fortunate in having Dr. Gennadius to represent his country here through a long and most eventful period of Modern Greek history. It is possible that other diplomats might equally have safeguarded the interests of Greece: it is certain that none could have won in fuller measure the warm esteem of Englishmen."⁶¹

Similar observations were made in the *The Times* obituary for him: "Few foreign diplomatists have ever held in London a position analogous to that of Gennadius."⁶²

⁶⁰ *The Retirement of Mr. Gennadius. Speeches of Monsieur Venizelos, M. Joannes Gennadius, Lord Robert Cecil, the Hon. W. Pember Reeves, Principal Burrows and others at a valedictory Dinner given by M. Venizelos on November 18, 1918 in Honour of M. Gennadius*, Pamphlet no. 38 (London: The Anglo-Hellenic League, 1919), 7.

⁶¹ E. Hermitage Day, "The Renaissance of Greece. An Interview with Dr. Gennadius", *The Treasury* (Sept. 1920), 419–423.

⁶² "M. Gennadius. Greek Diplomatist and Scholar", *The Times*, 8 Sept. 1932, p. 12 A.

Gennadios was also closely associated with two components of British culture: the Church of England and cosmopolitanism. His lengthy and learned introduction to the book *Hellenism in England*⁶³ was seen as “one of innumerable proofs which Dr. Gennadius has given, throughout his long residence in England, of his desire to see the resumption of communion between East and West.” He was a proponent of union between the Orthodox churches and the Church of England. In October 1908, at the Church House, Westminster, he addressed the anniversary meeting of the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches Union: “The Greek Church has always had a desire for close union and has shown much friendliness towards all members of the Anglican Communion.”⁶⁴ He was a wholehearted supporter of the activities of Randall T. Davidson (1848–1930), archbishop of Canterbury (1903–28), who in 1919 appointed the Eastern Churches Committee to deal with the issues of union. The archbishop received a strong endorsement by the decision of the Holy Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate recognising to the Church of England the “Charisma of the priesthood derived from Apostolic succession”, and a very sympathetic letter from the patriarch of Constantinople, Meletios, in July 1922. In February 1923 Randall delivered an allocution on Anglican-Orthodox relations to the bishops and clergy of his province, which was published as a bilingual pamphlet, the Greek version being prepared by Gennadios.⁶⁵

Both Mijatović and Gennadios were enthusiastic about the creation of the League of Nations. Gennadios saw the entire legacy of ancient Greece, including her Amphictionic council, her greatest philosophers, even the church fathers, as a prelude to the League of Nations. Modern Greeks, in his view, were continuing that tradition and, since “the duty of the citizen of a free state is to manifest his convictions by an active concern in public affairs ... As Greeks, therefore, we are in honour bound to support actively and wholeheartedly the aims of this Union.”⁶⁶ He became particularly active in this field at the close of the Great War.

Gennadios often expressed his Anglophile sentiments, and his demeanour and the pride he took in being a member of two gentlemen’s clubs,

⁶³ Joannes Gaennadius, Litt. D., “Hellenism in England. Introduction”, in Theodore E. Dowling, D.D., and Edwin W. Fletcher, F.S.A. Scot., *Hellenism in England* (London: Faith Press, 1915), 19–57.

⁶⁴ “Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches Union”, *The Times*, 24 Oct. 1908, p. 19F.

⁶⁵ Most Rev. Randall T. Davidson, *Allocution on the Relations of the Anglican and Eastern-Orthodox Churches* (London: Faith Press, 1923).

⁶⁶ His article “The Greek Community and the League of Nations Union” was printed in two journals: *The Covenant. A Quarterly Review of the League of Nations* (July 1920 or 1921), 28, and *To-day and To-morrow*, vol. III, no. 5 (Aug.-Sept. 1920), 197.

the Johnson and the Cobden, is certainly something that reveals how strongly he embraced British culture.⁶⁷ Britain, in her turn, rewarded him amply. He was made an honorary doctor of the universities of Oxford (1882), St. Andrews and Cambridge, and an honorary member of the Royal Society of Literature (1891), and was also an honorary G.C.V.O. His Anglophile sentiment must have been nurtured by the reciprocal British admiration and appreciation for ancient Hellas, so common not only among the Oxbridge elite of the epoch, but also among people of humbler background, such as David Lloyd George. Gennadios once summed up his fondness of Britain:

Greece has maintained with no other country in Europe relations so ancient, so historic, so full of romance, so important to scholarship, so bound up with the interest of both nations, as the relations with this country in which I have spent the best years of my life, and which I love of all others best — next to my native land.⁶⁸

He set up a visible monument to that mutual fondness, a library in Athens named “Gennadeion” after his father. He spent a lifetime collecting books, and not just any books: everything that had ever been published on ancient Hellas, Byzantium, modern Greece or the modern Balkans in Britain and other major European countries found its place in this collection which also includes journals, pamphlets, photographs, maps and newspaper clippings. In 1922, after decades of passionate collecting, his library had 24,000 volumes. During his visit to Washington in 1922, when he became an honorary doctor of George Washington and Princeton universities, he made an agreement with the American School of Classical Studies. The Gennadius Library, an impressive classicist building constructed with a donation from the Carnegie Endowment on the slopes of Lycabettus next to the building of the British School in Athens, was opened in April 1926. Thus the edifice reflects three cultural strivings: more than a century-long American and British philhellenism, and the Anglophilia of Ioannes Gennadios.

Gennadios died in London in 1932. Prominent British ecclesiologist, antiquary and expert on Eastern Orthodoxy John Athelstan Riley (1858–1945) wrote for *The Times*:

Those who followed his career will know that his conspicuous success as the representative of his country at St. James’s was largely due, not only to his knowledge of England and English ways, but to his identification with the English spirit; talking to him was like

⁶⁷ L. F. Powell, Prior of the Johnson Club at the time of Gennadios’s death, noted that he had been the first scholar of non-English birth to be elected a member of the Johnson Club. Gennadios received additional distinction by being elected the Club’s Prior two times in a row (1898–1899); cf. *The Times*, 12 Sept. 1932, p. 12F.

⁶⁸ Gaennadius, “Hellenism in England”, 56.

talking to an Englishman [...] it was difficult to believe that this Orthodox Greek was not an Anglican Englishman.⁶⁹

An epigram in Gennadios's honour contributed by the distinguished Greek academic Theogenes Livadas on the occasion of his birthday reads:

*Excellenti viro
Domini Joanni Genadio
Graeciae apud Britannos legato*⁷⁰

The last line indeed epitomizes Ioannes Gennadios's lifelong mission: he was Greece's envoy among Britons.

The highest point of British philhellenism was not its affection for a modern writer or artist, but for a politician. **Eleutherios Venizelos** (1864–1936) was born in Crete, but became a refugee at the age of two, since his father was deported to the island of Syros as punishment for participating in a rebellion against Ottoman rule. This experience left an indelible mark in Venizelos's life. Throughout his career he persistently fought for the freedom of the Hellenic people and the downfall of the Ottoman Empire, and in all possible capacities: as an insurgent, a political propagator, minister of justice of autonomous Crete, and finally as prime minister of the Hellenic Kingdom.

His political rise was meteoric. In August 1910, he entered Parliament, in October, he was prime minister, and from then on remained an unavoidable factor in Greek politics. He headed six Hellenic governments (1910 – March 1915; 23 August – 5 October 1915; 1917–20; 1924; 1928–32; 1933).

Once the Great War proved to be a world conflict Venizelos looked for a chance to bring the Hellenic Kingdom into the war on the side of the Entente. This, naturally, made him popular in London and Paris, but then he had already been noticed and highly praised for his integrity during the London Conference of 1913. When in November 1914 the Ottoman Empire joined the Central Powers, the Entente was compelled to strike back by launching, in February 1915, the Dardanelle Expedition, which encouraged Venizelos to make another attempt to bring Greece into the war. The opposition he met with from King Constantine resulted in his resignation on 6 March 1915.⁷¹

⁶⁹ "M. Gennadius", *The Times*, 17 Sept. 1932, p. 15c.

⁷⁰ Gennadios, "Autobiographical Notes", 45.

⁷¹ See Richard Clogg, *A Concise History of Greece* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 85; N. Petsalis Diomidis, *Greece at the Paris Peace Conference (1919)* (Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1978), 34.

In June 1915, however, Venizelos won the parliamentary election, taking 184 out of 317 seats, and was back in power before the end of August. How good his reputation was in Britain at that time may be seen from the caricature “The Return of Ulysses” published in the *Punch* of 23 June 1915. Upon Bulgaria’s entry into the war, Venizelos decided that the 1913 Agreement with Serbia became enforceable. The King, however, considered that Greece was under no obligation to Serbia since a world war was in progress, and the Agreement of 1913 could not have envisaged such a course of events. Faced with the resistance not only of the King but also of the General Staff, by early October Venizelos had decided to resign again, which caused dissatisfaction in the Entente camp. The most important consequence of the dispute between Venizelos and King Constantine was that the Allies accepted his suggestion to send in troops, and their disembarkation near Salonica began on 3 October 1915.

What was Greece’s image in Britain in this period? There were still many influential philhellenes in Britain on the eve of the First World War, but there was an opposite trend as well. Arnold Toynbee came to believe, in 1912, in “the soundness of racial prejudice” and began to “religiously preach mishellenism” to any philhellene he came across.⁷² Yet, an important pro-Hellenic association which was to play a major role in the pro-Hellenic and pro-Venizelist propaganda effort during the Great War was founded in 1913 in London: the Anglo-Hellenic League initiated by Ronald Burrows (1867–1920), principal of King’s College London. The League whose aim was to defend the “just claims and honour of Greece”⁷³ was instrumental in changing the image of both Venizelos and Greece in Britain.

