Urban historians have long associated modernizing a city with the modernization of people's mentalities. In reviewing the planning of Paris under Baron Haussmann (1853–70), the art historian T.J. Clark asserted: “Part of Haussmann's purpose was to give modernity a shape, and he seemed at the time to have a measure of success in doing so: he built a set of forms in which the city appeared to be visible, even intelligible: Paris, to repeat the formula, was becoming a spectacle.” Nevertheless, Clark and others considered Haussmann's project incomplete and unsuccessful, as it met with constant opposition by the citizens. Reviewing the same period through a different lens, the cultural historian Marshall Berman focused on the work of the poet and critic Baudelaire, who, according to Berman, “shows us something that no other writer sees so well: how the modernization of the city at once inspires and enforces the modernization of its citizens’ souls.”

Does urban change, indeed, affect inhabitants' daily patterns and their mental picture of the city? Is it possible to examine how new architecture and planning affect the people? Can the modernization of a city cause the modernization of the citizens' souls? We will examine these questions by focusing on Thessaloniki, Greece. After a review of the city's earlier history, we will focus on the major urban projects and the relevant urban literature since the 1950s. Our aim is to gauge the support for and resistance to urban changes, as reflected in the literature. Although literary depictions of a city do not necessarily represent mainstream public opinion, they do open a window onto people's private thoughts. We believe that our research reveals an image of the city that is at once familiar to locals and illuminating to urban planners and historians.
Furthermore, by examining the image of the city through the eyes of writers, we are obliquely addressing the following broader questions: Do changes in the architecture and planning of a city enter into people's consciousness? In short, do architecture and planning matter?

**THESSALONIKI BEFORE THE 1950S: AN URBAN AND LITERARY OVERVIEW**

Located on the major routes linking Europe with the Orient, Thessaloniki has had a continuous urban presence for more than twenty-three centuries. Founded around 315 BCE, the city became an important commercial, administrative, and cultural center, passing successively through Hellenistic, Roman, Byzantine, and Ottoman periods. Each period left its particular imprint on the city's architecture and urbanism. A large community of Spanish Jews was established in the city in the end of the fifteenth century, further enriching its cosmopolitan character. Thessaloniki was incorporated into the Greek state in 1912. As the second-largest city in Greece, it has continued to enjoy steady growth.

At the turn of the twentieth century, Thessaloniki was a multietnic city with a population of 150,000. Its medieval framework, with dense and irregular streets, clearly defined urban clusters, and introverted neighborhoods, survived and supported the city's demographic and social physiognomy. As the Ottoman Empire instituted westernizing reforms (Tanzimat, from 1839 to 1876), Thessaloniki underwent gradual modernization from 1869 onward. Its sea walls were demolished, allowing the city to expand toward the sea, where a modern quay was developed. Thessaloniki's occidental character was enhanced by a new rail link with Europe and Istanbul, newly organized port facilities, a modern central business district, and the construction of new residential areas outside of its traditional nucleus. These changes sharpened the city's socioeconomic stratification, but did not alter drastically its overall urban character.

In 1912, the Greek army succeeded in capturing Thessaloniki and the surrounding regions from the Ottomans, incorporating them into the Greek state. According to the 1913 census compiled by the new Greek administration, there were 157,889 inhabitants, of whom 62,439 (38.91 percent) were Jews, 45,867 (29.05 percent) were Muslims, and 39,956 (23.31 percent) were Orthodox Christians. There were also French, English, and Italian inhabitants. Thessaloniki's residential and civic/religious sectors reflected the city's multietnic population. While the city had enjoyed a central commercial role under Ottoman rule, comparable to that of İzmir or Alexandria, after its incorporation into the Greek state it was downgraded to a provincial center. Between 1855 and 1930, Greek literary production in Thessaloniki remained rather slight. Athens served as the undisputed capital of the Greek novel until at least the 1920s.

In 1917, a major fire destroyed 128 hectares (316 acres) of the tightly built historic center. The fire dealt a major blow to the prominent Jewish community, destroying three-quarters of its neighborhoods and leaving 70,000 people homeless. Immediately after the fire, the Greek government redesigned the downtown according to the latest methods of modern town planning. The Ministry of Communications (the government...
department responsible for town planning) set up an International Commission for the
New Plan of Thessaloniki, headed by French architect Ernest Hébrard.

Hébrard’s plan, which followed Beaux-Arts principles, radically reshaped the
urban space along European lines. Thessaloniki was to be transformed into a national
urban center of monumental scale. The proposed regular blocks and broad boulevards
reflected planning principles of the preceding decades, evident in Haussmann’s designs
for Paris, the City Beautiful movement in the United States, and contemporary colonial
designs around the world. Ancient, Byzantine, and Ottoman historic buildings became
focal points of the composition, projected against a neo-Byzantine architectural back-
ground. Traces of the old city’s layout were swept away, except for the Upper Town,
which was preserved due to its picturesque qualities. Hébrard’s plan also echoed the
rigorous grid pattern of Hellenistic Thessaloniki, but articulated it with major diagonal
avenues for the accommodation of modern traffic. This drastic urban undertaking was
intended to cement the Greek presence in the city and signal a new national beginning.
Under Hébrard’s direction, the commission completely redesigned the downtown area,
introducing a central north-south civic axis, Aristotelous Avenue, linking the Upper
Town with the sea. The redesign of the historic center, along with future extensions, was
intended to accommodate a predicted population of 350,000 (as opposed to the existing
170,000), covering an area of 2,400 hectares (5,930 acres). The inward-focused character
of the late Ottoman city gave place to a modern, open arrangement that introduced the
apartment block, the use of reinforced concrete, and the freehold land system.

