*Corresponding Author' Email: xastella@gmail.com
Proceedings of the International Conference on Research in Humanities and Social Sciences,
Vol. 1, Issue. 1, 2023, pp. 36-49
DOI: https://doi.org/10.33422/icrhs.v1i1.147
Copyright © 2023 Author(s)
ISSN: 3030-0304 online

Difficulties of the Executives of the "Educational Association" at the Beginning and during Its Operation

Dr. Stella Chantzi
University of Western Macedonia (UOWM), Greece

Abstract

The article deals with the executives of the Educational Association "Ekpaideftikós Omilos "(EO) at the beginning and during of its operation, from 1910 to 1930, in Greece. The Educational Association was founded by well-known and prominent people of the time, with the main purpose of improving Greek education and language and educational reform. Founders and executives sought to diffuse reformist ideas from the aristocratic society of their time. They faced several difficulties in cooperation, collecting the prejudice of the others while in 1920 Triantafyllidis leaves the Group for reasons of not getting along with Glinos. After 1920-1922, new ideological upheavals posed intense concerns to the speakers and contributed to its disintegration and later dissolution. The pioneers of the Group seemed quite concerned about the Idea of demoticism, their action was intertwined with the composition of their forces, although the contribution and distinct roles of the three are recognized, at the same time the particularly important presence of Glinos in the attempts at reform was clear. The work is going to investigate the ground, the preparation of the members of the EO and the general and special conditions that have prepared its creation. The method followed is the historical interpretive method of accessing evidence from several archives as well as relevant literature. The research demonstrates that the protagonists of the EO from the beginning experience many obstacles and difficulties in the mutual understanding and processing of the purpose of establishing their organization related to the recovery of Greek education and linguistic renewal with the use of the vernacular in school. It seems the lack of disposition of some for personal work and the strong prejudice of the people for the populists of the Group. At the same time, major ideological confrontations between Delmouzos and Glinos are erased, after the Asia Minor disaster and the arrival of refugees in Greece.

Keywords: Demoticist Movement; Pioneers; Difficulties; Founders; Executives

1. Introduction

1.1 Research Methodology

The paper focuses on the difficulties of the executives of the Ekpaideftikós Omilos at the beginning and during its operation. The work is going to investigate the ground, the preparation of the members of the EO and the general and special conditions that have prepared its creation.

EO was an educational organization founded in 1910 in Athens, with founders Tsirimokos, Triantafyllidis and Delmouzos. It aimed to carry out an educational/linguistic reform with the introduction of elementary school and other changes in the structure of education, and the ultimate goal was to improve the training of Greek teachers and the state of Greek schools. The paper presents the cooperation difficulties, the ideological transitions and the different approaches between the main partners of the group, regarding its operation, its directions and its basic program. Focusing on the difficulties of the Group's protagonists is useful as it can justify its programmatic action, and interpret any failures and to some extent foresee the eventual halting of its operation. In any case, the search for the problems and difficulties of the partners of this educational organization highlights issues of an ideological nature as well as issues of the era and the Greek society of the beginning of the 20th century, apart from interpersonal relationships, therefore it is of particular interest.

The method followed is the historical interpretive method of accessing evidence from several archives as well as relevant literature. The paper attempts to reconstruct the action and effect of the Educational Group using primary and secondary sources, and the interpretive historical method of their analysis. It is a type of research that proceeds to explain the emergence and evolution of phenomena in a specific historical context by periodization, classification, and comparison of evidence (Kallas, 2015, p. 159). The historical method is identified with the citation of abstract technical recipes and patterns of thought (Noutsos, 2011, p. 146). It is a necessary condition for giving meaning to empirical research and as a supplement to it and for formulating pedagogical questions (Pyrgiotakis, 1981). The evidence comes from the anecdotal archive of Delmouzos, the digitized archive of Glinos and Triantafyllides, the archives of Dragoumis, Sotiriou and Someritis and books and articles on the role of the EO.

1.2 The results: Difficulties of the executives

There were many problems with the EO: the difficulty of finding collaborators for the magazine, the impossibility of following a certain line in the magazine DEO, the absolute character of the Group and the magazine, the lack of remuneration for the collaborators and financial narrowness in a review that published in their magazine, in 1915 (The work of the group, *DEO,* vol. 5, 1915, pp. 7-9). After 1917 the operation of the group was difficult, as its key workers were devoted to their government duties, as members of a government committee in the government of Venizelos. In 1921, the political situation of the country was predicted to be abnormal, the language question and the educational reform, basic issues that preoccupied the Group, did not care about the world.