Burrows and other British philhellenes finally found a hero symbolising both ancient Hellas and modern Greece and suitable for being presented to the British public. How high Burrow’s esteem of Venizelos was may be seen from his poem “Song of the Hellenes to Veniselos the Cretan”:

Veniselos, Veniselos,
Do not fail us! Do not fail us!
Now is come for thee the hour,
To show forth thy master power.
Lord of all Hellenic men,
Make our country great again.

Venizelos had been known to the British public from 1906, when *The Times* began reporting on his Cretan activities. By the end of July 1914 the leading

⁷² Cited in Richard Clogg, “The British School at Athens and the Modern History of Greece”, *Journal of Modern Hellenism* 10 (1993), 95.

⁷³ Richard Clogg, *Britain and Greece* (London: Foreign & Commonwealth Office, 1995), 6.

London daily had mentioned him 343 times.⁷⁴ Venizelos's participation in the London Conference in 1912 earned him a good reputation and provided him with the opportunity to establish good connections in Britain. His personality and diplomatic abilities were noticed both by British statesmen and by other Balkan politicians and diplomats. Čedomilj Mijatović, who joined the Serbian delegation semiofficially, observed:

Of all the Balkan delegates, Greece's first delegate, Mr. Venizelos, made the best impression in diplomatic circles and in London Society. He looked a born gentleman, of fine mannerism consideration for others, dignified, yet natural and simple.⁷⁵

British journalists were equally impressed: "I recall that famous dinner given to the Balkan delegates in London in the midst of the First Balkan War when all our hopes were so high and I remember how the personality of the man stood out from the commonplace figures of his colleagues."⁷⁶

Greece's image in Britain had been declining from the beginning of 1915. The reaction of the British public to the situation in Hellas had some reasons other than the strategic position of Bulgaria. As Ronald Burrows somewhat overenthusiastically pointed out in 1916: "From the moment the war began, there was not a doubt in either country [France and Great Britain] that Greece was a friend, a good friend, and a brave friend... There was no question then in the Western mind of anyone in Greece being pro-German. Up to the beginning of 1915, there was no nation more trusted and believed in than Greece."⁷⁷ Yet, there was one exception to this general trend. Venizelos's efforts throughout 1915 to bring Greece into the war on the side of the Entente strengthened his good reputation in Britain, and he gave several interviews assuring the British public of Greeks in general being loyal to Britain, France and Russia: "Whatever happens within the next few critical weeks, let England never forget that Greece is with her, heart and soul, remembering her past acts of friendship in times of no less difficulty, and looking forward to abiding union in days to come."⁷⁸ His repute in England by that time is obvious from the following paragraph:

⁷⁴ Using three different spellings: usually Venezelos, less frequently Venizelos, and only once Veniselos.

⁷⁵ Mijatovich, *Memoirs*, 237.

⁷⁶ A. G. G., "M. Venizelos and his Conflict with the King", *The Daily News and Leader*, 17 April 1915.

⁷⁷ Ronald Burrows, "Philhellenism in England and France", *The Contemporary Review* (July 1916), 163.

⁷⁸ "Greek Faith in Allies. Interview with M. Venizelos. The Elections. Mandate Expected for Ex-Premier", *The Daily News*, 7 April 1915.

For Greece knows that in him she has touched greatness, and that through him she has caught a vision of a nobler destiny than has been hers since the Turk brought his blight upon the Balkans. Venizelos is for the Allies for no mean thing. He is for them because he knows that with all their deficiencies they stand for freedom, for the moral law in the world against the law of Krupps and that in their triumph is the hope of liberty, of democracy and of the small nationality all over the world.⁷⁹

By the time of his parliamentary victory Venizelos had become so popular in Britain that journalists began a search for his noble ancestors, tracing his origin to the famous fifteenth-century family of Benizeloi (Venizeli).⁸⁰

When he took the office of prime minister again the British press was more sympathetic. The periodical *World*, reminding its readers that it had described Venizelos as “one of the most striking personalities among European statesmen” on the occasion of his visit to London in January 1914, now went even further: “No one, however, then thought that all Europe would be watching with painful anxiety the line of policy he might elect to pursue in the course of a great international struggle. Eighteen months ago, therefore, he was a celebrity; now he is almost a super-celebrity.”⁸¹

When he established a provisional government in October 1916, this mood was revived, most of all by Ronald Burrows, his supporter ever since the Balkan Wars. He praised Venizelos in several articles and championed him through his many and influential private contacts, and in frequent letters to all major London dailies, *The Times* in particular. Many others soon followed suite. Burrows, of course, had paved the way, writing as early as May 1915:

The one thing that can be said with certainty is that in the eyes of Europe Venizelos is the greatest asset Greece has possessed since she became a kingdom, and that it will be many years before his successors win, as he has done, the implicit confidence of the statesmen and the people of England and France.⁸²

A. W. A. Leeper wrote, in November 1916, an Allied portrait of Venizelos, describing him as “the man who was to prove the most stalwart opponent to Prussianism in S. E. Europe”.⁸³ Crawford Price completed a book on

⁷⁹ A. G. G., “M. Venizelos and his Conflict with the King”.

⁸⁰ A letter signed by “A Greek” as a reaction to the previous text of *Guardian’s* correspondent, *The Manchester Guardian*, 21 June, 1915.

⁸¹ “Celebrities at Home”, *The World*, no. 1787, 24 Aug. 1915.

⁸² Ronald M. Burrows, “Venizelos and the Greek Crisis”, *The Contemporary Review* (May 1915), 552.

⁸³ A. W. E. Leeper, “Allied Portrait: (I) Eleutherios Venizelos”, *The New Europe*, 23 Nov. 1916, p. 183.

Venizelos in November 1916, and called for Allied action on the side of Venizelos:

If we are sincere in our devotion to the cause of freedom, justice and righteousness, then this Venizelist movement is one which ought to receive our unstained support and full official acknowledgment. If we are determined in our intention to crush militarism in Europe, then it is illogical to us to support any offshoot of it in the Balkans.⁸⁴

Another important element in pro-Hellenic and pro-Serbian propaganda was the founding in 1916 of the journal *New Europe* by R. W. Seton Watson, Ronald Burrows, T. Masaryk and two influential journalists of *The Times*, Henry Wickham-Steed and Harold Williams.⁸⁵ It promoted the cause of small nations and supported the war effort of the Kingdom of Serbia and Venizelist Greece. For Britain's monarchist public, however, the legitimate government was in Athens as long as there was a king, and they naturally tended to assume the subjects' loyalty to their sovereign. The very existence of a royal government reluctant to take any decisive step towards Hellenic participation in the war produced in some sections of British public opinion an unfavourable image of the Hellenes as a nation,⁸⁶ which not even Venizelos's arrival in Athens to take the office of prime minister of a unified Hellas could change. Burrows criticized some British journalists:

No Philhellene can fairly complain of the attitude of the English Press as a whole. There has been a tendency, however, natural enough, to throw Venizelos into high relief by contrasting him with his fellow countrymen. It is a left-handed compliment to one who is Greek of the Greeks, and, above all men, stands for the solidarity of the race. So able a war correspondent as Mr. Ward Price found nothing in the welcome given to the Allied troops by the population of Thessaly, but a proof that "the Greek mind has little consistency, and no shame at suddenly renouncing one allegiance to embark on the opposite".

Burrows was equally dissatisfied with the *Daily Chronicle's* interpretation of the shift of allegiance from King Constantine to Venizelos as something

⁸⁴ Crawford Price, *Venizelos and the War. A Sketch of Personalities & Politics* (London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co. Ltd, 1917), 9.

⁸⁵ George Glasgow, *Ronald Burrows: A Memoir* (London: Nesbit & Co., 1924), 198–199.

⁸⁶ In a letter to Burrows of 17 November 1916, Venizelos noted that the Entente Powers had warned his movement that it "must not assume an anti-dynastic character". Venizelos believed that "the preservation of the dynasty should be thought a sufficient concession to the 'sentiments très respectables des Souverains des Alliés de la France'", *ibid.*, 243, 246.

that “does not impress one with the strength of Hellenic character. The nation ... has shown, on the whole, more resemblance to the Greeks of Juvenal than to those of Pericles!”⁸⁷ The same ambiguous attitude can also be seen from an article of the famous anthropologist Sir J. G. Frazer, who described the anathema on Venizelos by the archbishop of Athens as a “barbarous ritual” common to “savages all over the world”.⁸⁸

The dazzle of Venizelos’s image did not necessarily shine on all of Greece, especially in the eyes of locally deployed British and French soldiers during the existence of two rival governments. The American journalist of Greek origin Demetra Vaka, travelling from Italy to Corfu on a boat full of Entente troops in early 1917, heard comments which made her realise:

... where Greece stood in the eyes of other nations. Hatred and scorn were her portion. “Cowered” was the least of the epithets applied to her, and because no one suspected a Greek under my American name I received the full blast of the world’s opinion on my race. With entire lack of justice no distinction was drawn between Old Greece, which would not abandon its neutrality, and New Greece, the members of which have left their homes, their business, their friends, to fight for the Entente, and to rehabilitate their good name toward Serbia.⁸⁹

Between September 1914 and October 1918 Venizelos was mentioned in 627 different articles in *The Times*. In terms of quality rather than quantity, he was mentioned seventeen times in editorials and leaders all of which depicted him in superlatives in the period between October 1915 and the end of the war, and in some twenty letters mostly written by members of the Anglo-Hellenic League. Between 1913 and 1918 the League published thirty-seven pamphlets, four of them entirely devoted to Venizelos and almost all referring to him in laudable terms.⁹⁰ This sustained effort made Venizelos probably the most popular foreign prime minister in Britain.

