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INTRODUCTION

Bernard Beatty

Byron: Heritage and Legacy, theme of the conference and of this collection has three terms: Byron, Heritage, Legacy. It is important that there are three terms and not just two. From one point of view, this book is about historical contexts. From another point of view, it is about Byron. Byron, I think, would approve. He set himself against the separation of poetry from life, from history, from politics, from ethics, and from thought. He set himself against the separation of English culture from European culture and world events. He was interested in the world, and the world was, and remains, interested in him. This book is about Byron and his worlds, and about Byron’s words.

Here, then, are eighteen essays by scholars from the United States, Canada, Western and Eastern Europe, South Africa, Israel, and India, on a range of subjects and contexts that Byron would recognize instantly as some of his own major interests—the Bible, Virgil, prehistory, scientific theories, animals, national cultures, the relation of religion to ethics and aesthetics, and the thought and writings of his own contemporaries. And Byron would think it perfectly proper to see these disparate things gathered together in a primarily literary context much as he was used to in the journals of his own times—such as the Edinburgh Review and Quarterly Review. We, by and large, no longer take the naturalness of this association for granted and come at it in more consciously constructed ways.

That is one context for this volume. But there is another that derives directly from these “more consciously constructed ways.” In the flurry of theories, countertheories, and antitheories, which have formed, disrupted, and partly erased the history of what used to be called “literary criticism” in the past fifty years, the word “contexts” has assumed a more aggressive and less ancillary force. For some, the entity “literature” is no more than a chimera generated by different contexts. There is nothing to attend to, it is suggested, other
than the contexts themselves, in themselves and in their intersections. Byron’s poetry, on this view, is simply a meeting of the waters—be they economic, sociopolitical, or broadly historical and cultural. The present volume does not take or proceed from a theoretical position here, but, of course, it is of its time and gladly presents itself as part of a growing interest in the relation of literary texts to other and to extraliterary contexts. Nevertheless, a reading of it will suggest that Byron’s poems and letters have an attracting shape and force of their own which is not conferred by context alone. Byron detested the separation of poetry from life, but he did not think that poetry was simply to be explained by things external to its own fashioning. He was, roughly speaking, a classicist here. His poetry is meant to be attended to in itself and in relation to its concerns and what brings it about rather than bypassed or swallowed up by some other governing drive or explanatory language. There is, and not by accident, a more than intermittent concern with the close reading of Byron’s text in the following pages. Hence the three terms of the title are meant. This book is about Byron, man and poet, and it is a book about contexts. That, I think, is how it should be.

Etymologically, “context” derives from contextere (“weaving together”). Byron’s life and his poetry weave many different things together and so does this book. But “weaving” implies threads and pattern. It is a spatial, not a temporal, term. “Heritage” and “Legacy” do not work like this. They imply a “before” and an “after.” What particular past did Byron derive his ideas and forms from? What effect did his ideas and forms have on the particular future that separates and joins us and him? These are also primary concerns of this volume. Many essays examine them explicitly; most do so implicitly. Once again, we must not make the mistake of making Byron vanish into these things or imagine that he is simply held together at the point where they meet. We understand him better through them, but they do not explain him away. Yet who else but Byron, in his Ravenna Journal, would choose to define poetry in this way: “What is Poetry?—The Feeling of a Former World and a Future”? This volume takes Byron at his word and tries to trace something of that “Former World and a Future” as both heritage and legacy.

The structure of the book naturally follows from these considerations. The three sections roughly correspond to past, present, and future, on the one hand, and to outer and inner frames of Byron’s own ideas and practices, on the other. They do not do so in an absolutely rigid fashion, for this would make contexts superior to what they contextualize. Byron was much concerned with the defense of fact,
disliked obscurantism, and resisted the idea that poetry was simply a fiction unrelated to the true and the good—but his definition of poetry begins with the word “Feeling.” We cannot wholly know the past and can only guess at the future. Knowledge, in Byron’s view (Manfred has much to say on the subject), can never wholly grasp its object. We might go further and agree with Manfred that knowledge tends to paralyze or kill what it most seeks to know in its particular living form by seeing it only as an object. Poetry and literary scholarship must try to proceed with more delicacy than this and not make impossible the blurred but real recognitions and insights that Byron intends by the word “Feeling.” We hope that this book works as a whole not only to make some specific points and investigations that invite words like “perspectives” and “overview,” but also to suggest more tactile and under the surface kinds of connection.