Glinos, although he was writing that the year went well, considered that the activity of the Club during the year 1919-1920, was relatively limited: The Friday meetings in the Club Hall with 60-70 people and the printing and distribution of appeals in 5000 copies a small result: the registration of approximately 150 new members in the Club. He, also, disapproved of the form of the Group, while Triantafyllidis the opposite opinion (Letter of 12th Glinos to Delmouzos on May 15, 1921, f. 14, Delmouzos Archive). Triantafyllidis continued to

criticize the limited work of the Group and the sluggish action of its executives. It referred to the disproportionate implementation of the Group's program and the small and insignificant means for their implementation. He pointed out that in the school there was a slackness in their work, after the establishment of demotic language. During the period of the language education reform, Triantafyllidis emphasized the difficulties, the need to support the work of the state by the EO and its program, and predicted difficulties for the coming years. Regarding EC's action, he became even more persistent and critical of the brevity of their sessions, of the opportunism and the sloppiness. He described the atmosphere as unbearable, highlighted their moral responsibility and emphasized that he was leaving if this situation continued. The act of final withdrawal takes place in 1920 and leads Triantafyllidis to distance himself, considering that Glinos is seeking to reconcile the irreconcilables, he speaks of an impasse in their cooperation that weighs more than the bad political situation and he does not want to sacrifice the idea towards himself of (Thoughts on the progress of the Educational Group. Typescript (copy) of text regarding thoughts on the development of the Educational Group. Series: B. Language Education Archive, f. B, 14 Group and Education Committee, subfolder B 2. Minutes of the Education Committee. Statutes, Sessions, Work Programs of the Educational Group, 1910-1920, Triantafyllidis Archive). In a letter to Delta in 1916, he wrote: *I recently returned to the program I made, if you remember, in 1910 in Zurich, shortly before the Club was formed. A movement with broader bases and more forces. What is being done today is more than enough, cruel and funny, so that we can continue it. I see it so clearly that I wonder how I laughed* (Letter of Triantafyllides from Athens to Penelope Delta, Alexandria on January 12, 1916. Typewritten (photocopy) letter. Double photocopy of a letter and comments from the book Correspondence of P. S. Delta, Triantafyllidis Archive).

The concern of the EO partners still existed, with the change of government and the favourable climate with was created in 1923. Despite the favourable condition, Delmouzos expressed fears that those who hope and see creative fermentation, *are laughed at and objectified individual desires and visions.* Educational rebirth for him was a mental rebirth that presupposes not only the need but the overflowing of inner life (Letter of Delmouzos to Michalakopoulos, January 1923, f. 13, Delmouzos Archive).

The correspondence of the period between Delmouzos and Triantafyllidis highlighted the magnitude of the reservations about the objective difficulty of reconstituting the reform effort in 1924. The two of them experienced the cancellation of two educational interventions, after the withdrawal of the Tsirimokos bills and the opposition to the reform of 1917. Triantafyllidis wrote: I *think it is impossible and dangerous (from a political and educational point of view) to seek the exclusion of the ''katharevousa''*[1] *from the primary school today. A language training program is needed. However, it is right that the state should decide today to establish demotic in legislation, courts, contracts, etc*. Although Triantafyllidis pointed out below the acceptance of the reform by the public teachers, he expressed his disbelief about the appropriateness of the situation (Letter 39th of Triantafyllides to Delmouzos on May 13, 1923, f. 2, Delmouzos Archive).

From the 1920s, there was confusion and the admission of different opinions between the active members and the pioneers of the Group. The movements of the refugee population in Greece and the political developments in Russia created new conditions that affected the ideological balances in the EO. Discussions began on the possibility of carrying out an educational reform within the framework of the bourgeois state, many new members raised

[1]The written language in Greece, which came to be known as ''katharevousa'', combined ancient orthography with modern pronunciation.

questions of political choices. In 1923, the question of the program of the EO and its changes was raised and a period of crisis of demoticism, according to Glinos, ended in the split of the EO and its final dissolution.

The study of the letters between the partners of the Group confirmed the problematic communication and correlation between them during its operation. Even its establishment seemed to be done rather hastily and casually, without the adequate settlement of issues such as the matter of school alphabets, the agreement on the issue of determining the written vernacular, and the establishment of a model school, which were basic announcements of the program EO. The news of the establishment presented as a sudden and unexpected action, which been decided in the background, on the initiative of a few individuals in Greece. The surprise of Triantafyllidis regarding the sudden announcement of the establishment, perhaps can compete, with the more general expression of surprise, on the part of EO, when the government's decision to implement the language education reform was announced. The problematic and incomplete communication of the initiators was often found densely. In the period 1917-1920, the three pioneers seemed to have problems in their cooperation, and the action of the EO was degraded (overlapping by the action of the EC).

The study of the minutes of the discussions of the period from 1920 to 1925 demonstrated the strong differences, ideological and political searches, and confrontations between the executives of Delmouzos and Glinos. Glinos included topics related to Bolshevism, Communism, and their potential for an educational reform in the discussion of the Group. He, currently, has formulated thirteen positions that are the culmination of his thought and testify to its ideological confusion. He recognized the incompleteness of the bourgeois renaissance, the stimulation of the big bourgeoisie and its inability to initiate developments, he emphasized the ever-increasing role of the working class but at the same time he insisted on renouncing the educational reform, through the communist approach. Nevertheless, his immediately following positions on the new worldview of the value of man, the teacher, the woman, and the new organization of study in popular education and popular universities, directly referred to the educational programs of the socialist countries.

Delmouzos attempted to defend the original demotic direction of the Group. He sought to limit the value in the words of Glinos and presented them as personal positions that do not burden the entire union. He was, meaningfully, emphasizing that the Group was not Glinos. The discussions that followed, were interesting for the variety of opinions, the exploratory climate, the scattered disagreement and concern. The Group was an intellectual reactor, where conservative views and progressive perceptions were said, discussed, tested, rejected.