During and immediately after the First World War four biographies of Venizelos appeared in Britain, an unprecedented honour not only to a Hellenic statesman but to any Balkan statesman of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The first biography, by Dr. C. Kerofilas, was complet-

⁸⁷ Ronald M. Burrows, “Venizelos in Athens”, *The New Europe*, 5 July 1917, p. 373.

⁸⁸ Sir J. G. Frazer, “The Cursing of Venizelos”, *The New Europe*, 22 Feb. 1917, p. 174.

⁸⁹ Demetra Vaka, *Constantine King & Traitor* (London: John Lane, 1918), 14.

⁹⁰ Pamphlet no. 19: *Eleutherios Venizelos and English Public Opinion* (1915), 29 p.; Pamphlet no. 28: *Speech of Mr. E. Venizelos to the people delivered in Athens on Sunday, August 27, 1915 [Greek and English]* (1916), 15 p.; Pamphlet No. 30: *Venizelos and his fellow countrymen, by P. N. Ure* (1917), 14+1 p.; and Pamphlet no. 35: *England’s Welcome to Venizelos* (1917), 20 p.

ed in Greek in August 1915 and then translated into English. Kerofilas's sympathies for Venizelos were more than open, as shown by his preface: "Carlyle would assuredly have included him among his 'Heroes,'" since he is a man "who, finding his country in the throes of a military revolution, restored it and raised it to the highest triumphs of victory."⁹¹ The second biography, from the pen of Crawford Price, a strongly pro-Hellenic and pro-Serbian British journalist, was completed in mid November 1916 and published in January 1917. Inspired by Venizelos's departure from Crete to Salonica, it was an attempt to strengthen pro-Venizelist feelings in Britain. In conclusion to his preface Price noted: "If we are sincere in our devotion to the causes of freedom, justice and righteousness, then this Venizelist movement is one which ought to receive our unstinted support and full official acknowledgement."⁹²

After the First World War there appeared, in 1921, the biography by S. B. Chester,⁹³ as well as the one by Vincent J. Seligman. The latter, intended as a study of Greek politics from 1910 to 1918, was a clear laudation of its hero. Seligman dedicated his book to Venizelos, as "a small tribute of the author's respect and admiration."⁹⁴

Venizelos's image in Britain saw a shiny moment during his visit to London in November 1917. Two months earlier *Punch* had made a tribute to Venizelos, portraying him and Kerensky as liberators in the style of *Ex oriente lux*. To a worried Kerensky, Venizelos says with determination: "Do not despair, I too went through sufferings, before achieving unity."⁹⁵ On 16 November 1917 the Anglo-Hellenic League organized a meeting to welcome Venizelos at the Mansion House. Apart from the lord mayor, it was attended by leading British politicians, such as Arthur James Balfour (foreign minister), Lord Curzon, and Winston Churchill (minister of munitions), by Mr. and Mme. Gennadius, Mr. and Mme. Burrows, and many other distinguished figures.

At the beginning Ronald Burrows read the message of the archbishop of Canterbury and then the lord mayor yielded the floor to A. J. Balfour:

⁹¹ Dr. C. Kerofilas, *Eleftheriois Venizelos. His Life and Work*, transl. by Beatrice Barstow (London: John Murray 1915), xv.

⁹² Price, *Venizelos and the War*, 9.

⁹³ S. B. Chester, *Life of Venizelos* (London: Constable, 1921).

⁹⁴ Vincent J. Seligman, *The Victory of Venizelos. A Study of Greek Politics, 1910–1918* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1920), 5. Venizelos's fifth biography in English was published in the United States: Herbert Adams Gibbons, *Venizelos* (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1920).

⁹⁵ "Liberators", *Punch or the London Charivari*, 5 Sept. 1917.

By common consent Mr. Venizelos is the most distinguished living representative of the great historic race to whom, as the Archbishop of Canterbury observes in the letter just read out to you, civilisation owes much...

Mr. Venizelos has now been travelling through Allied countries for some time. He has seen Rome, he has seen Paris, he has finally come to London; and I do not think that in any Entente capital will he find a warmer welcome than he will find in the capital of the British Empire. [Cheers.] And that is not merely because he has shown qualities greatly admired by our race – moderation, courage, love of liberty – but also because he has, from the very beginning of these hostilities, seen with a sure and certain intuition that the cause of nationalities and the cause of international freedom lay in the keeping of the Entente Powers. [Cheers.]⁹⁶

Having expressed his thanks to the lord mayor and the Anglo-Hellenic League for organising the meeting, Venizelos made a brief historical overview of his policy. He wanted to assure the British public that ordinary Greeks had remained loyal to the Entente and particularly to Britain throughout the crisis between Venizelos and King Constantine. That he knew how to approach Britain's highest classes and win their hearts for the Greek cause can be seen from an excerpt from his speech:

I can assure you that during that protracted and painful crisis, the great majority of the Greek people never approved of that treacherous policy. The good opinion of your great Empire is a precious asset for the Greek people. Ever since their resuscitation to a free political existence, the Greeks have looked for guidance to the great and splendid lessons which British political life offers. In it we have found harmoniously blended personal liberty with that order which ensures progress. All the public men of modern Greece, worthy of that name, have been unanimous in their belief that the edifice which has been reared by the genius of the British people, and which is known as the British Empire, or the British Commonwealth, is the grandest political creation in the life of man. [Cheers.]⁹⁷

There is one thing in Venizelos's biography that remains unclear though. Was he a genuine Anglophile or he simply knew what it was that Britons liked to hear? Or to put it differently: Was his publicly displayed Anglophilia during the First World War just a natural but superficial response to the resurgence of British philhellenism? An answer may be that, unlike Jovanović, Mijatović, Gennadios or Geshov, he may not have been an An-

⁹⁶ *England's Welcome to Venizelos*, 3 and 5–6.

⁹⁷ *England's Welcome to Venizelos*, 15.

glophile from the outset. By 1917, and probably as early as 1912/3, he had definitely become a genuine one and strongly believed Greece's future to be entirely and justifiably in Britain's hands. It was as early as December 1912 that Venizelos told Lloyd George: "All the national aspirations of Greece tended towards a closer union with England," and six months later he said to the British minister in Athens that Greek policy was "to conform absolutely to the advice of Sir Edward Grey".⁹⁸ His pro-British position was reinforced when a British Hellenophile, Lloyd George, became British prime minister (December 1916 – October 1922).⁹⁹ His Anglophilia developed at the time when British Hellenophilia was at its peak, when a trend that may be termed Anglo-Hellenism reached its climax. Throughout the crucial years from 1913 onwards the Anglo-Hellenic League acted fervently in support of Venizelos. The fact that he had a kind of PR agency in London and that so many Britons volunteered to support him must have had genuinely impressed him.

What Venizelos nonetheless lacked in his early years was cultural Anglophilia. His library indicates a greater inclination for books in French than in English, and is dominated by the French historian François Guizot, although Thomas Carlyle, G. M. Trevelyan, Arnold Toynbee and, unavoidably, John Morley's *Life of Gladstone*, are also there.¹⁰⁰ Little by little, however, his Anglophilia expanded to include the field of culture. He presided over the founding meeting of the Anglo-Hellenic Educational Foundation held on 20 November 1918. The Foundation's aim was "to advise and assist in the foundation in Greece of schools conducted on English principles and in general questions of English teaching in Greece."¹⁰¹ When on 14

⁹⁸ Michael Llewellyn Smith, "Venizelos' Diplomacy, 1910–23: From Balkan Alliance to Greek-Turkish Settlement", in Pashcalis M. Kitromilides, ed., *Eleutherios Venizelos. The Trials of Statesmanship* (Edinburgh University Press, 2006), 148, 150.

⁹⁹ The two statesmen dined together on 19 May 1919. Frances Stevenson, Lloyd George's personal secretary, noted: "The two have a great admiration for each other, and D.[avid] is trying to get Smyrna for Greeks, though he is having trouble with the Italians over it." Cf. A. J. P. Taylor, ed., *Lloyd George. A Diary by Frances Stevenson* (New York and London: Harper & Row, 1971), 183. Through one of his closest friends, Sir Arthur Henry Crosfield, Lloyd George had a personal link with Venizelos since Crosfield's Greek wife, Lady Domini, was a close friend of Madame Venizelos. Frank Owen, *Tempestuous Journey. Lloyd George his life and times* (London: Hutchinson, 1954), 196. Crosfield was also very active in the Anglo-Hellenic League.

¹⁰⁰ Paschalis M. Kitromilides, "Venizelos' Intellectual Projects and Cultural Interests", in Kitromilides, ed., *Eleutherios Venizelos*, 377–378.