The first section of the book utilizes the international character of its contributors to examine the multinational reception of Byron’s poetry and personality. This is one aspect of “legacy.” It thus forms a helpful parallel to Richard Cardwell’s edited two-volume collection of essays on *The Reception of Byron in Europe* (2004), but the present essays have a broader, often extra European, and also a less systematic perspective.

The second section of the book bears on Byron himself in relation to ideas and forms which he receives and generates from Hebraic and Latin originals, from scientific discoveries, and to the specifically critical reading of his own texts and verse forms. They concern Byron in himself and what he draws upon or inherits as his “heritage.” These things cannot be wholly separated but they can be distinguished, and they demand different kinds of attention. This is the centre of the book.

The final section is mainly concerned with Byron’s immediate, and immediately succeeding, contexts of authors and writers. The presence here of Wordsworth and Heinrich Heine, or Paley and Darwin, will not surprise us though the perspectives taken may, but we are less prepared for a comparison between Byron and Jane Austen or for Byron’s influence on Victorian Anger.

So much for the shape of the volume. But it had its own shaping by its own “before and after” and, after some thought and discussion—which were not cut off from “Feeling”—the editor and publishers thought it right to make this relation to time and event explicit and incorporate it into the book. Everything written in these pages was conceived and delivered in earliest form not long before September 11, 2001, in the United States (at Boston, New York, or Delaware). Most of the contributors, including me, stayed in the Millennium Hotel.
immediately opposite the Twin Towers, which dominated the view out of my bedroom window. It is impossible to forget these circumstances. I think the decision by the editor and publishers to record this is a brave and correct one. “Heritage and Legacy” reads rather differently now. No one had a stronger sense of the interrelation of contingency, politics, history, feeling, and thought than Lord Byron. These interrelations form his subject matter and inform his forms. It would be odd if this volume, produced in and across the circumstances of 2001 to the present, did not incorporate them somehow into its text, and so there is an afterword in which contributors briefly describe their sense of New York before the catastrophe and after. It would not be appropriate for me to say any more than this except that I think that the volume is the better for it, and that Byron would have approved of this too.
Part I

Byron’s International Reception
Byron’s “Fragments of Stone” in the American Court of Appeals

Nora Liassis

Byron never visited Cyprus, although some of his friends did. “Cyprus—is an Island I have long been sick of—” he told Holland in an erotically loaded comment on Greek mythology (BLJ 3: 31). All the same, he would have been gratified to know of the historic link forged between his name and verse and a small village church on the northern peninsula of the island. In October 1990, the chief judge of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals in Indiana handed down a landmark ruling befitting the sentiment of a Romantic poet outspoken in his stand against the dismantling of the Parthenon. This essay considers the validity of Byronic reference in this far-reaching decision, which set a legal precedent for concerted campaigns against the illicit global trade in antiquities.

Under appeal from the Federal Court in Indiana was the fate of celebrated victims of Cyprus’ troubled history. Four sets of wondrous religious mosaics, dated sixth century AD, had long been regarded as rare masterpieces, indeed holy relics, of early Byzantine art: “Remnants of things that have pass’d away,” noted the judge. The opening statement of the Court’s Subject Opinion was a twelve-line quotation from the “temple in ruin” scene of The Siege of Corinth (1816), specifically lines 450–61 connecting Alp’s meditation at the temple interlude with the apparition of Francesca, an ostensibly
Romantic encounter negated by a phantom maiden and Alp’s choice of an “immortality of ill” (*Siege* 605). Byron in 1809 had passed by the ruins of Roman Corinth, with the Acrocorinth fortress towering overhead, near the spot where Paul had surveyed this great cosmopolitan city, despised that very temple with its rampant hedonism, and addressed his letter on love. Byron told Leigh Hunt in 1816 (regarding *Siege* and *Parisina*) that he was “so partial to their place (& events connected with it) that I have stamped them while I could” (*CPW* 3: 479). “Byron,” says the judge, “writing here of the Turkish invasion of Corinth in 1725, could as well have been describing the many churches and monuments that today lie in ruins on Cyprus, a small, war-torn island in the eastern corner of the Mediterranean Sea” (*Trial* 5). Although court judgments are not prefaced with Romantic verse, Chief Judge William Bauer, a history major, was “filled with the historical significance of the mosaics and suggested that Lord Byron should have had the responsibility for the writing” (Bauer). His associate Joseph Heyd, a Byron student, produced his copy of *The Siege of Corinth* to inspire the content of the findings. Together, sharing Byron’s poetic sympathies, they wrote up a compelling intertextual exchange on the moral and cultural legacy of Romantic “ruins of empire” within a contemporary framework for justice.