The freehold land system (or “horizontal landownership,” as the term is described
in Greek) allowed the ownership of individual apartments in a multistory building and
the corresponding ownership of a percentage of the original building lot. Before the
introduction of the freehold system, the owner of a lot was by law also the owner of the building on it. Co-ownership was not permitted within the same building. The freehold system was introduced for the first time in Thessaloniki's post-fire rebuilding. Later, it made possible the accommodation of the Asia Minor refugees of 1922–23 and the post-1950s internal migration. It liberated real estate properties from chronic ownership disputes and encouraged the redevelopment of urban centers and the construction of higher-density apartment buildings in Thessaloniki.

The implementation of Hébrard's design proceeded slowly, frequently adjusted to accommodate property rights, increased speculative activity, and the sharp economic divisions that resulted after the fire. Although the newly designed center featured smaller squares and plots than those in the original plan, it signaled the radical modernization of urban structure and form for the intramural city. The new plan eliminated the old spatial patterns, erased the territorial basis of the ethnic-religious communities, and replaced them with a homogenized city fabric that was stratified according to social and economic criteria. Although new ownership of the historical center included many of its former residents, the numerous poorer inhabitants were forced out of the center. Traditional activities and old business sites were replaced with a modern urban center that included financial, commercial, and civic districts. The extraordinary political and military events that followed World War I, however, spelled the suspension of most planning activities and the drastic adjustment of the Hébrard plan.

Between 1919 and 1922, the Greek army led an expansionist campaign in Asia Minor, aiming to incorporate Izmir and its surrounding areas into the Greek state. After

Refugee houses in the Upper Town, an example of vernacular architecture.
the defeat of the Greek army, Greece and Turkey signed the Treaty of Lausanne (1923), which stipulated the compulsory exchange of minority populations between the two countries. More than 1.2 million Christian Greeks from Asia Minor migrated to Greece, and 355,000 Muslim Turks from Greece migrated to Turkey. At the time, Greece had fewer than 5 million inhabitants. From the start, Thessaloniki was the main pole of attraction for the urban refugees: 117,000 settled in the city between 1920 and 1928, while approximately 25,000 Muslims left with the forced exchange. These dramatic changes placed extraordinary pressures on the physical resources of the city and strained the finances of the city and the state. To control these changes, the public sector stepped in to approve all levels of planning, from the allocation of refugee settlements to the urban design and building of dwellings.\textsuperscript{30}

Given the urgency and speed of these extensive building efforts, planning was reduced to the most rudimentary level. As evidenced by the 1923 decree "On the rural settlement of refugees," every settlement was to be "planned in a rough manner and divided into building blocks."\textsuperscript{31} New buildings had only the minimum essentials, and almost no social amenities, such as parks or public squares. By 1930, the refugees had founded more than fifty settlements on the city's outskirts. These settlements, together with the camps for the Jewish victims of the 1917 fire, formed the "outcast city." They formed a ring of ghettoized districts, contrasting with the air of urbanity of the historic center.

The implementation of the new city plan, designed by Hébrard's team, was now restricted to the historic city center. Housing projects for the refugees bore no resemblance to Hébrard's elaborate design. Instead, they followed plain and uniform grid patterns and simple building codes and construction techniques, without regard to each site's special conditions or the cultural background of each refugee community. Even the city center was negatively affected by the strained economic resources. The construction of civic buildings was abandoned due to lack of funds, while the building blocks of the city bazaars were subdivided to accommodate small shopkeepers. Nevertheless, the city center emanated an air of vibrant economic activity that did not extend to the refugee developments.

In an expedient and haphazard manner, Thessaloniki underwent an unprecedented expansion in all directions, covering a surface area of more than 1,500 hectares (3,705 acres) by 1928 and 2,000 hectares (4,942 acres) by 1940. Although the influx of refugees helped transform Thessaloniki into a regional industrial metropolis, the complete neglect of the cultural particularities of the different refugee groups accelerated its transformation from a communal to a socially stratified city. Throughout the city's twentieth-century development, the historic center managed to retain some of its earlier character. This historic core overlaps with the Ottoman historic residential and commercial center, stretching north–south from the Upper Town to the Thermaic Gulf (or Gulf of Thessaloniki), and east–west from the White Tower to Vardari Square and the city's port. Modern architecture was restricted to the city center, with multistory apartment buildings becoming the new form of bourgeois housing. In contrast to the center's modern urban eclecticism, working-class housing on the city's outskirts was modest and semi-rural in appearance.
THE LITERARY RESPONSE

How did literature respond to the radical urban transformations following the 1917 fire and the influx of refugees? As the literary historian Peter Mackridge pointed out, after the incorporation of Thessaloniki into the Greek state in 1912, the nation-building project included the creation of literature that featured the expanded territories. While the architects reshaped Thessaloniki into a modern Greek city, the writers were expected to compose new literary landscapes about Greek Thessaloniki.

