



ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ

Εθνικόν και Καποδιστριακόν  
Πανεπιστήμιον Αθηνών

ΙΔΡΥΘΕΝ ΤΟ 1837

Τμήμα Ιστορίας και Φιλοσοφίας της Επιστήμης

Τομέας Φιλοσοφίας και Θεωρίας της Επιστήμης και της Τεχνολογίας

## ΣΕΜΙΝΑΡΙΟ ΔΙΔΑΣΚΟΝΤΩΝ

Σειρά διαλέξεων ανοικτών σε όλους

τους διδάσκοντες και φοιτητές του ΕΚΠΑ

**Αριστείδης Χατζής:**

**«Οι “απόλυτοι βάρβαροι” ως θύματα:**

**Εκδοχές δικαιολόγησης της σφαγής στην Τριπολιτσά»**

**Τρίτη 9 Απριλίου 2024, 19.00**

**Νέο Κτήριο ΙΦΕ (ισόγειο)**

**Περίληψη:** On October 5, 1821, the Greek revolutionaries captured the city of Tripolitsa, triggering an eruption of extreme violence. The “Tripolitsa massacre”, a gruesome event that took place during the Greek War of Independence in 1821, has long been a subject of both historical analysis and ethical debate. In this paper I examine the rationalizations used by Greek revolutionaries in their memoirs, but also by later historians, to defend not the massacre but the behavior of the Greeks involved. Initially, I discuss two arguments presented during the Revolution and in the decades that followed: the “cycle of violence” argument and the “mirroring the known model” argument. Nowadays, these two arguments can be integrated into a broader “contextualizing the massacre within the wider conflict” approach like those that modern historians use in similar instances. Linked to this is the modern “presentism” argument, which is not necessarily relativistic; it leans more towards positivism. If we accept these arguments, we might exonerate the Greeks from moral blame or even moral responsibility for what happened – and of course we can even reject our authority or the value of analyzing distant historical events in moral terms. However, as we’ll see, without necessarily rejecting positivism and without adopting strong theories of moral objectivity or moral progress, we can embrace a form of “moral or historical disapproval” (as philosopher Miranda Fricker proposes). This disapproval is for past acts not necessarily deemed immoral by the majority at the time, but rather acts that could have been seen in a less routine, more nuanced moral light, resulting in exceptional moral judgments. We will then present evidence that there were indeed Greeks of that era capable of such exceptional moral discernment, often tied to Christian morality. Additionally, we will explore another line of defense used both by Greeks and non-Greek Philhellenes (supporters of the Greek cause). This justification mirrors the “bandwagon” fallacy, suggesting Greeks merely emulated what the Ottomans but also the Europeans had done in numerous prior instances. Interestingly, British Philhellenes appeared willing to offset Greek actions against those of other Europeans and the British themselves. The overall Philhellenes’ response to Greek atrocities is marked by a prevailing orientalist perspective, alongside romanticized views, and political considerations. British liberals were willing to unabashedly apply double standards, if it served the Greek cause — a cause they had championed for their political ends. In the concluding segment, I will examine the efforts of the Greek revolutionary Government to absolve Greeks from blame for the massacre by skillfully employing nearly all the previously discussed arguments in a pamphlet prepared for the British opinion makers. As an appendix, we publish the text from this obscure and underutilized pamphlet.

**Το πλήρες πρόγραμμα διαλέξεων του ακαδ. έτους 2023-24:**

7.11.2023	Alex Paseau: «The Euclidean Programme»
12.12.2023	Ερμής Πλευράκης: «Ο Χέγκελ και οι θετικές επιστήμες»
9.4.2024	Αριστείδης Χατζής: «Οι “απόλυτοι βάρβαροι” ως θύματα: Εκδοχές δικαιολόγησης της σφαγής στην Τριπολιτσά»
23.4.2024	Vanessa Seifert: «Metaphysics of Chemistry: What are chemical reactions?»
14.5.2024	Robert DiSalle