At the strategic crossroads of three continents, Cyprus has 9,000 years of civilization, and European travelers often felt compelled to comment on the bequest of history. Byron’s Cambridge friend, Professor Edward Clarke, touring Cyprus in June 1801, remarked on “this island that had so highly excited us and amply gratified our curiosity by its most interesting antiquities” (315). And a later visitor, Byzantinist Robert Byron, heading for Oxiana in 1933, pronounced, “History in this island is almost too profuse. It gives one a sort of mental indigestion” (6). Under a legion of invaders and rulers Cyprus witnessed, to quote *The Curse of Minerva* (1811), “successive tyrannies expire” while it managed to sustain its own cultural heritage amid foreign impact (96). However, just as the time of Byron’s first tour of Greece (1809–11), so the period since 1974 has been politically adverse to safeguarding culture; “plunder from a bleeding land” graphically depicts the chaotic scenario (*CHP* II.13). From then until now human displacement and looted art have remained unresolved issues. Acclaimed Turkish Cypriot poet and academic Mehmet Yaşın summed up the catastrophe: “Cyprus is being estranged from itself; the historic, environmental, communal, and cultural structure is being spoiled” (“Perishing Cyprus”).
The Preamble to the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict states, “Damage to cultural property belonging to any people whatsoever means damage to the cultural heritage of all mankind.” The cultural legacy of Cyprus has above all been dominated by church heritage, ever since the arrival of key figures such as Mark, Lazarus, and Andreas. Cypriot Christians give witness in the Acts of the Apostles, and the monotheistic proselytizing of “That fellow Paul—the parvenú!” in 45 AD led to the island’s conversion to Christianity (Vision of Judgement 20). The Orthodox Church became fundamental to Greek Cypriot identity, although Byron’s religious skepticism, it seems, did not endear him to Orthodoxy, its churchmen, or its churches. St. Sophia he rated “inferior in beauty and size” to some mosques and cathedrals (BLJ 1:251). His allegation that “Indeed a more abandoned race of miscreants cannot exist than the lower orders of the Greek clergy” (CPW 2:194) was echoed by one of his contemporaries, William Turner, in Cyprus in 1815 as he observed the mastery of priests over peasants: “In short, these Greek priests, everywhere the vilest miscreants in human nature, are worse than usual in Cyprus from the power they possess” (583).

Even so, Byron’s name is now linked with the small village of Lythrakomi and its church of Panagia Kanakaria. The little domed Church is a less imposing structure than the fortress of Corinth where Byron in his fourth Oriental Tale depicts the destruction of the citadel and its church. In the final onslaught between “Christians” and “Othmans” despoliation reigns: statues are felled, shrines spoilt, and the consecrated chalice is “a glittering prize” (Siege 955). Because churches constitute a conspicuous cultural symbol (an estimated 500 Cypriot churches have been looted regularly since 1974), the pillage of the famed Kanakaria mosaics came as no surprise. Between 520 and 530 AD a complex mosaic was applied to the dome of the sanctuary apse, “[f]ashioned by long forgotten hands” of Cypriot artists and silversmiths (Siege 451). Each mosaic piece, about two-feet square, was composed of hundreds of jewel-like bits of glass, marble, and stone. The overall landscape was paradisiacal with palm trees and a decorative frieze enclosing twelve apostle medallions in roundels, three-quarter life-size with silver halos, flanking archangels around the central image of Madonna and child. These mosaics, in the Constantinople-cum-Hellenistic tradition, were “thoroughly metropolitan in theme and composition, but included iconographic features which, in a work dating probably from the first year of Justinian’s reign (527–565 AD), must be counted conservative and provincial”
(Megaw and Hawkins 133–35). Just so, the ensemble was regarded by World Heritage as a valuable ethnographic index of the high quality of church decoration in the provinces in the early Byzantine era and has been favorably compared in workmanship and color with the mosaics of St. Catherine’s in the Sinai, and those of San Vitale in Ravenna, center of early Christian art in the West. A. H. S. Megaw, director of antiquities during the British colonial period, recorded the looting in his 1977 monograph on the church, co-authored with the renowned Byzantine restorer E. J. W. Hawkins. *The Church of the Panagia Kanakaria at Lythrankomi in Cyprus: Its Mosaics and Frescoes* was a volume that became solid testimony of Cyprus’ ongoing search for the lost mosaics. Furthermore, no one could claim that they were uncared for—a common justification for removal of treasures overseas—as the mosaics had undergone cleaning and indexing from 1950 and were listed in the *UNESCO Collection of World Art* (1963 Series). The Megaw text also included numerous close-up photographs, taken after substantial restoration work in the mid-1960s.