The School of Thessaloniki was the first major modern Greek literary movement. It flourished between 1930 and 1940 and represented the work of a fairly close-knit group of writers. They produced the modernist literary journal *Makedonikes Imeres* [Macedonian Days] (1932-39) and published mainly works of experimental prose. Despite its name, the School of Thessaloniki became known for its lack of place specificity and recognizable social and historical settings. Ignoring not only the nationalist propaganda but also the city's historical past, the writers described an introverted and troubled relationship to their environment, reflecting a private sense of loss and rootlessness. Most of the members of the School of Thessaloniki focused on the search for self and the cultivation of one's inner world, as articulated in the long interior monologues and their experimental novels. For example, Petros Spandonidis, in a poem titled "Saloniki-Saloniki" (Macedonian Days, September 1932), describes the city as "chaos city." The speaker, as a citizen of "chaos city," has chaos within himself as well. We believe that these writers, most of them newcomers to Thessaloniki, avoided specific discussions of the city in part because they did not yet possess a personal and deep familiarity with it. Moreover, their focus on the interior world and experimental prose reflected their engagement with a broader, contemporary European modernist movement that favored these themes.

THESSALONIKI SINCE THE 1950s: URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND LITERARY NARRATIVES

Planning Changes and the Destruction of Neighborhoods

All architectural and planning activity in the city came to a halt with the outbreak of World War II. Greece endured a brutal German occupation (1941-44) and a violent Civil War (1946-49). In 1943 Thessaloniki witnessed the mass expulsion of virtually the entire Jewish community (50,000 people) to the German camps, where most died—a loss of a population that had been a major component of the city's character for centuries.

Beginning in the 1950s, the population measured over 300,000. In an attempt to revive the local economy and reduce the growing housing problem, the government decided to mobilize private capital. The notorious increase in the building coefficients in 1955 and 1960 permitted an extensive exploitation of building plots (much denser in Thessaloniki than in other Greek cities) and triggered feverish building activity throughout the 1960s and 1970s. At the same time, the great wave of internal migra-
Urban growth from 1930 to 1990.
tion increased both the population and the size of the city, creating squatter settlements on the western periphery. The city increased in population and density too, with 557,000 inhabitants by 1971 and 706,000 by 1981.

Most urban literature since the 1950s has focused on the physical destruction of the built environment. Writers who had come into adulthood during the interwar years dwelled on the loss of the historic parts of the city and of its medieval and Ottoman street pattern, most of which had been obliterated in the 1917 fire. Their emphasis on the city's physical destruction may also reflect a symbolic reference to the Greek military catastrophe in Asia Minor and the subsequent loss of the Greek presence there. Some writers recorded the process of change and the disappearance of the old city with a naturalist's curiosity. Others illustrated urban change using dramatic and apocalyptic visions. Nikos Gabriil Pentzikis (1908-93) was the only member of the School of Thessaloniki to describe the city in detail, through the eyes of a narrator who favored long walks. In his collection of essays titled Mitera Thessaloniki [Mother Thessaloniki] (1970), he wrote: “For years now they have been working on widening the road. Workers go up to the old houses and demolish them. At first, the wooden skeleton of the roof is laid bare. The roof tiles are removed. The houses are left without a hat. Then starts the lowering of the walls. [...] The interior is revealed [...]”16 Vassilis Vassilikos (born in 1934 and best known for his political novel Z) recorded primarily the changes in the historic center and the Upper Town, focusing on the demolition of old houses as they entered into an uneven battle with new apartment buildings. Through vivid and even violent metaphors, he depicted the little houses falling under the ammunition of advancing engineering offices, victims of heavy building artillery.17 Most writers also criticized the destruction of the urban and social fabric of the city's old neighborhoods. Unlike Baudelaire's celebration of modernity, noted at the beginning of this chapter, most Greek writers bemoaned the advent of modernity in Thessaloniki because it ushered in menacing, tall, anonymous, and unarticulated apartment buildings that destroyed the earlier neighborhoods and turned the streets into dark and narrow passages. Often they described the disappearance of a neighborhood through the eyes of the returning protagonist. For example, the main character in one of Vassilikos's novels returns to Thessaloniki after years abroad and becomes devastated to discover the disappearance of his neighborhood, and with it, “of many narrow roads, where he had planted his agonies, his heart palpitations, in short, his whole adolescence.”18 More often, the narrator reflects on his childhood memories, as Sakis Papadimitriou (b. 1940) remarked in one of his essays (1960-73):

All these years in this quiet neighborhood I had almost no complaint. Of course, it was not some suburb with trees, green and openness; nevertheless, our house had its own little courtyard and next to us were other single houses or two-story houses. The apartment buildings were approaching in a threatening manner, two or three narrow streets further down. Eventually they would reach us, blocking the air, building up the courtyards, pulpifying the green. But for now, we still had a lot of time ahead of us.”19
Street in the Upper Town in 1900.
While demolition crews uncovered the private houses and the lives taking place inside them, something about the mystery of the old city and perhaps the mystery of the narrators' own childhoods suddenly came into sharp focus, and then was lost forever.