¹⁰¹ Richard Clogg, "The 'ingenious enthusiasm' of Dr. Burrows and the 'unsatiated hatred' of Professor Toynbee", *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook IX* (1993), 83. His reform of the Greek education system during his last premiership in the late 1920s and early

May 1920 the great supporter of the Hellenic cause, Ronald Burrows, died, Venizelos wrote: "By the death of Dr. Burrows, Greece has lost a staunch friend and an enlightened advocate. His friendship was the more valuable as it was entirely free from the atmosphere of the romantic Philhellenism of the last century ... For all his deep knowledge of Ancient Greek Life and Letters, it was not primarily because of his appreciation of the grandeur of classical Hellas that Dr. Burrows loved the Greece of to-day."¹⁰² Burrows indeed did a lot for establishing a favourable Hellenic image and almost a cult of Venizelos in Britain, but it was also very much thanks to Venizelos that the British public remembered Hellas pleasantly in the decades that followed the Great War. It is not at all surprising, then, that Venizelos enjoyed substantial respect in Paris, and particularly in London. Bonar Law, leader of the Conservative Party at the time, said in the House of Commons in April 1920: "No single statesman has supported the Allied cause through good report and ill so strongly as M. Venizelos."¹⁰³

At the Paris Peace Conference, Venizelos once again demonstrated his ability to ensure significant concessions in favour of the Hellenic cause. The peace treaties with Bulgaria (Neuilly, November 1919) and Turkey (Sevres, August 1920) as well as the San Remo conference (February 1920) were triumphs both for Venizelos and for Hellenism. However, in the 1920 election Venizelos suffered a defeat, and even lost his own seat. He immediately went into voluntary exile, escorted by a British war ship.

As has already been observed, "Venizelos's guiding principle was to associate Britain with his main goals".¹⁰⁴ Similarly, Britain associated her goals in the eastern Mediterranean with Venizelos's expected long tenure as prime minister of Greece. His electoral defeat therefore signalled the end of Britain's staunch commitment to a Greater Greece.¹⁰⁵ Once the new Odysseus was no longer prime minister of Hellas, British regional plans which counted on new Greece as a key ally in the eastern Mediterranean collapsed. He remained in opposition and abroad at the time Hellenism suffered its greatest modern defeat: the Greek-Turkish War of 1921/2, which ended with what a pamphlet of the Anglo-Hellenic League termed "the

1930s was also based on the British model. Cf. Ioannis D. Stefanidis, "Venizelos' Last Premiership", in Kitromilides, ed., *Eleutherios Venizelos*, 198.

¹⁰² Foreword of E. K. Venizelos to Glasgow, *Ronald Burrows*, xi.

¹⁰³ Chester, *Life of Venizelos*, 202.

¹⁰⁴ Robert Holland and Diana Markides, *The British and the Hellenes. Struggles for Mastery in the Eastern Mediterranean 1850-1960* (Oxford: OUP, 2008), 180.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Eric Goldstein, "Great Britain and Greater Greece 1917-1920", *The Historical Journal* 32, no. 2 (1989), 356.

Smyrna holocaust”,¹⁰⁶ the massacre of at least 30,000 Greek and Armenian Christians. Almost all of his First World War achievements were thus effaced. The Hellenes were expelled from their millennia-old cultural centres in Asia Minor. Venizelos was only able to save some territories in the Aegean with the peace treaty signed in Lausanne (1923). In 1924 Greece became a republic, but remained divided into the Venizelist and anti-Venizelist camps. The former was strengthened by the influx of some 1.1 million Greek refugees from Turkey. In July 1928 Venizelos returned to power and, apart from two brief interruptions, was prime minister of the Republic until March 1933. His policy of reliance on Britain pursued in 1912–20, however, was no longer feasible due to a shift in the balance of power in Europe. To secure peace for Greece Venizelos needed to change his foreign policy and to conclude a pact of friendship with Italy (1928), to restore good relations with the Serbs through an alliance with Yugoslavia (1929), and to make a bold agreement with Turkey (1930). As his recent biographer has put it, Venizelos became “Prime Minister of peace”.¹⁰⁷

Although his careful handling of the Anglo-Greek crisis over Cyprus, caused by Cypriote agitation for unification with Greece, demonstrated that he was still very committed to having good relations with Britain, it was a far cry from his fascination with Britain in 1912–20. Venizelos lost the election in March 1933. In June, he was the target of an assassination attempt in Athens, after which he moved to his native Crete. In March 1935 he supported a conspiracy against the government of Panagis Tsaldaris. As two attempted military coups, in Athens and in the north, were suppressed, Venizelos fled to the Italian-ruled Dodecanese and then left for Paris, where he died on 18 March 1936. The British government acted neutrally during this crisis, albeit with some benevolence towards Venizelos. The British public, parliamentarians and even the Foreign Office were still sympathetic towards their war ally.¹⁰⁸

C. A Bulgarian Anglophile and a British Bulgarophile

As for Bulgaria, Gladstone’s openly displayed affection for the nation made a huge impression in Bulgaria and produced a favourable response towards

¹⁰⁶ *The Tragedy of the Christian near East*, by Lysimachos Oeconomos, Lecturer in Modern Greek and Byzantine History at the University of London (King’s College). Appendix, *the Smyrna holocaust* by Charles Dobson, M.C., *Late British Chaplain of Smyrna*, Pamphlet No. 50 (Anglo-Hellenic League, 1923).

¹⁰⁷ Nikolaos Emm. Papadakis, *Eleftherios K. Venizelos. A Biography* (Chania: National Research Foundation Eleftherios K. Venizelos, 2006), 48.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Ioannis S. Koliopoulos, in Kitromilides, ed., *Eleutherios Venizelos*, 242–243.

Britain. The latter was to be obscured by Bulgaria's alliance with Britain's enemies in both world wars, but an affinity for Britain nevertheless existed in some influential circles in Bulgaria. One of its most significant exponents was the politician and writer **Ivan Eვაstratiev Geshov** (1849–1924). Geshov came from a well-known family of merchants and bankers. His father and four uncles were prosperous merchants in Philippopolis (modern-day Plovdiv). In 1834 they had started a trading company, The Geshov Brothers (*Bratya Geshovi*), expanding their business and opening branch offices in Vienna (1835), Constantinople (1847) and Manchester (1865).

Geshov attended a Bulgarian grammar school in Plovdiv for eight years, where he was able to learn literary Bulgarian, Greek, Turkish and French. The school was imbued with the Bulgarian national spirit in opposition to the Hellenisation of Bulgarian culture. At the age of fourteen Ivan began to learn English, intensively in the winter of 1864/5. In September 1865, sixteen-year old Ivan and his family left Constantinople for Manchester. After a year with a private tutor, he entered Owens College, part of the University of London at the time and subsequent Victoria University.

He was the first Bulgarian to address the British public on the issue of Bulgarian nationality. He was only seventeen when he sent a letter, dated 18 September 1866, to the *Pall Mall Gazette*:

No Bulgarian, in the present state of our national advancement, will think of himself as Russian or Servian — nationalities whose language and history are wholly distinct from ours. And, of course, the mere supposition that there are Bulgarians who think of themselves as Greeks is an anachronism. In proof of this, I beg to state that those Bulgarians who were and are educated in Russia, Servia, and Greece, and who naturally ought to have some tendency towards these countries and their nationalities, are the boldest champions of the claim to our being a separate nationality — speak and write much more purely the Bulgarian than any others...

Much later he wrote: “So far as I know, this letter was the first political utterance of a Bulgarian, addressed in English to a newspaper. It appeared in *The Pall Mall Gazette* of September 26, 1866. Lord Strangford who had written the article ‘The Language Question in the Tyrol and Istria’, published it with a long commentary.”¹⁰⁹

His studies at Owens College took three years (1866–69). He finished his first year as the best student in Latin, German and in English language and literature, and subsequently as the best student in political economy, and was a frequent visitor to the Manchester literary club Athenaeum. He was much influenced by his professor of logic and political economy, Wil-

¹⁰⁹ I. E. Gueshoff, *The Balkan League* (London: John Murray, 1915), v.

liam Stanley Jevons (1835–1882): “If there is a lecturer to whom I greatly owe for what I am, it is he.”¹¹⁰

Having obtained a decent education, he believed it his calling to enlighten Bulgaria. In his *Memories* Geshov sorrowfully remarks that before his family moved to England he had not been able to see a single Bulgarian barrister, engineer or architect.¹¹¹ As his parents saw his education as a prelude to a successful career in trading, after the college he worked in the family company from 1869 until its closure in 1872, but he never gave up self-education. For the three years at the company he keenly read English political thinkers and economists. As he put it: “I was influenced by English political and social life amidst which I was developing. And what especially remained in my mind were thoughts and works of John Stuart Mill.”¹¹² So, upon his return to Bulgaria in 1872, he spent several years improving the educational situation in the country.

In April 1876 an uprising against Ottoman rule began in Bulgaria. Ill-prepared as it was, it failed to recruit the expected number of insurgents as no more than 10,000 answered the call, but it nonetheless demonstrated that there was a movement for political freedom. The brunt of the reaction to the uprising, however, did not come from regular Ottoman troops but rather from Circassians and Bulgarian Muslims, and it involved serious atrocities against Bulgarian Christians, the most notorious cases being the massacres in Bratsigovo, Perushtitsa and, particularly, Batak.¹¹³ It is estimated that some 15,000 Bulgarian men, women and children were slaughtered, “with all attendant circumstances of atrocities”.¹¹⁴ The news of the

¹¹⁰ Iv. Ev. Geshov, *Spomeni iz godini na borbi i pobedi* [Memories from the years of struggles and victories] (Sofia: Gutenberg, 1916), 33. Geshov was particularly influenced by Jevons’s *Principles of Science* (1874).

¹¹¹ Geshov, *Spomeni*, 31.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, p. 35. Describing Mill as a formative influence on his worldview (p. 36), Geshov says that “Jevons’s lectures and Mill’s books” laid down “the groundwork for my ideology” (p. 37).

¹¹³ R. J. Crampton, *Bulgaria* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 91–92.