Why was this mosaic decoration such a significant eastern “text” for its own congregation and, equally, an enticement for illicit collectors? First, it is a rare surviving example of the period before Iconoclasm, the “War against Icons” (726–843 AD) initially decreed by Leo III. By a twist of fate, the recurrent Arab raids on Cyprus (648–961 AD) brought the island to the brink of devastation but protected these mosaics from the destruction of sacred images that swept the Eastern Roman Empire. With the Constantinople court so remote, priests and monks, promoting icons as the votive focus for illiterate peasants, became the stalwarts of Greek Orthodox culture. The fifth-century basilica was destroyed in the raids but rebuilt; its ornamented apse survived. More importantly, this is *unique* full-frontal iconography—the one and only example on record in Byzantine art where the Virgin is surrounded by a shining *mandorla* (almond-shaped halo), always reserved exclusively for depictions of Christ’s divinity (artistic inspiration is probably *Apocalypse* Book 12, recounting a woman crowned with a halo of twelve stars). The mosaics thus affirm the Virgin as “Theotokos,” mother of God, not merely mother of Christ. The Panagia Kanakaria (The Virgin Caresser) is regaled on a lyre-shaped throne holding an adolescent. The geometric *mandorla* sets them apart from the Archangels Michael and Gabriel flanking them. Travel writer Colin Thubron stood in front of the apse in 1972: “[T]he Christ Child shone above me with the look of a boy-emperor, and dangled a gold-shod foot as if he might descend” (239). In passing, one can detect here a parallel with that
otherworldly duo in the heavenly sanctuary of The Siege of Corinth as the carnage draws near: “Her, and the boy-God on her knee, / Smiling sweetly on each prayer” (910–11). Until 1976, then, having survived the vicissitudes of history, the mosaics were “relics that time and barbarism have left” (CPW 2: 191).

Two years later, harassed priests and villagers fled south abandoning the church and mosaics—a dramatic real-life instance of “Her sons too weak the sacred shrine to guard” (CHP II. 12). In November 1979, tourists brought fragments of tesserae to the Department of Antiquities, which could not access the occupied areas. Thieves had broken through windows on the domed roof and forcibly removed the frescoes by placing adhesive cloth over them. Cyprus sought immediate assistance to locate its looted art. Formal appeals were made to UNESCO, the Council of Europe, the International Council of Museums and Sites, auction houses, the American Congress, and institutes such as Dumbarton Oaks Institute for Byzantine Studies. Certainly, tracking the mosaics was a more daunting task than the pursuit of the Parthenon marbles had been in the 1800s, when the identity of the “classic Thieves” and their shipment of the antiquities to “northern climes” was public knowledge (14, 15). Even so, in countering the defendant’s accusation of the plaintiffs’ lack of diligent search, Gary Vikan, former senior associate at Dumbarton Oaks, gave witness at trial that Cyprus “stands apart” in its efforts to recover stolen cultural properties (Trial 19). Finally, in 1989, the government and the Church of Cyprus, as dual custodians of heritage, initiated repatriation procedures for the return of the smuggled art in the successful two-stage legal drama of Cyprus v. Goldberg. They took an Indiana art dealer to federal court in her hometown to retrieve four of the mosaics: the lower part of the Virgin and Child (the upper half is missing); the medallions of apostles Matthew and James; and the torso of Michael, the luminous angel with the broken wing, for whom Goldberg developed a special fascination.