Frequently the demolition of traditional buildings became a metaphor for the destruction of traditional neighborhood ties, as expressed in the following prose poem by Dinos Christianopoulos (b. 1931), published in 1986:

**The Death of the Neighborhood**

At night, the son of the neighbor woman, [who lived] across from me, was waiting for me at the door. "Tonight my mother passed away," he told me, his eyes filled with tears. For a while we both remained silent; at that point, there were no appropriate words. "I thought of letting our neighbors know of the funeral, but aside from Mrs. Despoina and you, no one else of the old timers is left. My mother, who saw all her neighbors off, will now pass on alone."

"Our neighborhood, too, died with her," I thought, feeling a tightness in my heart.20
Opposite: The death of the neighborhood. From the original historic fabric, only monuments survived the process of urban modernization. All houses have been replaced by multistory apartment buildings. Visible in this aerial photograph are the Alaca Imaret mosque in the foreground, a multidome mosque set in a square; the Yeni Hamam baths, with one dome, mostly visible; and the large basilica church of Hagios Demetrios, near the Yeni Hamam.

Above: Popular landmarks: The church of Hagia Sophia and the "red building," across Hagia Sophia Square, dwarfed by the taller apartment buildings surrounding it.
Despite the city's continuous physical expansion, most authors described a circumscribed area, one that focused on the historic center and on the same major landmarks. These landmarks included not only historic buildings and sites but also commercial establishments, new streets and squares, the seafront, and the sea itself, the Thermaic Gulf. The White Tower continued to be the city's most recognizable symbol, a popular meeting spot and point of orientation. The city's numerous Byzantine churches, especially Hagia Sophia, continued to act as points of reference, along with the Red Building across from Hagia Sophia, with its ground-floor café, the foreign-language bookstore on Tsimiski Street, the basement of the (original) Fokas department store, the Modiano Market, and the Bravo coffee store. Narrators found themselves on Egnatia Street, remarking on its cheap merchandise, and on the shopping street Ermou, aptly named for the god of commerce, Hermes. See, for example, Yorgos Ioannou's reference in *Refugee Capital* (1984), published when the author had moved to Athens permanently: "Whether I arrive in Salonica by train, or in my imagination, I head straight up the Via Egnatia, naturally, toward the tall building where I lived for twenty-five years."

There is some inconsistency in descriptions of the city's transformations. Modern planning is supposed to produce an open city, legible to newcomers and old-timers alike. Thessaloniki's new plan, ordered according to geometric and transportation axes, transformed it from an inward-focused city, legible only to its own people through a complex system of symbols and references, to a public city that was supposed to be legible to everyone. In the process, writers maintained, the city lost its distinct interiority and its particular relationship with its inhabitants. This purported break with the past was not always supported, however, by the literature we reviewed. We found that most writers counterbalanced the effects of new planning by creating their own maps of Thessaloniki, organized around daily walks, shopping, and visits to cafés. The image of the city that continued to emerge from these narratives is not the open, modern city of the planners but rather the private city of its longtime inhabitants. In fact, as writers conveyed their own intimacy with Thessaloniki, even when they did not live there permanently, they assumed that their readers experienced the same familiarity. Consider, for example, the reference to a romantic date, described in one of the short stories by M. Karagatsis (1908-60): "At six in the evening. I will be there in my car in the narrow street behind the church of Hagia Sophia." The reader is expected to know the approximate if not precise spot of the meeting. The anti-development criticism regarding the destruction of the neighborhood notwithstanding, literary references to places—be they churches, cafés, or corner dairies—continued to appear in the literature about Thessaloniki. This leads us to conclude that despite the drastic planning changes, the literary city remained legible, and, for the most part, familiar to its residents.

Another example of the writers' continued intimacy with their city is the persistence of Thessaloniki as a locus eroticus. In the 1970s, the sites of this literary image focused primarily around Vardari Square (near the train station), the undeveloped suburbs of Karabournaki by the sea, in the suburb of Panorama in the hills, and in the unbuilt lots
throughout the city. The following undated prose poem by Christianopoulos reveals the narrator’s search for intimate encounters among the city’s familiar landmarks:

**Saturday Night**

From Vardari to the Fountain  
And from the [White] Tower to Dioikitiriou Square,  
I look for you in all the sidewalks of love for hire,  
I have been by all the construction sites looking for you. ...

Metaphorically, illicit love took place outside the newly planned city center, or in undeveloped parts of the city. But as the population continued to expand, these earlier spaces of escape disappeared under the homogenizing effects of growth and development.

Most of the well-known works on Thessaloniki were written by male authors, representing a decidedly masculine view of the city that offers sites for trysts (homosexual and heterosexual), exploration, and refuge. In many of these works, the female image represented a lover or a mother, both objects of desire and memory. Although there were female authors writing in Thessaloniki in the 1950s to 1980s, their sphere of activity remained more limited, focusing often on the personal rather than the public urban experience.

The novel *Fear* (1998), written in English by the Greek-born Irini Spanidou, who lives and writes in the United States, referred to the exclusion of women in the traditional city:

“You and I should talk,” he said.
He took her to a café, a dreary large-scale place with pale green oil-painted walls, a gray-and-black mosaic floor, and bright bare light bulbs hanging on black cords. There was a scattering of customers—two old men playing checkers, four men playing cards, a group of merchant marines drinking ouzo, and a solitary drunk.