¹¹⁴ R. T. Shannon, *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation* (Hassocks, Sussex: The Harvester Press 1975), 22, adopts the estimates made by American consul Schuyler who found evidence for 65 villages burnt entirely or in part and for at least 15,000 Bulgarians killed in the districts of Philippopolis and Tatar Bazardjik. British consul Baring estimated the number of murdered Bulgarian Christians at 12,000 and the number of Bulgarian villages totally or partially burnt at 51, while the missionary Stoney reduced the death toll to 3,694. Ottoman authorities admitted (in the *Turquie*) at first 1,836 and later 6,000 dead, while Bulgarian authorities claimed that 100,000 persons were killed. Harold Temperley, “The Bulgarian and Other Atrocities, 1875–8, in the Light of

massacres soon reached Britain, Europe and the United States. By July they had provoked agitation and in August became the main topic in the British press. Yet, the Conservative prime minister, Benjamin Disraeli, seemed utterly unmoved by the events in June and July. His pro-Ottoman position remained unshaken even by Queen Victoria's letter of 11 August urging him to prevent further atrocities.¹¹⁵

The campaign in the British press, however, had an effect on the general mood in the country and even on Britain's foreign policy. In August 1876, the correspondent of the *Daily News*, American journalist Januarius Aloysius MacGahan (1844–1878), already well known by then as the *New York Herald* war correspondent, published a series of articles offering his account of the atrocities against the Bulgarian Christians in the village of Batak. The articles caused outrage in Britain. They all quoted the American consul-general, Schuyler, as a source confirming his accounts. His accounts were used by Gladstone for his famous pamphlet on Bulgarian horrors published in September 1876. At this crucial moment in Bulgarian history Geshov's role was quite prominent. He supplied the British vice-consul in Adrianople, J. Hutton Dupuis, with the notes that he used for his reports, but also MacGahan from the *Daily News*, Schneider from the *Kölnische Zeitung* and the American consul Schuyler.¹¹⁶

It was clear that the Great Powers had to do something and, eventually, in late December 1876 and January 1877, a conference was held in Constantinople to devise a series of reforms. It was at the time of the conference that Eugene Schuyler, apparently the first professional American diplomat, and consul-general in Constantinople since 1876, encouraged Geshov to become a contributor to *The Times*.¹¹⁷ So, on the eve of the Russo-Ottoman War of 1877, Geshov wrote a series of seven letters for *The Times*. The first was published 14 February and the last 11 April 1877,¹¹⁸ and, as he put it

Historical Criticism”, *The Proceedings of the British Academy* XVII (1931), 124–126. Cf. *Mr Baring's and Mr. Schuyler's Reports on the Atrocities Committed upon the Christians in Bulgaria* (London: Goubaud & Son, September 1876), where Baring (p. 5) estimated that the number of Muslims “killed in cold blood does not exceed 200 for the whole Sandjak of Philippopolis”.

¹¹⁵ Shannon, *Gladstone*, 54.

¹¹⁶ Ivan Evstratiev Geshov, *Vizgledi i deinost* [Views and Activity] (Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1926), 23–24.

¹¹⁷ Peter Bridges, “The only diplomatist”, *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 16, no. 1 (March 2005), 13–22; “Obituary. Eugene Schuyler”, *The New York Times*, 19 July 1890.

¹¹⁸ I have identified seven letters published in *The Times* between 14 February and 11 April 1877 which were sent from Philippopolis and written by the same person, obviously Geshov, between 26 January and 29 March 1877: “Bulgaria. (from an Occasional Correspondent)”, 14 Feb. 1877, p. 5D [written 26 Jan.]; “The Bulgarian Commission.

himself, they “voiced the sufferings and hopes of my people”.¹¹⁹ This was apparently the main reason why, in August 1877, he and a relative of his were imprisoned and sentenced to death by Ottoman authorities in Philippopolis.

The Times commented on this affair as late as 22 September, but in a tone which was an obvious warning to the Ottoman authorities. Its special correspondent wrote from Karlovo that his failure to report timely about “a very hard case” was due to personal reasons and his fear that his writing might fall into the wrong hands, but that he then decided to take a risk. He informed the readers that two cousins by the name of Gueshoff had been arrested in Philippopolis and charged with treason: “By careful inquiry, however, I satisfied myself that the real reason of their arrest was that they were suspected of having addressed letters to the Editor of *The Times*.” According to him, there was a consideration “which recommended them to British sympathy. They have been educated at Owens College, in Manchester, and were in speech and ideas as British as if they had been born and brought up in our own land.” Fortunately, their case was taken up by British ambassador Layard and the American minister, “and I believe they are now as good as saved”. *The Times* correspondent claimed that one of the two had been appointed American vice-consul two days prior to his arrest, but that the papers did not arrive in Philippopolis until later.¹²⁰ W. T. Stead later revealed, in a leader for the *Northern Echo*, that it was the American minister who had insisted that no harm should befall Geshov, while the British ambassador had refused to submit an official appeal since Geshov was an Ottoman subject. Moreover the Foreign Office had initially backed Layard. Fortunately, the news of Geshov’s arrest reached England and Manchester’s Bulgarian merchant community initiated a petition. Signed by more than four hundred local businessmen, it was submitted to the British foreign secretary, Lord Derby, and British diplomacy was encouraged to act.¹²¹ Finally, in late September 1877, Lord Derby

(from an Occasional Correspondent)”, 21 Feb. 1877, p. 4E [written 5 Feb.]; “Misgovernment in Bulgaria. (from an Occasional Correspondent)”, 1 March 1877, p. 8A [written 12 Feb.]; “Turkish Tax-Gatherers. (from an Occasional Correspondent)”, 16 March 1877, p. 10B [written 28 Feb.]; “Bulgaria. (from an Occasional Correspondent)”, 3 April 1877, p. 6A [written 16 March]; “Bulgarian Symptoms. (our Philippopolis Correspondent)”, 6 April 1877, p. 10D [written 26 March]; “The Governor of Bulgaria. (our Philippopolis Correspondent)”, 11 April 1877, p. 5B [written 29 March]. There are articles in *The Times* sent by the correspondent from Philippopolis both before February and after April, but it is obvious from both contents and style that they were written by different author(s).

¹¹⁹ Gueshoff, *Balkan League*, viii.

¹²⁰ “The ‘Terror’ in Bulgaria”, *The Times*, 26 Sept. 1877, p. 8A.

¹²¹ *The Northern Echo*, 24 April 1879; cf. Geshov, *Vüzgledi*, 27–28.

instructed the British ambassador in Constantinople to urge the Porte to take steps regarding the affair.¹²²

Geshov had considerable luck with the whole affair since the British ambassador in Constantinople, Sir Henry Eliot, was much closer to Disraeli's stance than to the outraged British public, by then already quite sensitive to the sufferings of Slavs in general, and Bulgarians in particular. In his infamous letter to Lord Derby, Eliot adamantly argued that British interests in the Ottoman Empire should not be affected by "the question whether it was 10,000 or 20,000 persons who perished in the suppression".¹²³ The new British ambassador in Constantinople appointed in March 1877, Austen Henry Layard, was also opposed to Gladstone's position on Turkey, finding the commotion stirred by the Bulgarian horrors naively sentimental. Therefore it is still not quite clear who was instrumental in saving Geshov, American minister or British ambassador.

During his imprisonment Geshov witnessed the horrible fate of the Christian captives from Karlovo who were hanged on a daily basis. Awaiting the same end, he learnt one day, from the Turkish newspaper *Vakut*, that his execution was postponed due to British ambassador's and American minister's interventions. Later he read in the same newspaper that his death sentence was commuted to imprisonment. In late October three families of the Geshov clan with twenty-two members, including Geshov and his relative, were ordered by Ottoman authorities to move from Philippopolis to Constantinople. The latter two were transferred to a prison in the Ottoman capital and later were held under house arrest. They were released after general amnesty was proclaimed following the Treaty of San Stefano.¹²⁴ This Russian-dictated treaty envisaged a Greater Bulgaria, but other Great Powers refused to accept it. In July, under the new Treaty of Berlin, Bulgaria was divided into the Principality of Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia, an autonomous province of the Ottoman Empire with its seat at Philippopolis. Under the same treaty, the large Slav-inhabited parts of Macedonia which had been ceded to Bulgaria at San

¹²² Elena Stelova, *Ivan Evstratiev Geshov. Ili trūnliviat pūt na sūzidanieto* [Ivan Evstratiev Geshov. Or the thorny path to building] (Sofia: Academic Press – Marin Drinov, 1994), 23.

¹²³ Shannon, *Gladstone*, 23. Even Lord Derby reacted and wrote to Eliot that "no political considerations would justify the toleration of such acts." Temperley, "Bulgarian and Other Atrocities", 127.

¹²⁴ Geshov first published his reminiscences of his days in prison in the Bulgarian journal *Periodichesko spisanie* (vol. XXXIV and XXXVI), under the title "Zapiski na edin osūden" [Notes of a convict]. They were republished in 1916 in his *Spomeni* and in 1928 in his collected memories and studies *Spomeni i studii*, 13–62. His memories from prison were retold in English by W. R. Morfill, "The Sufferings of a Bulgarian Patriot", *The Westminster Review*, no. 135/1 (Jan. 1891), 524–531.

Stefano were now restored to the Ottoman Empire. The terms of the Treaty of Berlin left Geshov desperate; formally, his native Plovdiv was still part of the Ottoman Empire. The new autonomous province of Eastern Rumelia came to be known in Bulgarian as Yuzhna Bulgariya (Southern Bulgaria).