In the same period, from 1923 onwards, the establishment of the association of the ''New Greeks'', contributed with certainty to the reproduction of scepticism and questioning of the effectiveness of the Group's political choices and educational plans. The two Groups were functioning as communicating containers with parallel actions of persons. The left-wing political identity of its key executives triggered constant ideological ferments and concerns in the Group. The culmination of all was the rupture of 1927. With the resignation of the Delmouzos group, EO was appearing, as a union of the left space, with renewed aims, targeting, new members from the pool of socialists of the time. Despite renewed expectations, the period leading up to its suspension was marked by heated debates and arguments among its members, and the inability to identify was once again apparent. In the minutes of the Executive Committees and of the General Meetings of the last phase of its operation, the ideological conflicts of the persons who belonged to the main executives of the Group and came from the factions of the socialists and the communists, with which Glinos ultimately aligned, were evident.

1.3 Pioneers & founders. Teamwork and individual offer-viewing

The access to the archival sources allows us to approach the communication and correspondence not only of the three pioneers with each other but also with other important people founders of the EO, and simple and influential members from the wider field of educational demoticism.

Tsirimokos together with Dragoumis and Petrokokkinos a leading role in the early years. They participated in the Board of Directors, taken initiatives for the publication of books and they participated in the General Meetings and in shaping the Group's action as much as they could. Gradually, Tsirimokos did not actively participate, Petrokokkinos continued as treasurer until 1920 and Dragoumis was murdered in 1920. At the same time, from 1912 onwards, the well-known triumvirate acted. During the period of their coexistence, it seems that the relationship between Tsirimokos and Glinos was problematic. Glinos was referring to a greater possibility of communication with Dragoumis and Delmouzos, but not with Tsirimokos (Glinos, 1985, p. 495).

The removal from positions of responsibility of the Group, obviously displeased Tsirimokos, the original leader of the Group and resulted, gradually, in his physical removal. His bitterness was expressed in his article on the History of EO in Hestia, in June 1927. Dragoumis wrote about Tsirimokos, *that he lost the glory of being seen as a leader*, and that he wanted to do everything himself in the Club (Dimaras, 1986, p. 21), an opinion which perhaps explains the impossibility of understanding with Glinos. For his part, Tsirimokos does not hide his bitterness over the silence of the Group's action in the first two years (where Tsirimokos was responsible for the Group) by Triantafyllidis and referred with an ironic tone to his modesty (Tsirimokos, 1927, p. 410).

On November 17, 1911, Dragoumis requested with his application to Petrokokkinos, his deletion from the EO and the subscribers of their Bulletin. In addition, he requested that in the case of reprinting the articles of association with the names of the founders next to his name, it should be: written *resignation (resigned). Very friendly. I.D* (Item 0643, Letter of Dragoumis to Petrokokkinos, At: http://www3.ascsa.edu.gr/digital_images/Archives_low/DragoumiAllilografia/20070713/0643_1a.jpg, Digital archive I. Dragoumis, Gennadios Library, ASKSA).

His statement application was very impressive, only about a year and a half after the official appearance of the EO in the limelight for no apparent reason. His signature with the addition of the word ''friendly'' makes his reasoning even more difficult to interpret. However, some of his letters to Mr Agiadis show that at the same time, he may be under some pressure for national issues and that he seeks to agree with him. Agiadis pressured him by publishing his letters, although Dragoumis stated that he nothing to fear. Perhaps it is worth mentioning the attempted reconciliation between demoticist circles in September 1911. It could be assumed that the deletion request is a goodwill gesture, towards their unifying action, although the case conflicts with the decision to unite the demoticist struggle in the EO. Another possibility was the indignation of Dragoumis, since in the first months there was no response to his call from those who expected to help. In the next period, it seemed that he participated in the Club. In fact, during the famous mystagogy of the demoticists on March 26, 1912, he took the floor as a representative of the Group and as a demoticist. In 1913 he was elected a member and president of the Administrative Commission (AC) until 1916. Later, it seems that he withdrawn from the active action of the union and in 1920 he was assassinated.

With the establishment of the Group, the new rising triad of Glinos, Triantafyllides and Delmouzos ormed, as the triad of the Group opposite the well-known triad of the diaspora (Pallis, Psycharis, Eftaliotis) (Mackridge, 2009, p. 266).

The three main contributors to the EO from the earlier era as well as from their membership in the EO from 1912 onwards were in communication. In their letters, apart from the anxiety over the educational-linguistic issue, the network of personal relationships that was created over time, was being captured. The interest in the idea of demoticism and their intention to activate immediately for its defence, was captured. Their systematic correspondence began in 1909. Initially, Glinos was unknown to Triantafyllidis and Triantafyllidis, and was trying through the letters and information of others such as Tsirimokos, and Dragoumis, to form an objective opinion about him. With their correspondence, it seems that trust was established between them and between Delmouzos and Glinos. They even began to write together the book entitled: ''The Road of New Life'', a popular catechism, which remained incomplete, where a comprehensive approach to modern Greek problems was attempted and a special emphasis on issues of culture, language, and education (Glinos, 1983, V. B΄, Note on the second volume), to demonstrate the causes of the modern Greek regression and the road to the rebirth of Greek society (Iliou, 2007, p. 167). They understood that they common desires and goals. They envisioned the reformation of education and the Greek schools and the establishment of elementary schools. They expressed their concerns about the spiritual stagnation of the place. Their association was formalized later in 1912, when they were officially in the action group of the EO. During the fermenting phase of the convening of the EO, Glinos maintained correspondence with Dragoumis, Tsirimokos, Petrokokkinos. At the beginning of his membership in EO, he signed as Dimitris Foteinos (DF) (Gatos, 2003, p. 64).