There were no women. He always took her places where no women went: the barber, his tailor, men’s cafés—places where he should be going alone but needed company.

**FROM HOME TO APARTMENT: MASS CONSTRUCTION, EVIL DEVELOPERS, AND PROVINCIAL NEWCOMERS**

Thessaloniki continued to grow in a largely ad hoc manner, with more than ninety planning extension decrees enacted between 1921 and 1979. The expedient and utilitarian land development adopted for the refugee resettlement presaged the extensive exploitation of building sites in the postwar years. Sudden industrial growth and major public works, accompanied by a dying agrarian economy, brought an influx of new residents during the 1950s and 1960s who came primarily from the countryside. Small houses
gave way to multistory apartment buildings, which altered both the scale and the density of the city, destroying the earlier harmonious relationship between the city and its natural environment. Apartment ownership became the vehicle not only of urban development but also of urban assimilation. Throughout most of the city, modern architectural styles coexisted with the utilitarian design of the standard apartment block.

Most private home ownership was developed by small-scale contractors through the institution of antiparochi, a contractor-financed building arrangement that returned a percentage of the new development to the original landowner. Most new apartment buildings throughout Greece were financed through antiparochi. Building in Thessaloniki, however, was controlled by especially development-friendly building codes between 1956 and 1969. Throughout the consequent building frenzy, the state failed to undertake and safeguard the parallel development of adequate infrastructure for a functional and beautiful urban environment. 27 Multistory apartment buildings displaced the modest post-1950s housing construction in the city center and covered most of the open spaces. As building codes changed to allow still higher density, additional floors were added to existing low-rise structures. Private apartment ownership and exhaustive private development, at the expense of most other planning considerations, have governed most planning and design decisions to the present day.

Although the effects of unchecked urbanization can be seen throughout the country, they are especially apparent in Thessaloniki, where the homogeneous built fabric mirrors also its mostly homogeneous (Greek) population, contrasting with the celebrated multi-ethnic and visually distinctive city of the early twentieth century. Given the centralization of governmental, financial, and political institutions in Athens, Thessaloniki, like most other provincial Greek capitals, has been left to survive by its own devices.

As the city changed, writers bemoaned the loss not only of its earlier character but also of its earlier way of life. Postwar authors associated urban change with the advent of modernity, which they resisted and criticized. In one of his novels, Vassilis Vasilikos likened apartment buildings to prisons and apartments to prison cells. In another novel, the protagonist, alienated by the dominant political and social conditions, compared his situation to that of a deserted traditional single-family house, surrounded by identical apartment buildings with dirty light wells and no psychological escape. 28 (At the time, the apartment buildings lacked fire escapes as well.)

Although all of these changes were primarily the result of government legislation, most writers did not direct their anger toward the state. Contractors and predatory developers became the villains in many stories, as they exploited antiparochi and destroyed the city forever. Yorgos Ioannoú (1927–85), one of the most poignant raconteurs of Thessaloniki, who appeared on the literary scene in the 1960s, described the situation in one of his short stories (1972–73): “The house had already been surrendered to a gang of developers and in its place was erected an apartment building, among the most hideous ones. Now they are getting ready to demolish it, these ridiculous people. Who knows what their cunning brains have conceived for the next business plan?” 29
Perhaps these contractors were reviled precisely because they were “of the people,” as they often came from the working class, but profited from the city’s loss of character. In one of the novels by Nikos Bakolas (1927–99), contractors were compared to the black marketers who profited from their compatriots during the German occupation.30

In the 1950s and 1960s, there were only two notable exceptions to the ubiquitous apartment building developments: the flight of many higher-income residents to the hills of Panorama, an exclusive Thessaloniki suburb, and the appearance of the “villa” typology, an expensive, often modernist single-family dwelling surrounded by a large garden. Yet even these villas succumbed to wholesale apartmentization of the 1970s.

The city’s new planning and architecture intensified its social and economic stratification. Escaping to the city of the past became the defense mechanism for some of the writers, who did not recognize the new city, with its newcomers from the villages and the hinterland. In the literature from the 1960s and 1970s, we noticed a recurring distinction between the longtime urban residents of the city and the provincial newcomers, who became either excited or alienated by city life. Many of the writers dwelled especially on the inability and unwillingness of these newcomers to become integrated in the city’s fabric, just as the earlier refugees from Turkey remained apart from the local population for at least one generation. In a story by Tilemachos Alaveras (1926–2007), published in 1976, the narrator observes that domestic refugees “from all of Northern Greece, from New Orestiada, to Tsotyli came and perched in the developers’ matchboxes.”31 This distinction between old residents and newcomers was also subtly implied in the following newspaper chronicle by Ioannou, published in 1978: “In the wide streets stroll the people from the provinces on Sundays—in the morning, especially, and in the early afternoon. Of course, the locals stroll, too, but they are a lot fewer.”32 We believe that part of the criticism of the urban changes in Thessaloniki was the result of latent discrimination toward the newer residents.

In his essay collection Mother Thessaloniki, Pentzikis reflected on change through the eyes of an older woman:

Already the street has been widened in parts and buses go by, full of the population that has increased. The little lady in the poor little house across the street does not recognize her neighborhood any more. “Where did all the mansions go” she reflects, looking out of the narrow window of her house [. . .]. The only child of the wealthy home owner, who was planning to get married in that house some day, expired with the demolition of his house. Elsewhere, they destroyed altogether sixty imposing elm trees.33

It is not only the physical change that was recorded here. More deeply, the narrator describes the disappearance of the old, stable social order. Nostalgia was also laced with a conservative and selective remapping of the past.