In August 1878 Prof. Marin Drinov and Geshov drew up a protest note to the ambassadors of the Great Powers in Constantinople. In March 1879 Geshov was sent to European capitals again. He visited Bucharest, Vienna and Paris, where he was joined by Dr. Georgi Yankulov. The goal of their mission was to express protest against the provisions of the Treaty of Berlin splitting Bulgaria into two. On 6 April they arrived in London, where they met prominent British politicians, including Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, subsequent British commissioner for Eastern Rumelia (1880/1), Duke of Argyll, Lord Granville, Dr. Sandwith. Yet, they failed to meet Lord Salisbury, British foreign minister, and were only able to leave a memorandum with the Foreign Office.¹²⁵ By then Geshov was already quite well known in Britain and a reader of *The Times* wrote that there was interest in the north of England in organising a public welcome.¹²⁶

Before Geshov set off on his European tour, he received a personal letter from Gladstone denying that he withdrew “sympathies from the Bulgarians on account of the outrages upon the Mahomentans committed by some among them”, but observing that it was true “that some of them have been so corrupted by the brutalising *regime* which has lasted so long in their country, that they have committed acts shameful in any man, but especially disgraceful when perpetrated by Christians.”¹²⁷ This gave Geshov one more reason for a mission to London. After the debate on “Bulgarian atrocities”, Ottoman diplomacy realised that they might profit if they could prove that Bulgarians had committed atrocities against Turks, and so Geshov had to struggle to downplay such claims.¹²⁸

He did not succeed in winning the British political mainstream for the Bulgarian cause and a leader in *The Times* went so far as to even wonder if the two gentlemen were “really qualified to speak for the inhabitants of East Roumelia”.¹²⁹ By contrast, the Liberal press supported Geshov. Thus Stead wrote: “There are at present in England waiting for an audience with Lord Salisbury two representatives of the nationality for whose freedom the

¹²⁵ Statelova, *Ivan Evstratiev Geshov*, 32–34.

¹²⁶ “M. Gueshoff and the Bulgarians”, *The Times*, 23 April 1879, p. 9F.

¹²⁷ “Mr Gladstone and the Bulgarians”, *The Northern Echo*, 17 March 1879, p. 3E.

¹²⁸ Rumén Genov, *Gladston* (Sofia: Open Society, 1996), 264.

¹²⁹ *The Times*, 2 May 1879, p. 9A. Geshov denounced this comment in a letter to *The Times* published three days later, “The Deputation from East Roumelia”, *The Times*, 5 May 1879, p. 8E.

English nation has pleaded, but whose liberties the English Government has betrayed.”¹³⁰

After East Rumelia was joined to the Principality of Bulgaria in 1885, Geshov was sent again to Britain to promote the interests of Bulgaria, and thus played the role of Bulgaria’s main advocate in Britain in the early years of her statehood.¹³¹ Geshov arrived in London in October 1885 and soon received an encouraging letter from Gladstone. The British politician was explicit that he was “favourable to recognising the accomplished fact”, hoping that the union “will be a real one”, and dismissing Greek and Serbian aspirations.¹³² This time Geshov received conditional support for the Bulgarian position from prime minister Salisbury and head of the Eastern Department Philip Currie.¹³³

Shortly afterwards Geshov was appointed Bulgarian delegate at the peace negotiations in Bucharest. There two Anglophiles, a Serb, Mijatović, and a Bulgarian, Geshov, concluded a peace treaty. It is obvious that both of them demonstrated a determination towards peace, which was their individual line rather than the line of their governments. Mijatović noted in his *Memoirs* that “Bulgaria’s delegate Ivan Geshov, and myself, cherishing admiration for the British people and their ways, entered at once into friendly relations.”¹³⁴ Thus Britain played an important role at the peace negotiations in Bucharest through two Anglophiles who headed the negotiating parties.

In his *Memories* Geshov gives a list in more than one page enumerating various fields of J. S. Mill’s activity which profoundly influenced him. The list includes Mill’s protection of freedom, of those deprived of their rights, such as workers, Irishmen and the Negroes of Jamaica; his advocacy of proportional representation; his support for peasant-proprietors, for cooperatives in agriculture; his stand against state intervention in the economy, and his activity as MP into which he “put all his ardent love for freedom”, all of which “left lasting marks on my mind”.¹³⁵ He wanted to implement these ideas in Bulgaria once she became independent and once he was in power: “I was almost hanged because I fought for the freedom, for the self-government that I learned to appreciate in England.” His guiding principle was “the greatest happiness for the greatest number”, and he did everything

¹³⁰ “The Delegates from Southern Bulgaria”, *The Northern Echo*, 24 April 1879.

¹³¹ He held a high position at home at the time. The National Bank of Bulgaria was established in 1879, during the Russian administration of Bulgaria, and Geshov was its governor from 1883 to 1886. The first law on the National Bank was passed during his tenure (1885), and his British experience must have been of great assistance.

¹³² “Mr Gladstone and the Bulgarian Question”, *The Morning Post*, 17 Oct. 1885, p. 5G.

¹³³ Genov, *Gladston*, 317.

¹³⁴ Mijatovich, *Memoirs*, 62.

¹³⁵ Geshov, *Spomeni*, 37–38.

he could “for the greatest majority of our people — small peasants”. Finally, during his tenure as prime minister of Bulgaria (1911–13), proportional representation was introduced. This last achievement prompted him to say: “I finished with what had initiated my political career, the struggle for the freedom of the slave.”¹³⁶ By promulgating the law on proportional representation Geshov proved to be a man of principle, since his National Party could only lose from its implementation and his bitterest enemy, Bulgarian King Ferdinand, could only gain.¹³⁷

At this point due attention should be given to a prominent British journalist who did much to inspire Anglophilia in some leading Balkan Christian politicians: **James David Bouchier**. With the background of a classical scholar at Trinity College, Dublin, and King’s College, Cambridge, he went, in April 1888, on a trial mission to Romania and Bulgaria for *The Times*. He soon became so fascinated with the Balkans and with Bulgaria in particular that he chose to be an advocate of the Balkan Christians’ liberation. Before Bouchier’s arrival there was no special correspondent for Balkan Christian countries. In July 1895, he was promoted to “Our Own Correspondent”, which meant that he became *The Times* first permanent full-time correspondent in the Balkans.

Considering that Bouchier was *The Times* correspondent in South-East Europe for some twenty-five years, that he sent dispatches almost daily, and that no other British daily had a permanent correspondent in the Balkans, his influence was unprecedented. It is not far-fetched to claim that neither before nor since has any British journalist had such an influence on Balkan politics.

On the eve of the Balkan Wars a peculiar set of circumstances occurred. In Greece Venizelos became prime minister in 1910, in Bulgaria Geshov took the same office in March 1911 and won the election in September 1911. At that point (1911), the creation of a Balkan alliance, a dream of many British supporters of Balkan Christians, very much depended on Greco-Bulgarian understanding. The fact that two admirers of Britain were prime ministers of the two Balkan countries centrally important for the alliance provided Bouchier with a unique opportunity.

Bouchier worked towards the establishment of a Balkan alliance both openly, through his newspaper articles, and secretly, through his special activities. After his death, Geshov recalled: “There is no foreigner who so efficaciously worked for shaping public opinion in Bulgaria in favour of a Balkan League as he.”¹³⁸ Proposals with historical implications were de-

¹³⁶ Ibid.

¹³⁷ See Richard J. Crampton, *Bulgaria 1878–1918. A History* (Boulder Co: East European Monographs, 1983), 401–402.

¹³⁸ Lady Grogan, *The Life of J. D. Bouchier* (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1925), 211.

veloped in his room at Grande Bretagne Hotel in the very heart of Athens. It was there that he held long talks with the Anglophile prime minister of Greece, Eleutherios Venizelos, between autumn 1910 and spring 1911. The idea of proposing an alliance to Bulgaria gradually crystallized. Through a colleague of Bouchier's, it was secretly transmitted to the Bulgarian legation in Vienna, to the Bulgarian court and to Ivan Geshov. Bouchier had meetings with Geshov on 3 November 1911 and 6 February 1912 in Sofia. On the latter occasion Geshov gave him a personal message for Venizelos.¹³⁹ Finally, the Greco-Bulgarian Treaty was signed on 29 May 1912. After this treaty was signed all Christian states in the Balkans became allies and in the First Balkan War (October 1912 – May 1913) the rest of Balkan Christians were finally liberated from Ottoman rule.

That Bouchier created the Balkan Alliance, as Sir Reginald Rankin¹⁴⁰ or Lady Grogan suggest,¹⁴¹ is an overstatement, but he certainly fostered it. Yet, the formation of the Balkan League was a rare, if not unique, instance in the history of the Balkans of a British journalist being able to influence the course of Balkan history. Bouchier's joy was short-lived, though. The Second Balkan War broke out on 29 June 1913, as a result of antagonisms among the winners of the First Balkan War (Bulgaria, Greece and Serbia), and their inability to reach a compromise as regards Macedonia.

At this point Geshov proved to be a conciliatory voice in Bulgaria, but the militarist party which consisted of Macedonian-born officers blocked his peacemaking efforts. Aware that he would not be able to pursue an initiative for arbitration, Geshov resigned. His successor, Danev, was much less inclined to negotiations and a new Balkan war soon broke out.¹⁴² The animosities between former allies reached a high pitch, and were sustained as the Balkan states took different sides in the First World War to settle the issues that the Second Balkan War had left behind.

Subsequently, Geshov was well received in Britain for being in favour of Bulgaria's alliance with the Entente rather than with the Central Powers. His book on the Balkan League was published in London in 1915. The book and his contributions published in the British press made him widely known among the portion of the British public interested in the Balkans. His writing style differed greatly from other Balkan propaganda efforts in Britain which simply attacked opponents. He always sought to present his adversaries' position correctly, and then to offer Bulgarian arguments as the

¹³⁹ Ibid., 137.