During their active activity, the pioneers of EO were preparing articles, books, studies, and the rest of their activity. Everyone has their personality and personal ambitions. Moreover, complaints were often made about the non-methodical and sufficient cooperation of others. After 1920, the cooperation between them created friction and was particularly problematic. Triantafyllidis, after completing a decade, retired from the active activity of the Group, while a little earlier, in 1918 he declared his resignation, first from the role of the secretary of the EC and his status as a member of the EE. From 1925, perhaps even earlier, Delmouzos was intensively engaged in his writing work and the promotion of its circulation and seemed to be indifferent and did not show the interest that one would expect in the period when for example, Glinos was alone in Athens and was trying to keep the Club live. Then their relationship become difficult, as Glinos seemed to differ in terms of thinking and ideological positioning. Delmouzos does not respond to Glinos' proposal to participate with his article in his magazine ''Anagennisi''. According to Triantafyllidis, Glinos seemed to be acting autonomously in various actions representing the EO, without considering the applicable statutes of the Group, without the corresponding information of the rest of the Board, bypassing the organs of the Group. In the accounts which were published in the DEO, for each year and in the corresponding speeches, the dysfunction, the low performance at the level of projects and actions and an expectation for the intensification of efforts in the future become apparent.

At the beginning there was regular correspondence between Tsirimokos and Delmouzos, Dragoumis regarding the course of action, the axes of action and issues concerning the future school program, and the organization of the EO departments. Delmouzos asked him to keep the manuscript of his alphabet book away from Boutonas and Kourtidis (as he did not trust (them) (Dragoumi's letter to Tsirimokos on May 2, 1910, f. 9, Delmouzos Archive).

Triantafyllidis, although he was out of Greece until 1912, intervened with suggestions, ideas, concerns, and proposals for the more effective action of the EO as well as with his articles. He was making suggestions about the structure and format of the Bulletin. When it began its circulation, he commented on the content of the magazine, and advices on the printing of books, and articles and the formation of the magazine's editorials. He insisted on the official recruitment of Glinos by the EO and others such as Skleros, which was ultimately not carried out due to financial weakness. He also suggested Vamvetsos and Apostolakis as people who could help and insisted on the need for spiritual communication (Triantafyllidis, 2001, p. 205). he was making suggestions on spelling issues in the direction of language regulation (Triantafyllidis, 2001, p. 207). In Greece, he became the main editor of the DEO until 1922, the year of his departure from the EO. Through the writings of Triantafyllidis in the letters, we can discern a constant reservation, an inner fear of the need for greater combativeness and activation on the part of the founders and workers of the EO. This sense of incomplete activation occupying him throughout the entire period of his course. His general feeling and belief was that *for every change there must come the fullness of time and a deeper justification for it for things to succeed* (Papanoutsos, Language and education: intellectual issues, article on May 31, 1951, Triantafyllidis Archive).

The relationship between the pioneers with each other and the pioneers with the first founders such as Dragoumis or other known members was quite close with frequent correspondence between them. Glinos wrote to Triantafyllidis after the death of his sister Eleni in 8-17-1913: *Dear Manolis, I mourn with you like a brother for Eleni* (Triantafyllidis, 2001, f. 235). The caring and loving disposition is evident in Delta's letters to Triantafyllidis: *you deserve better... with much friendship I shake your hand* (Triantafyllidis, 2001, f. 237).

In February 1914, Triantafyllidis found that some movement begun around the Group, but the forces that would lead to a big push were missing (Triantafyllidis, 2001, letter 242). Evdokia Athanasoula, demoticist and member of the EO, in her letter to Triantafyllidis, commenting on the general meetings of 1927 that led to the split, recognized the following virtues: energy, planning, true interest in the result, lack of stubbornness, lack of self-deception. Her friendship and special sympathy were evident from the advice that she gave to him to take care of his health (Triantafyllidis, 2001, pp. 348, 349). From the beginning of the formation of the Group expressed his favour to Glinos, due to his livelihood problems and proposed his financial support by assigning him the position of secretary of the EO, and at the same time the decision to pay the articles intended for the EO or other stand-alone versions of the EO.

On July 30, 1920, Dragoumis was assassinated, just a few months after his return to Athens, from his exile. The (AC) of the EO published a resolution of protest, for the disapproval of the perpetrators. That became the reason for Petrokokkinos' resignation from the position of treasurer and from the status of a member of the Club on August 6, 1920. It seems that the reason for Petrokokkinos' departure was his dissatisfaction with the publication of the letter by the EO's Executive Committee about the death of Dragoumis, without exempting himself as he requested. It is an issue of political propriety. His resignation indicated the different ideological tendencies in the Group and the critical period of the union. Referring to the resignation, Triantafyllidis tried to soften the negative impression and attributed it to Petrokokkinos' desire to leave giving his place to younger ones and characterizing him as irreplaceable.