Nevertheless, not all literary references were negative. Some of the characters in the work of Vassilikos and Ioannou remark that although the demolitions and higher-
density new building destroyed old neighborhoods, they did succeed in revealing and showcasing the city’s Byzantine physiognomy, as many of the Byzantine landmarks became focal points of the new designs. These two authors also acknowledged that from the point of view of the poorer residents, moving into apartment buildings signaled an improvement of their living conditions. Ioannou underscored that for the first time, many of the refugees were able to move into their own apartments, after suffering through long periods of temporary, makeshift, and crowded housing. Some of the characters of Vassilikos, more cosmopolitan and often returning to Thessaloniki after long absences abroad, acknowledge the overall improvements in the city, even at the cost of the old neighborhoods.

CONTEMPORARY PLANNING: PROTECTING THE PAST, ACCOMMODATING THE PRESENT

At the urban scale, Thessaloniki’s historic identity was enriched by three major archeological discoveries. Since 1962, excavations for the foundation of a new court building in the upper part of Hébrard’s civic axis uncovered the magnificent Forum Romanum. Meanwhile, ongoing excavations begun in 1945 in the eastern section of the historic nucleus (Navarinou Square) have unearthed the Palace and parts of the Hippodrome of the remarkable complex of Galerius Maximianus (reg 305–311). Furthermore, since 1990 a large part of the Hellenistic and Roman city has been uncovered at the northwest section of the center (Dioikitiriou Square). Also, for the first time a concurrent policy of conservation was applied, listing all of the city’s Ottoman monuments. Important as these discoveries were from an archeological point of view, they do not feature prominently in the city’s literature.

Writers acknowledged the presence of the major squares and sites in their work, not only because of their urban significance but also because of their historical importance, from the Roman and early Christian periods to the German occupation and the expulsion of the Jews. It was not only the personal memories that marked the topographies of their novels but also the memories of recent political events. Several works made references to the political assassination of Grigoris Lambrakis in 1963 near the intersection of Ermou and Venizelou Streets; this event became the subject of the book (1967) and the French-language political film of that name (1969). In a short story by Sakis Serefas (b. 1960), published in 1996, the narrator remarked: “My girlfriend was standing on the point where Lambrakis was killed right next to the commemorative sculpture.” Once again, a writer recorded the city’s intimate history and topography from a local’s point of view.

Beginning in the 1970s, the city initiated efforts to protect and enhance the Upper Town’s architectural heritage. Until then, one could stroll along narrow streets and gaze at modest single-family houses from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Since 1978, however, the intramural area of Upper Town has been transformed through a preservation and redevelopment project that allowed the construction of neo-vernacular two- or three-story apartment buildings, akin to the New Urbanism.
architecture in North America. In Thessaloniki’s Upper Town, the ancient city walls, together with a limited number of the original buildings, acted as a picturesque backdrop for the housing of middle-income residents.

The Upper Town, with its traditional urban quarters and strong presence of refugee and Jewish residents, played a central role in the city’s literary image. In a short story by Dimitris Miggas (b. 1951), published in 2003, the narrator seeks to escape from the present as he routinely climbs up to the Upper Town. Listing a string of streets and bus routes, he aims to fix the city in his memory unchanged: “It was raining again yesterday. I went up to the Walls by bus and then went down on foot: Akropoleos, Dimitriou Poliorkitou, Tsinari, Athonos, Theophilou, and Akropoleos again.”

We find a similar stringing of place names in the works of Vassilikos, Ioannou, and Bakolas. As the literary critic Triantafyllos Kotopoulos remarked, they represent a broken, partial depiction of
the city, rather like the tesserae of a large mosaic of a broken image, a multifocal narrative of many heroes.\textsuperscript{39}

In Vassilikos's novel \textit{Thymata eirinis} [Victims of Peace] (1956) the protagonist brings tour groups to the Upper Town. By always following a strict, predetermined itinerary around the central sites, he is able to describe the city's historical continuity. But in his story "To phyllo" [The Page] (1994), the narrator wanders around the narrow and labyrinthine passages of Upper Town, which reflect his isolation and tangled human relations.\textsuperscript{40} Thus in some cases, the Upper Town has been depicted as safely retaining the characters' youthful memories, while at other times it is shown in the throes of change and destruction.