¹⁴⁰ Sir Reginald Rankin, *Inner History of the Balkan War* (Constable and Co.).

¹⁴¹ Edward Boyle, "M. Ivan Gueshoff", *The Times*, 18 March 1924, p. 13G, credited Geshov, Venizelos and J. D. Bouchier with the formation of the Balkan League.

¹⁴² Gibbons, *Venizelos*, 143–145.

most acceptable. In this respect, all three prominent Balkan Anglophiles portrayed here, Gennadios, Mijatović and Geshov, demonstrated their appreciation of the British sense of fairness.

Of all the Balkan Anglophiles Geshov was the wealthiest one. In 1897 he became sole inheritor of the huge property of his uncle Evlogii, who had lived in Bucharest, which caused great dissatisfaction of his family, and was accompanied by various unpleasant rumours spread by his political opponents in Bulgaria.¹⁴³

Humanitarian work was yet another important activity in Geshov's career. He was a member of the Bulgarian Red Cross from its founding in the 1880s, and became its life-long president in 1899. Under his presidency, it quadrupled its branches to sixty in 1924. He was instrumental in creating a nursing school in 1889, and in building a special 100-bed hospital for the Bulgarian Red Cross. In both initiatives he was the pioneer in the Balkans.¹⁴⁴

He is also a central figure in the history of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. The Bulgarian Literary Society founded in Braila in 1869 was transferred to Sofia in 1881, when Geshov became a member. He was elected its treasurer in 1884 and its president in 1889. He was instrumental in the transformation of the Society into the Bulgarian Academy, and he contributed to its founding with 120,000 leva in 1908.¹⁴⁵

Geshov's fondness of Britain was aptly summarised in *The Times* obituary: his education "together with his subsequent residence in Manchester made him thoroughly at home with the English language and with English modes of thought."¹⁴⁶

D. Some parallels between the Balkan Anglophiles

Although only five Balkan Anglophiles have been covered in this paper some parallels between them seem obvious. Common features include institution building inspired by Britain, mostly in the field of banking and liberal laws (Mijatović and Geshov) or education (Gennadios and Venizelos). The Balkan Anglophiles found their most fervent supporters in Britain amongst the clergy of the Church of England, particularly the High Church. Therefore they were very active in the effort to bring the Orthodox Churches and the Church of England as close together as possible. In this

¹⁴³ Statelova, *Ivan Evstratiev Geshov*, 199–224.

¹⁴⁴ Geshov, *Vizgledi i deinost*, 167–168.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 169–173.

¹⁴⁶ "M. Ivan Gueshoff", *The Times*, 8 March 1924, p. 13g.

respect, Gennadios was the most active of all, but the other Balkan Anglophiles were also sympathetic towards the idea. Mijatović, who had a Non-conformist wife, was also very much inspired by Scottish Presbyterians and personally protected a Protestant Nazarene sect in Serbia while holding the office of minister in Belgrade. Two of them had British wives (Gennadios and Mijatović) and Venizelos's second wife came from a well-known family of the British Greek community. Being married to British ladies, Gennadios and Mijatović were natural bridges between cultures, and published dozens of articles and books on their native countries in England, but also translated books and articles from and into English. Both were fortunate in that their British wives fully embraced the national ideas of their native countries. Jovanović was also active in translating from English into Serbian. The table below offers a summary of the legacy of Anglophilia in Balkan Christian countries:

	<i>Institutions inspired by Britain</i>	<i>Foreign policy</i>	<i>Church affairs and the Church of England</i>	<i>Cultural affairs and institutions inspired by Britain</i>	<i>Incident/ major event in relations with Britain</i>
Vladimir Jovanović		•Pro-Russian	•Close relations with the Church of England	•Political Dictionary •Translation of Mill's works	•Crisis in Serbo-Ottoman relations in 1862
Čedomilj Mijatović	•National Bank of Serbia •Free trade	•Pro-Austrian •Pro-Anglo-American during WWI	•Possible union with the Church of England	•Gothic novel •Protestant sermons •Work inspired by Samuel Smiles •Translations	•Serbo-Bulgarian War •May Coup
Ioannis Gennadios	•Renewal of Greek bonds at London Stock Exchange	•Pro-British	•Possible union with the Church of England	•Gennadius Library in Athens	•Dilessi Murders •Resignation in 1916
Eleutherios Venizelos	•British-style educational system	•Pro-British and pro-French in 1912–20 •Balanced foreign policy in 1928–33		•English schools in Greece	•Crises in 1913 and 1915 •Greek Schism
Ivan Evstratiev Geshov	•National Bank of Bulgaria •Proportional representation	•Pro-Russian and pro-Entente		•Philanthropy	•Support for the Unification in 1885

All the Balkan Anglophiles had cosmopolitan ideas and supported global initiatives, in particular the League of Nations, although they all were nationalists at the same time. Their nationalism was liberal and, while supporting their respective national causes, almost all of them believed in a general emancipation of humankind. This duality is best exemplified by a statement in Geshov's *Memories*: "There is no greater history in the history of mankind than that of the resurrection of a nation."¹⁴⁷ Indeed they all believed that the emancipation of their nations would contribute to the progress of mankind at large. In this sense, they all shared ideas that combined Mazzini and Gladstone. All five were passionate admirers of Gladstone, and four of them met him personally.

Finally, all five used every opportunity to try to influence British public opinion. All were well-informed about what the British press liked, and knew how to present their countries to the reading public. Therefore, it is only natural that they played major roles in the efforts to alleviate the effects of the incidents and developments that threatened to undermine relations between Britain and their countries. Jovanović stood up for Serbia after the Ottoman bombardment of Belgrade in 1862. Gennadios was most directly involved in the passionate debate following the Dilessi murders and also in the situation that arose in 1915 when Greece remained neutral. Mijatović struggled relentlessly to lessen the antagonisms towards Serbia during the Serbo-Bulgarian War and after the May Coup. Geshov defended Bulgarian interests in 1879 and in 1886 in Britain, and under very difficult circumstances after Bulgaria joined the Central Powers. Finally, Venizelos was singularly effective in presenting the Greek side of things to Britons on all occasions, but particularly in 1912–20.

Through all their cultural and political activities the Balkan Anglophiles left a lasting mark on the history of relations between Britain and Balkan Christian countries, but also an important legacy to the Balkans: recognition of the need for cooperation among the Balkan nations. They disseminated Victorian messages of Christian affection and promoted liberal ideas. Their fondness of Britain undoubtedly inspired their cosmopolitanism and had some influence on their advocacy of peaceful conflict resolution.

UDC 930.85(497):316.75(=111)]"18/19"

Bibliography and sources

Archives of the Serbian Academy of Sciences, Belgrade, No. 9792/13 (Č. Mijatović to P. Todorović, July 7th/20th 1902).

¹⁴⁷ Geshov, *Spomeni*, 3.

- Baillie Cochrane, Alexander. *The Kingdom of Greece*. London: Harrison, 1862.
- Bešlin, Branko. *Evropski uticaji na srpski liberalizam u XIX*. Novi Sad 2005.
- Boyle, Edward. "M. Ivan Gueshoff". *The Times*, 18 March 1924.
- Bridges, Peter. "The only diplomatist". *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 16, no. 1 (March 2005).
- Burrows, Ronald. "Venizelos and the Greek Crisis". *The Contemporary Review* (May 1915).
- "Philhellenism in England and France". *The Contemporary Review* (July 1916).
- "Venizelos in Athens". *The New Europe*, 5 July 1917.
- Chester, S. B. *Life of Venizelos*. London: Constable, 1921.
- Clogg, Richard. "The British School at Athens and the Modern History of Greece". *Journal of Modern Hellenism* 10 (1993).
- "The 'ingenious enthusiasm' of Dr. Burrows and the 'unsatiated hatred' of Professor Toynbee". *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook IX* (1993).
- *Britain and Greece*. London: Foreign & Commonwealth Office, 1995.
- *A Concise History of Greece*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Crampton, Richard J. *Bulgaria 1878–1918. A History*. Boulder Co: East European Monographs, 1983.
- *Bulgaria*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Davidson, Most. Rev. Randall T. *Allocution on the Relations of the Anglican and Eastern-Orthodox Churches*. London: Faith Press, 1923.
- Eighteenth Annual Report of the Association of Chambers of Commerce*. London: Dr. Johnson Press, 1878.
- Eleutherios Venizelos and English Public Opinion*. Pamphlet no. 19. Anglo-Hellenic League, 1915.
- England's Welcome to Venizelos*. Pamphlet no. 35. Anglo-Hellenic League, 1917.
- Frazer, Sir J. G. "The Cursing of Venizelos". *The New Europe*, 22 Feb. 1917.
- Gennadios, John. "Hellenism in England. Introduction". In Theodore E. Dowling, D.D., and Edwin W. Fletcher, F. S. A. Scot., *Hellenism in England*, 19–57. London: Faith Press, 1915.
- "Autobiographical Notes" / Αφιέρωμα στον Ιωάννη Γεννάδιο. *The New Griffon* 4 (2001).
- "The Greek Community and the League of Nations Union". *To-day and To-morrow*, vol. III, no. 5 (Aug.-Sept. 1920). Republished in *The Covenant. A Quarterly Review of the League of Nations* (July 1920 or 1921).
- Genov, Rumen. *Gladston*. Sofia: Open Society, 1996.
- Geshov, Ivan Evstratiev. *The Balkan League*. London: John Murray, 1915.
- *Spomeni iz godini na borbi i pobedi*. Sofia: Gutenberg, 1916.
- *Vǔzgleđi i deinost*. Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1926.
- *Spomeni i studii*. Sofia: P. Glukovu, 1928.
- Gibbons, Herbert Adam. *Venizelos*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1920.
- Glasgow, George. *Ronald Burrows. A Memoir*. London: Nisbet & Co., 1924.