From 1921 onwards, Glinos was alone in Athens and took over secretarial duties himself after the resignation of their secretary Horvat. For some time, he acted as treasurer after the resignation of Koryllos from the position of treasurer. In 1922, he hired Makrigiannis as a

secretary, who became his valuable assistant. At the same time, his dedicated collaborators were Sotiriou, Kleanthus, and Miliadis. The latter take the lead in organizing and supporting literary evenings. Glinos, despite the feeling of fatigue and disgust that he, he perceived his work as an anonymous sacrifice super of the group. He was writing to Delmouzos: *We are keeping the fight... In the consciousness of society, we have won our issue. We need breadth and depth in our actions.* He was worried about the action of the EO in the coming winter and hoped that the EO would bear rich fruits in two or three years. Often, apart from personal work and dedication, he was forced to assign chores to others to complete tasks such as Koryllou for sending the copies of the appeal and the DEO (Gatos, 2003, 14th, 15th, 19th letter).

In any case, the survival of the EO was considered an essential and primary case that deserves all support. This point of view was often repeated by Glinos in the letters that he sent to Delmouzos, where he sometimes complained about the uncertain future of the Group and the removal of Triantafyllidis, sometimes about the continuous all-nighters to achieve the overall passing of the bills for the restoration of the demoticism (the 1923-24). Elsewhere, he directly asked Delmouzos to return from Germany, in order to support him in the issue of the Higher Women's School and in general in the fight for demoticism, as his presence was necessary, and the situation needed all Greeks. He believed that in their struggle the positions of responsibility of the Ministry of Education needed to be filled by people who were dedicated to the idea of demoticism and trust in themselves. He so he placed his people where he could, for example for the operation of Maraslios, he suggested the partner of Miliadis. Essentially, he been left alone, he also felt frustrated about the extra work he undertook at the same time in private schools in Athens for the sake of his family's livelihood, which frustrated him as he considered it an extravagance that limited the time he can devote to their essential work (Gatos, 2003, 7th, 1st, 14th, 15th, 19th, 21st, 24th, 29th, 33rd, 34th, 36th letter).The following excerpt from Glinos' letter to Delmouzos was typical: *Despite disgust, endurance, and persistence are needed. You would be convinced how much it takes to do the work with the state, that the dominant positions are held by people absolutely and that the language is independent of the political question* (University Traditions, Comments on Language Reform. Handwritten notes from Epimeter. Series: E. University archive, folder E-4IH University traditions (Tutorials 1923-1953), subfolder 110 Tutorial: lessons in modern Greek grammar based on the text of the Mountains (1942-43), Triantafyllidis Archive), *sincerely devoted to the Idea. Otherwise, no work is done. Now you will perhaps understand how great and useful the struggle of 1917-1920, which proved to be fruitful, was my sacrifice in the position of General Secretary during those three years* (Gatos, 2003, 29th letter).

It appears that the close relationship between the three began to fray as early as 1922 onwards. Triantafyllidis withdrew from the active activity of EO and Glinos began to deviate from his original worldview Triantafyllidis considered that Glinos sought to compromise the irreconcilables. He spoke for a dead end in their search and a bad political situation that annihilated any desire for change. He recognized a clear failure in their cooperation and argued that this weighed more than the general situation and that the teamwork between them depended on many factors. Triantafyllidis remained in his original opinion on the necessity of their collaboration. He remained unmoved in his views and did not wish to sacrifice the idea he in mind from the beginning and distanced himself from the active action of the Group (Letter from Triantafyllidis from Berlin to Dimitris Glinos, Andros June/July 1922. Typescript (copy) of letter. The original is in the hands of Andreas Glinos. About the situation in Greece. For their work in the Ministry (problems in cooperation). News from Berlin, p. 329, Correspondence: 1895-1959, Triantafyllidis Archive), as well as from the educational committee (EC) where, within the framework of the operation of the EU,

Athanasakis speaks of Glinos' harmful guardianship of the two others (Delmouzos, 2014, Letter of Athanasakis to Venizelos regarding the dissolution of the EC, p. 207).

The individual actions of the three pioneers coexisted and were intertwined with the composition of their forces through the organization of the committees and the methodology of their decisions. The Administrative Commission (AC) signed the decisions on expected actions, the announcements of the EO and the texts that were published in the EO. There were parallel publications with their name but what was faithfully followed was to display their work as the work of EO. The signing of their articles in some periods was not possible as it was interfering with their public servant status, so they signed under another name or with the signature EO or AC.