A unified policy of major public works aimed to shape the city's modern character. Examples of modern architecture endowed this regional capital with distinctive public buildings, including the Thessaloniki University campus, the International Fairgrounds,
and the Archaeological Museum. Both the establishment of the university and the fairgrounds signaled the progressive intellectual and commercial forces that have shaped northern Greece.42

Unalloyed modernism was first ushered into the city with the design of the Thessaloniki University complex, originally proposed by Hébrard (1919 and 1928) and later developed by Nikolaos Mitsakis (1939). The master plan for the Thessaloniki University campus was completed in 1950 by Vassilios D. Kyriazopoulos. Several prominent architects designed the individual buildings, which are part of a freestanding arrangement in a loosely articulated master plan.42 Despite its central location and its significance as a site of modernist designs, the university campus remains outside of most city inhabitants’ daily experience.43

The Thessaloniki International Fair, another modernist planning venture, has been embraced by a broad spectrum of the population. As an institution, the Fair began in 1926 on the Military Esplanade, moving to its present location in 1939. Its informal layout is punctuated by several exhibition pavilions, both permanent and temporary, with the most important structures completed between 1960 and 1975.44 The Fair’s populist organization, combining a variety of industrial exhibits with old-style amusement park entertainment, created an open environment for the promotion of modern architecture. For most visitors, the Fair offers one of the few opportunities to experience modern and avant-garde buildings. The significance of the Fair in people’s lives is evident in the many commemorative family photographs that record annual visits. Most other new buildings in the city are still modest and utilitarian, while public amenities like parks and squares remain sparse.

Of all the new planning projects, the International Fair is the only modern site that is frequently mentioned in the literature we reviewed.45 In the following undated poem, Christianopoulos captured the contrast between the urban resident, who yearns to escape the crowds, and his lover from the village, who revels in the Fair’s opportunities for cheap amusement:

At the Fair

I met you at the Fair, amongst the lights,
amongst the crowd, very tight,
and immediately I suggested we go to some deserted area.

But you had come from the village for entertainment;
we had to get on the bumper cars,
buy ice cream, go into the House of Horrors,
I had to treat you to a sandwich and dark beer,
buy you a lighter as a souvenir.

I didn’t realize that you were fed up with deserted areas.46
One of the major large-scale projects was the modernization and extension of the harbor, begun in 1953 and completed in 1973. The new quay (promenade by the sea) was created at the southeast seafront, extending from the White Tower to the Kalamaria boundary line. The development of the seafront became one of the city's most prominent architectural modernist projects. It changed the whole face of the city as seen from the sea and permitted the gradual replacement of the villas once lining the shore with the present row of free-standing massive apartment blocks. Moreover, there was a considerable effort to develop an appropriate eclectic or modern architectural vocabulary for the new apartment buildings that lined the newly expanded quay. Despite the straitjacket nature of individual lot development, the city's new waterfront as a whole presented an appropriate and successful modern design. The project also produced a 2-kilometer-long quay, with a 150-meter-wide strip of public space serving as a favorite promenade. In most literature, the seafront represents a central place of escape, entertainment, solitary reflection, and identification with the city. While Pentzikis underscores the picturesque view of the sea from the city, Alaveras reveals the city's more recent problems with the polluting of the Thermaic Gulf.
The development of Aristotelous Avenue gave the city its most important urban complex. It is bordered by symmetrical neo-Byzantine arcades, with prescribed building façades, terminating in an expansive square with a view of the Thermaic Gulf. This imposing north-south axis, one of the hallmarks of Hebrard’s design, appeared in the work of some authors, including Vasilikos and Bakolas.

In general, writers placed their characters in the city center when the story called for action and in the Upper Town when the story called for reflection, escape, or return to an earlier time. Given the relatively recent experiences of the German occupation and civil war, and considering the city’s working-class roots, many stories hinge on political action, with their protagonists crisscrossing the city as they carry out special assignments. According to Kotopoulos, the sites of the city itself became the protagonists in some of the novels by Alavera and Ioannou, who depicted the city in exhaustive detail.

CONTROL OF URBAN GROWTH AND THE ENHANCEMENT OF THE CITY’S HERITAGE SINCE THE 1980s

The first substantive attempt to control urban development was manifested in the Thessaloniki Master Plan (TMP), approved in 1985. The aims of the TMP included highlighting the city’s historical profile and enhancing the city center. It introduced measures to protect the archeological and historical sites and made possible the adoption of additional special measures and restrictions regarding land uses and traffic circulation. Furthermore, it proposed upgrading and linking the major historical sites and axes of special significance with a number of archeological walks. These included: to the east, from the White Tower up to Eptapyrgion; in the center, from Aristotelous Square up to Vlatadon Monastery; and to the west, from Vardari tower up into the Upper Town. In addition, the TMP proposed the qualitative upgrading of the city’s traditional districts, including the Upper Town and the old commercial center.

According to the 1991 census, Thessaloniki’s population was more or less stable at 750,000, though the city continues to spread over the surrounding area, particularly toward the southeast, with homes and businesses lining the major provincial roads. Considerable residential development has been registered in the last fifteen to twenty years toward the east, particularly toward Panorama and Therme, where middle- and high-income residents have recently settled after abandoning the congested fabric of the lower city. To the west, where low-income districts have grown since the early twentieth century, the division of the land into ever smaller plots, combined with high building coefficients and lack of organized planning, have resulted in unattractive urban districts, lacking infrastructure and public spaces.