- Goldstein, Eric. "Great Britain and Greater Greece 1917–1920". *The Historical Journal* 32, no. 2 (1989).
- Grogan, Lady. *The Life of J. D. Bouchier*. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1925.
- Hermitage Day, E. "The Renaissance of Greece. An Interview with Dr. Gennadius". *The Treasury* (Sept. 1920).
- Holland, Robert and Diana Markides. *The British and the Hellenes. Struggles for Mastery in the Eastern Mediterranean 1850–1960*. Oxford: OUP, 2008.
- Jenkins, Romilly. *The Dilessi Murders: Greek brigands and English hostages*. London: Pion, 1998.
- Jovanović, Slobodan. "Vladimir Jovanović". Vol. 11 of *Collected Works*. Belgrade 1991.
- Jovanović, Vladimir. *Za slobodu i narod pokušaji*. Novi Sad 1868.
- Kerofilas, Dr. C. *Eleftherios Venizelos. His Life and Work*. Transl. by Beatrice Barstow. London: John Murray 1915.
- Kitromilides, Paschalis M. "Venizelos' Intellectual Projects and Cultural Interests". In *Eleftherios Venizelos. The Trials of Statesmanship*, ed. Paschalis M. Kitromilides. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.
- Leeper, A. W. E. "Allied Portrait: (I) Eleftherios Venizelos". *The New Europe*, 23 Nov. 1916.
- Livadas, Dr. Th. *Artemis G. Genadius. Biographical Reminiscences*. London 1890 (originally published in Greek in 1884).
- Mackenzie Wallace, Sir Donald, Prince Kropotkin, C. Mijatovich, J. D. Bouchier. *A Short History of Russia and the Balkan States*. London: The Encyclopaedia Britannica Company, 1914.
- Marković, Slobodan G. *Grof Čedomilj Mijatović. Viktorijanac među Srbima*. Belgrade: Belgrade Law School and Dosije Press, 2006.
- "The Celebration of 'Kosovo Day'". *The South Slav Journal*, vol. 28, no. 1-2/107-108 (Spring-Summer 2007), 85–96.
- Mijatovich, Chedomille. *A Royal Tragedy. Being the Story of the Assassination of King Alexander and Queen Draga of Servia*. London: Eveleigh Nash, 1906.
- *Servia and the Servians*. London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, 1908. [2nd (1911) and 3rd (1915) British editions by Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons. American editions: Boston: L.C. Page & Company, 1908; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913; New York: Scribner, 1914.]
- "The New Era in Turkey". *The Times*, 4 August 1908, p. 6 f.
- "The Agram Trial and the Servian Nation". *The Times*, 4 October 1908, p. 6 f.
- "Pitanje o sjedinjenju crkava". *Hrišćanski vesnik XXVI*, No. 5 (May 1909), 321–330.
- "Serbia's True Case. Interests of the Allies". *Daily Telegraph*, 13 November 1915.
- *The Memoirs of a Balkan Diplomatist*. London: Cassel and Co., 1917.
- Mijatovics, Elodie Lawton. *The History of Modern Serbia*. London: William Tweedie, 1872.
- *Serbian Folk-lore, popular tales selected and translated by Madam Csedomille Mijatovics*. London: W. Isbister & Co., 1874.
- *Kosovo: an Attempt to bring Serbian National Songs, about the Fall of the Serbian Empire at the Battle of Kosovo, into one Poem*. London: W. Isbister, 1881.

- Morfill, W. R. "The Sufferings of a Bulgarian Patriot". *The Westminster Review*, No. 135:1 (Jan. 1891).
- Mr Baring's and Mr. Schuyler's Reports on the Atrocities Committed upon the Christians in Bulgaria*. London: Goubaud & Son, 1876.
- Nicol, Donald M. *Joannes Gennadios, The Man. A Bibliographical Sketch*. Athens: American School of Classical Studies, 1990.
- Owen, Frank. *Tempestuous Journey. Lloyd George, his life and times*. London: Hutchinson, 1954.
- Papadakis, Nikolaos Emm. *Eleftherios K. Venizelos. A Biography*. Chania: National Research Foundation Eleftherios K. Venizelos, 2006.
- Penny Illustrated Paper*, 5 December 1885.
- Petsalis Diomidis, N. *Greece at the Paris Peace Conference (1919)*. Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, 1978.
- Price, Crawford. *Venizelos and the War. A Sketch of Personalities & Politics*. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co. Ltd, 1917.
- Rankin, Sir Reginald. *Inner History of the Balkan War*. London: Constable and Co., 1914.
- Punch or the London Charivari*, 5 Sept. 1917.
- Riley Athelstan, John. "M. Gennadius", *The Times*, 17 Sept. 1932.
- St. Clair, William. *That Greece Might Still Be Free. The Philhellenes in the War of Independence*. London: OUP, 1972.
- Stokes, Gale. *Legitimacy through Liberalism*. Seattle and London: U. of Washington Press, 1975.
- Taylor, A. J. P., ed. *Lloyd George. A Diary by Frances Stevenson*. New York and London: Harper & Row, 1971.
- Taylor, Derek. *Don Pacifico. The Acceptable Face of Gunboat Diplomacy*. London, Portland OR: Valentine Mitchell, 2008.
- Temperley, Harold. "The Bulgarian and Other Atrocities, 1875-8, in the Light of Historical Criticism". *The Proceedings of the British Academy XVII* (1931).
- The Retirement of Mr. Gennadius. Speeches of Monsieur Venizelos, M. Joannes Gennadius, Lord Robert Cecil, the Hon. W. Pember Reeves, Principal Burrows and others at a valedictory Dinner given by M. Venizelos on November 18, 1918 in Honour of M. Gennadiu*. Pamphlet no. 38. London: The Anglo-Hellenic League, 1919.
- "The Servian Nationalities", *The Examiner*, 21 July 1871.
- The Tragedy of the Christian near East, by Lysimachos Oeconomos, Lecturer in Modern Greek and Byzantine History at the University of London (King's College). Appendix, the Smyrna holocaust by Charles Dobson, M. C., Late British Chaplain of Smyrna*. Pamphlet No. 50. The Anglo-Hellenic League, 1923.
- Tregaskis, Hugh. *Beyond the Grand Tour. The Levant Lunatics*. London: Ascent Books, 1979.
- Trevelyan, G. M. *British History in the Nineteenth Century and After: 1782-1919*. London: Penguin, 1968.
- Seligman, Vincent J. *The Victory of Venizelos. A Study of Greek Politics, 1910-1918*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1920.

- Seton-Watson, R. W. *Disraeli, Gladstone and the Eastern Question. A study in diplomacy and party politics*. New York: The Norton Library, 1972.
- Shannon, R. T. *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation*. Hassocks, Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1975.
- Speech of Mr. E. Venizelos to the people delivered in Athens on Sunday, August 27, 1915*. Pamphlet no. 28. The Anglo-Hellenic League, 1916.
- Statelova, Elena. *Ivan Evstratiev Geshov. Ili trúnliviat pút na súzidaniето*. Sofia: Academic Press – Marin Drinov, 1994.
- Stefanidis, Ioannis D. “Venizelos’ Last Premiership”. In Pashcalis M. Kitromilides, ed., *Eleutherios Venizelos. The Trials of Statesmanship*. Edinburgh University Press, 2006.
- Stead, William T. “Character Sketches: Members of the Parliament of Peace”. *The Review of Reviews*, June 1899.
- *The Review of Reviews*, vol. XIX (1899).
- “A Clairvoyant Vision of the Assassination at Belgrade”. *The Review of Reviews* 28 (July 1903).
- The Athenaeum*, No. 4202, 9 May 1908.
- The Daily News and Leader*, 17 April 1915.
- The Manchester Guardian*, 21 June, 1915.
- The Morning Post*, 17 Oct. 1885.
- The New York Times*, 15 May 1932, 19 July 1890.
- The Northern Eco*, 17 July 1876, 17 March 1879, 24 April 1879.
- The Times* 14 Feb. 1877, 21 Feb. 1877, 25 February 1886, 1 March 1877, 16 March 1877, 3 April 1877, 6 April 1877, 11 April 1877, 26 Sept. 1877, 23 April 1879, 2 May 1879, 5 May 1879, 12 November 1889, 24 Oct. 1908, 8 Sept. 1932, 12 Sept. 1932.
- The World* no. 1787, 24 Aug. 1915.
- Vaka, Demetra. *Constantine King & Traitor*. London: John Lane, 1918.
- Venizelos, E. K. Foreword to George Glasgow, *Ronald Burrows: a Memoir*. London: Nesbit & Co., 1924.
- Venizelos and his fellow countrymen, by P. N. Ure*. Pamphlet no. 30. The Anglo-Hellenic League, 1917.
- Yovanovich, Vladimir. *The Serbian Nation and the Eastern Question*. London: Bell and Daldy, 1863.
- *The Emancipation and Unity of the Serbian Nation*. Geneva 1871.
- *The Near Eastern Problem and the Pan-German Peril*. London: Watts and Co., 1909.
- “The Balkan Confederacy”. *The Near East*, vol. 2, no. 21, 5 January 1910.
- Yovitchitch, Lena A. *The Biography of a Serbian Diplomat*. London: The Epworth Press, 1939.