Repeated phrases in the DEO speak of the work of the EO with the formulations: *the EO knows, judges, wants to look, proclaims etc*. although most of the works of the EO the personal stamp of the three pioneers. For example, Petrokokkinos in his letter to Triantafyllidis used, among other things, the phrases *our educational group, our Delmouzos who so masterfully clothed Ewald's fairy tales with a Roman spirit*, which demonstrated the familiarity between the main executives, the trust in their judgment and undivided support to the Group (Letter from Petrokokkinos to Manolis Triantafyllidis, Athens in 1915. Typewritten (copy) letter. His thoughts on the untranslatability of established terms "in administration, science, art and all manifestations of social life". To write new textbooks. For Evalt's "Fairytales". They were written on a study by Manolis Triantafyllidis, which will be published in the 1915 DEO ("Our language in social life") and written on the back of forms for telegrams. The leaves are stapled, see p. 280, letter 264, Correspondence: 1895-1959, Triantafyllidis Archive). In the DEO it was stated that every letter and subscription for the Club been sent to the EO committee and not to someone individually. Individual actions that co-exist and were presented as decisions or positions of the AC are noted. Given the limited simultaneous presence of the three pioneers in the AC in 1912, Vamvetsos commented that the overall action on behalf of the Group, was that of a few people, perhaps even just one. The pioneers of the Group might have been cultivating the sense of a numerous, fighting body that was helpful in their work, while Dragoumis applauded the essential contribution of impersonality to their struggle (Dimaras, 1994, pp. 22, 24).

Dimaras emphasized how difficult it was to determine in quantitative terms the percentage of participation and action of each of the three protagonists as well as their collaborators in the overall work of the EO (Dimaras, A. in: Honorary events for the centenary of the birth of M. Triantafyllidis, AUTH, INS).

He judged objectively the difficulty of cooperation of the three members of the EO in depth (With the apt diagram in the book by Dimaras, 1994, p. 23), proving based on historical data, that the periods when the three of them were integral to the operation of the Group were extremely limited. Although they were paying attention, and dividing their tasks, there was an objective difficulty in distinguishing the three leaders of the EO their individual action from the generalized action of the Group as they are largely identical and the individual action of the three has a collective character (Dimaras, 1994, p. 21). However, the scholars of the history of education Dimaras and Gatos attributed distinct roles to each of the three pioneers of the Group in the context of its operation. In the framework of the language education trinity, Glinos oversaw political strategic coordination, Delmouzos in pedagogical theory and especially practice, and Triantafyllidis in building the linguistic instrument of educational demoticism, i.e., elementary school. Gatos singled out Glinos as a protagonist in the conception-organization of the educational effort of the Venizelian period (Gatos, 2003, pp. 15, 58). Triantafyllidis in his thoughts on the course of the Group defined the idea of the

Group, considering that Glinos gave the width and Delmouzos the depth (Typescript (copy) of text regarding thoughts on the development of the Educational Group. Series: B. Language Education Archive, folder B 14 Group and Education Committee, subfolder B 2. Minutes of the Education Committee. Statutes, Sessions, Work Programs of the Educational Group, 1910-1920, Triantafyllidis Archive). Delmouzos also accepted this concept of separate roles being divided between them. Later, Delmouzos formulated the opinion (perhaps with the internal purpose of diminishing the work of Glinos) that their reforming action no leader but workers who each worked according to their specialty, guided by demoticism. Delmouzos mentioned the presence of Triantafyllidis and Glinos and their systematic work at EO following his work at Volos Senior Girls' School (APB) (Delmouzos, 1958, p. 229).

The three main EO workers based on the available evidence and manuscripts seem to control, decide and act almost exclusively. The participation of all or at least one of them in the AC ensured the possibility of considering their own opinions and goals. The chairman of the Board of Directors was often Triantafyllidis or Glinos and based on the current statute he represented the Group, acting and implementing the decisions of the Board of Directors. The three pioneers access to both the administration and the implementation of their planning decisions.

Although the impression of teamwork was promoted, the bulk of the work was coming from a limited number of people primarily involving the three key executives, and later only one of the three. The speeches, publication of the magazine, his articles, courses, etc. were actions where almost a few are exclusively responsible. There were also some of their closest collaborators who carried out complementary and supporting work and as a rule, followed his line. Sometimes they provide secretarial support, sometimes support in financial affairs or, participate with their scientific and educational articles in the DEO and in some lectures. They presented their work as a group project of the Group although their articles bear their name. They signed the contract with the EO which they set out in detail their obligations, rights, and the possibility of arbitration in case of disputes between them. They drew up and signed the remuneration regulation that defines the percentages of profit from their intellectual work in the Group (publishing activity, lectures, writing for the DEO, etc.). Also, after the signing of the contract for the establishment of the EU in June 1916, they set in motion the adoption of the EC's decision on the approval of the EU and its role. By signing the above forms and with the validity of the articles of association, they clarified their limits regarding financial transactions with the Group and their role in its administration and operation.

Triantafyllidis mentioned that, for example, he and Delmouzos were involved in the work of the editorial committee's readers, who wrote ''The alphabet with the sun'' almost alone. He disagreed with Sotiriou's opinion that the reading books were written in a short period with the inspiration and guidance of Glinos. Glinos took part in the council's judgments about the primary school reading books but was uninvolved in the regulation of spelling and grammar, proposed by Triantafyllidis. He did not belong to the editorial committee of the program of the two basic reading books the high mountains and the alphabet with the sun (Triantafyllidis, 1988, Apanta, V. 6, pp. 156, 157).