From 1992 to 1994, the European Union (sixteenth Directorate) sponsored a pilot plan for the revival of the city’s historic commercial center that helped to upgrade and enhance the city’s old markets, such as the harbor market (Ladadika) and the bazaars. The plan also funded the restoration of the Roman Forum. In 1994, a large part of the intramural city, coinciding more or less with the area destroyed by the fire of 1917, was declared a historical site. In 1997, on the occasion of Thessaloniki’s designation as the
Cultural Capital of Europe, numerous projects and architectural competitions were promoted, including proposals for pedestrian areas, squares, archeological excavations, and redevelopment; originating in the planning framework previously described. Most prominent has been the integration of the historic part of the harbor into the city's cultural life. Other important projects included the restoration of the Galerius complex, restoration and landscaping of major Byzantine sites such as the powerful Eptapyrgion Fortress, and restoration of Ottoman monuments such as the Bezezen (Market), the Alaca Imaret (mosque), the Yeni Cami (mosque), and the Bey Hamam and the Pazar Hamam (Ottoman baths). Other planning projects included the recovery of the fin-de-siècle cosmopolitan physiognomy of the city, with the renovation of more than thirty buildings—private mansions, public buildings, manufacturing premises, and religious buildings, renovated to host new uses. Thus in a belated manner, contemporary urban planning has attempted to recapture and reconstruct the lost image of early twentieth-century Thessaloniki, an image preserved and cultivated by the city's writers.
Despite these recent and ambitious planning efforts, Thessaloniki retains its popular identity as the “refugee capital” and “mother of the poor,” now home to a new influx of economic migrants from the former Eastern bloc. The newest arrivals established themselves primarily in the upper part of the historic center, north of Egnatia Street, and in the northwest extensions of the city— that is, in areas that have received migrants to the city since the late nineteenth century.

CONCLUSION: LITERARY MEMORY AND URBAN CHANGE

Unlike newspaper accounts, which offer an ongoing commentary on contemporary political and urban changes, literature often dwells in the past. Poets and writers often reflect on earlier periods, as the past enjoys a firmer hold on the consciousness of both the writers and their readers. Current research on autobiographical memory concurs that only “few vivid memories are reported after early adulthood,” resulting in “few new formative experiences occurring after early childhood.” Most individuals, when asked to recount their past, give a very detailed account of their childhood, up to about age twelve. After that, their stories tend to trail off, and long periods of time pass in a cursory manner.

“When I think of Buenos Aires, I think of the Buenos Aires I knew as a child: the low houses, the patios, the porches, the cisterns with turtles in them, the grated windows. That Buenos Aires was all of Buenos Aires,” reflected the Argentine author Jorge Luis Borges. Not only are most memories related to childhood, but memory itself seems to improve, not decay, with time. Encoded childhood memory appears more resistant to forgetting as time passes. Notice, for example, how the author Sakis Papadimitriou described the changes in the Thessaloniki of his childhood in an essay collection (1960–73):

The imposing new boulevard. All the houses that used to be by the sea retreated by about one hundred meters and in front of them, later, will be planted apartment buildings. And now I think of how we used to plunge into the sea from the courtyards, or go on a boat ride while our family watched us from one of the balconies. Everything was so close, squeezed tightly, gathered together. As I go by the boulevard by car now, I see the half-demolished single houses, as when we used to go out in the little boat; in a short while, none of the houses will be left. They are counterfeiting our memories, stealing our childhood images.

One of Ioannou’s narrators acknowledged the disappearance of the picturesque city of his childhood, the “old,” “moldy,” “burnt-smelling,” “enchanted” city of around 1940. In another story, the narrator recommended better protection and preservation of certain old buildings. Demolishing these buildings betrayed the ignorance of those who control the city’s future. Along the same lines, the narrator of another story underscores that the city’s plan was drawn by “people who neither know us nor feel for us.” One of the characters of A larvae reflects with melancholy that his nephews walk on the same roads, which, however, follow different planning trends. “The city’s color has been altered.” The neighborhood “is now defined by more multi-story buildings, and from
two and three rows of parked cars." Evocative as these comments are, they do leave open the question of knowing a city. How can planners come to know a city? How can newcomers come to know it? Should urban planning acknowledge the sites of specific historical events?

Several prominent themes emerge from the literature on Thessaloniki: nostalgia and sadness, anger, death, loss of recognition and identity, and illicit sex. Usually writers relied on their own memory to describe the destruction of old neighborhoods and the construction of new buildings. As a whole, literature has also waged a direct or indirect critique of various modernization projects. Although some of the writers embraced urban change, most criticized it, longing for the city of their childhood. Nevertheless, we cannot assign the statements or actions of narrators to the writers themselves. In fact, like the majority of the city's inhabitants, most writers lived in the new, poorly constructed, anonymous apartment buildings and only saw the few surviving old buildings in their walks. Nevertheless, they often chose to locate their narratives in the narrow parts of the city that had escaped demolition and rebuilding.

Writers did not criticize urban change only because it disrupted their childhood memories. Surrounded by buildings dating from the 1960s and later, the personal dislocation of the narrators became a metaphor for the dislocation, disorientation, and alienation of the modern inhabitant. Criticism of urban development often reflected criticism of modernization itself. Nevertheless, we believe that overall the Greek people oscillated in their position—at times identifying with the writers who held on to a world of the past, while at other times becoming seduced by the siren songs of progress and better life, as promised by small-time developers, architects, and the media.

More broadly, urban literature on Thessaloniki mirrored contemporary international literary tropes and themes. Although some writers around the world embraced life in the modern urban environment, others used literature for refuge and escape, making it possible to tolerate the modern city. The writers we reviewed may have criticized the lack of dreaming spaces in the modern city, yet they accepted the inevitability of that city and continued to reside in it.
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