In the phase of osmosis with politics and politicians from 1913, and 1914 onwards, the connecting link was Glinos, a man with the prestige of a scientist and his communication skills saw the favourable moment and convinced the other two to cooperate to realize their vision for a reform language in schools. He was the main factor of consultation together with the minister of education G. Tsirimokos for the involvement of the EO in the call for direct intervention in the country's educational affairs by Venizelos. When the educational reform

was decided, it caused confusion and surprise within the EO if we consider the reactions of Triantafyllidis to the EO where he comments that he pleasantly surprised us... (Dimaras, 1986, p. 23). The reaction of surprise on his part, raised the question of the collective nature of the decisions concerning the phase of language education reform.

Triantafyllidis, writing the ''Before they were burned'', declared that it was the last time that this kind of struggle was stirred up and continued: I *the obligation and towards the idea that I fought for this project to prevail, that I became his partner, to give those who are interested the explanations that the exhibition made necessary... I hope I did my duty with all the required objectivity. If the report not spread so many falsehoods about the educational reform in society, and if society itself been better enlightened as to what been done, the rather thorough explanations which I have been compelled to give would be superfluous* (Triantafyllidis, 1921, Before they were burn, DEO, vol. 9, 1919, pp. 313, 317). He was frustrated by the blocking of the reform effort by conservative circles. The interruption of his active presence by the EO in 1920 also signals the feeling of disappointment and incoherence within the Group as well. The sense of frustration was confirmed a few years later during his communication with Delmouzos. In 1923, when Delmouzos explained to him the change of condition in Greece and the possibility of continuing their reform, Triantafyllidis wrote to him about his concern for proper cooperation with Glinos: *a union where there was no place for my ideas, nor I have a position, he doesn't need me either. Elsewhere he adds that he is in the mood for cooperation and the future there is no spirit of misunderstanding.* He recognizes that Delmouzos showed a disposition to adopt the logic of Glinos, perhaps out of a mental need (Letter (39th) of Triantafyllides to Delmouzos on August 15, 1923, F. 2, Delmouzos Archive). Later, in 1927, he characterized Glinos' policy as bad and dangerous (Letter (40), (44) Triantafyllidis to Delmouzos, the first on August 17, 1924 and the second in 1927, F. 2, Delmouzos Archive).

After the stormy vote of the General Assembly of the EO in March 1927 and the departure of Delmouzos and his supporters from the Group, the relations between Glinos and Delmouzos were interrupted. Delmouzos initially invoked a disagreement without any enmity between them (Delmouzos, 2014, p. 284).

The disagreement then leaded the two former close associates to a complete breakdown in communication. In the Glinos Foundation there was the following unsigned comment (by Glinos) about Delmouzos: *Delmouzos, the educator of the enlightened big-bourgeois in 1910, is now the educator of the reactionary big-bourgeois*. Fragos characterized their views as modern and the opposite of the conservative intellectual views of Exarchopoulos' wing and considers that there is a difference of a century between them. He was calling their greatest difference an educational division corresponding to the well-known political division between Constantin and Venizelos. He called the educational triad of the EO divided and not of the same mind. From 1927, with the split of the EO, they followed a diametrically opposite course: Delmouzos led the new attempt at educational reform with the Godikas legislation, and became a professor at the AUTH and then he was overdue, remaining faithful to his apolitical ideology. Glinos joined the communist party and aimed at the application of a popular education plan by drawing up detailed programs for all levels of education (Frankos, 1986, pp. 20, 21).

2. Discussion-Consequences

The protagonists of the EO from the beginning experience many obstacles and difficulties in the mutual understanding and processing of the purpose of establishing their organization related to the recovery of Greek education and linguistic renewal with the use of the demotic language in school.

Based on the minutes and the letters between the members we find that there are several difficulties in the communication between the founders and the pioneers of the Group. Dissatisfaction was often expressed by Triantafyllidis, Delmouzos, Dragoumis and others about what they considered to be insufficient work being done. They speak of a lack of inclination for personal work, a strong prejudice against the Group's demoticists, and the need for group members to counterattack against criticisms of genuine ''Noumas'' demoticists or purists. Difficulty in finding collaborators for their journal, low public attendance at EO lectures and public indifference to the language issue, were observed.

Wariness and fear continue even after the favourable change of government. At the same time, major ideological confrontations between Delmouzos and Glinos were erased, after the Asia Minor disaster and the arrival of the refugees. The creation of the association of "New Greeks" was an indicator of the reflection within the EO. Their differentiation ultimately led to the split of the members of the EO and the isolation of Glinos who remained the leader of the Group until the end.

Bibliographical References

Delmouzos, A. P. (1958). *Studies and asides.* Athens.

Delmouzos, A. P. (2014). *Analects. Language is only a medium. A. Dimaras, A. Patrikiou (ed.).* Athens: INS & Society for Studies of Modern Greek Culture and General Education.

Delta, P. S. (2008). ep. Al. P. Zannas. *Ion. Dragoumis*. Athens: Ermis.

Dimaras, A. (1986). *The reform that did not take place,* vol. B, 2nd reprint. Athens: Ermis Publishing.

Dimaras, A. (1987). *Triantafyllidis and educational demoticism. Honorary events for the hundredth anniversary of the birth of M. Triantafyllid*is. Thessaloniki: AUTH. INS. IMT

Dimaras, A. (1994). *Membership list 1910-1927: composition, description, estimates*. Athens: Society for Studies of Modern Greek Culture and General Education.

Gatos, G. (2003). *The great passion of educational demoticism. 41 letters of Glinos to Delmouzos.* Athens: Greek Letters.

Glinos, D. (1983). *Apanda* Volume II: 1910-1914. Ed care, introduction: Philippos Iliou. Athens: Foundation.

Frankos, X. P. (1986). *Current education issues.* Athens: Gutenberg. Educational series.

Iliou, F. (2007). *Mosaics of history and politics of the 20th century.* Athens: Polis.

Mackridge, P. (2009). *Language and national identity in Greece, 1766-1976.* Oxford University Press.

Papanoutsos, E. Language and education: spiritual issues, article on May 31, 1951, Triantafyllidis Archive.

Ten years, *DEO,* vol.9, 1919, p. 23.

The work of the group, *DEO,* vol. 5, 1915, pp. 7-9.

Triantafyllidis, M. (1988). *Apanta, vol 6.* Thessaloniki: APTH/INS (Manolis Triantafyllidis Foundation). Reprint with corrections.

Triantafyllidis, M. (2001). *Correspondence 1895-1959,* (Philological curator: University of Mullas, Maria Vertsoni-Kokoli, Efi Petkou). Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Institute of Modern Greek Studies - Manolis Triantafyllidis Foundation.

Tsirimokos, Markos (1927). "History of the Education Club (written by a founder)". *Nea Hestia* (vol 7 and 8): pp. 401-410 and 468-478.

Triantafyllidis, M. (1921), Before they burn, *DEO*, vol. 9, 1919, pp. 313, 317.

Archival References

Letter of 12th Glinos to Delmouzos on May 15, 1921, F. 14, Delmouzos Archive.

Thoughts on the progress of the Educational Group. Typescript (copy) of text regarding thoughts on the development of the Educational Group. Series: B. Language Education Archive, folder B 14 Group and Education Committee, subfolder B 2. Minutes of the Education Committee. Statutes, Sessions, Work Programs of the Educational Group, 1910-1920, Triantafyllidis Archive.

Letter from Triantafyllides in Athens to Penelope Delta, Alexandria on January 12, 1916. Typewritten (photocopy) letter. Double photocopy of a letter and comments from the book Correspondence of P. S. Delta, 1906-1940, Triantafyllidis Archive.

Letter of Delmouzos to Michalakopoulos, January 1923, F. 13, Delmouzos Archive.

Letter (39th) of Triantafyllides to Delmouzos on May 13, 1923, F. 2, Delmouzos Archive.

Letter (0643) of Dragoumis to Petrokokkinos, At: http://www3.ascsa.edu.gr/digital_images/Archives_low/DragoumiAllilografia/20070713/0643_1a.jpg, Digital archive I. Dragoumis Gennadios Library, ASKSA.

Letter from Triantafyllides in Berlin to Ion Dragoumis, Athens on July 9, 1911. Typescript (copy) of letter, Triantafyllidis Archive.

Letter of Petrokokkinos in Athens to the Administrative Committee of the Educational Group, Athens on August 6. Handwritten letter with the resignation of Petrokokkinos. August 6, 1920. Series: B. Language Education Archive, folder B 14 Club and Education

Committee, subfolder B2. Proceedings of the Education Committee. Constitution, Sessions, Work Programs of the Educational Club, 1910-1920. Dragoumi's letter to Tsirimokos on May 2, 1910, F. 9, Delmouzos Archive.

University Traditions, Comments on Language Reform. Handwritten notes from epimeter. Series: E. University archive, folder E-4IH University traditions (Tutorials 1923-1953), subfolder 110 Tutorial: lessons in modern Greek grammar based on the text of the Mountains (1942-43), Triantafyllidis Archive.

Letter of Triantafyllidis in Berlin to Dimitris Glinos, Andros June/July 1922. Typescript (copy) of letter. The original is in the hands of Andreas Glinos. About the situation in Greece. For their work in the Ministry (problems in cooperation). News from Berlin, see p. 329, Correspondence: 1895-1959, op. p. Triantafyllidis Archive.

Letter of Petrokokkinos to Manolis Triantafyllidis, Athens in 1915. Typewritten (copy) letter. His thoughts on the untranslatability of established terms "in administration, science, art and all manifestations of social life", Triantafyllidis Archive.

Typescript (copy) of text regarding thoughts on the development of the Educational Group. Series: B. Language Education Archive, folder B 14 Group and Education Committee, subfolder B 2. Minutes of the Education Committee. Statutes, Sessions, Work Programs of the Educational Group, 1910-1920, Triantafyllidis Archive.

Letter (39th) of Triantafyllides to Delmouzos on August 15, 1923, F. 2, Delmouzos Archive.

Letter (40), (44) Triantafyllidis to Delmouzos, the first on August 17, 1924 and the second in 1927, F. 2, Delmouzos Archive.