However, the overlapping laws of Cyprus, the United States, and the international community were not the only practical considerations. In 1976, the mosaics were hurriedly given a fake export license by an illegal regime and then housed in Germany for some years. The contract was signed in the Netherlands on July 2, 1988, and the mosaics were viewed, paid for, and delivered in crates at Geneva airport’s “free port” on July 7, 1988. The purchase price of $1.2 million ($3 million was initially demanded) was broken down into $100 bills, carried in two satchels. Goldberg, for her part, noted the condition of the mosaics at this first viewing: “They were very dull and
it was very apparent that they...had numerous fissures, or splits, in them, that they were just marginally held together with glue...they were so fragile that when I bent down to start to touch them, thinking that maybe I was going to lift it up to look at the back, literally a piece separated in my hand.” But she “wanted them more than ever” (Trial 10). The following day they were freighted to the United States where Goldberg immediately proceeded to locate possible buyers. To complicate further the ongoing search by Cyprus, the ensemble had been broken down into sixteen fragments— “made plural by the vandals’ axes” was the court’s graphic comment (Trial 8). Later in 1997, more details of the extent of this vandalism would emerge after an eight-month sting operation in Munich, which resulted in an “archaeological” discovery of an outrageous kind. German police located photograph albums going twenty years back depicting looters on scaffolds removing mosaic fragments from the Kanakaria apse. The notebooks contained drawings showing workers which portions to hack off, directing them particularly to the faces. Hence, documented testimony attests to the loss of the organic unity in a blatant case of “wanton and useless defacement,” or “Thy walls defac’d, thy mouldering shrines remov’d” (CPW 2: 191, 15). A sixth mosaic, the apostle Thomas (value $8.6 million), was located in a hoard of Cypriot Byzantine treasures (estimated value $46 million) stuffed into the fake ceilings, walls, and floors of two Munich apartments owned by the Kanakaria looter, a Turkish archaeologist. Thus, the trial judge was to opine quite rightly that Goldberg was *not* the chief culprit: “Unfortunately, when these mosaics surfaced they were in the hands not of the most guilty parties, but of Peg Goldberg and her gallery” (Trial 23). Indeed, the tracking of the mosaics reads like an odyssey in which their role as a collective object of worship became distorted by a hedonistic “congregation” of unscrupulous, multinational dealers who, while protesting that they “fell in love with them,” got down to business as usual and worked up glossy brochures (Trial 9). Goldberg anticipated a quick resale, and Byron’s appraisal of classic marbles rings equally true of the exquisite mosaics: “[T]o whatever spot of earth these ruins were transported...there they would still exist in the perfection of their beauty, and in the pride of their poetry” (CMP 133). This was yet another variation on the indignant spectator of *The Curse of Minerva* who “Admires the plunder, but abhors the thief” (198).

In 1988, brokers for Goldberg and Feldman Fine Arts Inc., a firm based in Carmel, Indianapolis, offered the four mosaics for an inflated price of $20 million to potential buyers. One was the
J. Paul Getty Museum in Malibu. Luckily, its antiquities’ curator Dr. Marion True had a working relationship with the Department of Antiquities in Cyprus and promptly alerted the Republic’s law enforcement. With regard to such national laws on authenticity and rightful ownership, Professor Patty Gerstenblith of De Paul University, authority in Cultural Heritage Law and member of the Cultural Property Advisory Committee to the President (2002–3), applies a postmodern rendering in the phrase “Aromantic Byronism.” She upholds the legal contextualization of the mosaics for a culturally rich source nation like Cyprus and exposes the duplicity in dealers’ familiar claims that such countries cannot preserve their own culture. “The nation,” Gerstenblith says, “remains the only entity with the ability to protect the physical remains of its past. While protective national laws are what some would likely categorize as the product of Aromantic Byronism, many nations today, including the United States, use them as one method to reduce incentives to purchase undocumented antiquities and thus prevent the looting and destruction of archaeological sites” (“Museums”).3

Although American courts have granted few judgments on restoration of cultural property against their own citizens, this case generated intense media speculation worldwide, as in the BBC’s Omnibus documentary “The Kanakaria Mosaics” (1990). The trial held points of legal interest too, according to Professor Lauren Robel, Dean of the Indiana University School of Law: “History had given Cyprus little reason to be optimistic about the willingness of other countries to thwart the interests of their own citizens to protect those of a faraway island nation. Yet in this federal courtroom, almost matter-of-factly, the nation of Cyprus would have its national treasures returned, and the Indianapolis art dealer would go home over one million dollars poorer” (841). More poetically, Dan Hofstadter, whose investigation into the saga of the mosaics resulted in a fifty page article in The New Yorker (July 1992), and a subsequent book Goldberg’s Angel, explained: “The spirit of a people, even a small people, is inevitably furnished with memories of material things—of mountains and rivers and cities and shrines—and the appearance of an unmistakably Cypriot angel [Michael] on the shoulder of some lady in Indianapolis was not something that either the Church or the Republic of Cyprus could tolerate” (Goldberg’s 54).

Following the first District Court hearing in Indiana, which began on May 30, 1989, Federal Judge James Noland handed down an eighty-six page ruling, denouncing the dealer for lack of “due diligence” and a too cursory enquiry into “property title” before her
transaction (*Trial 24*). Incidentally, both court hearings dealt not with the looter (who was arrested in Germany in 1997) but with the art dealer and her prospect of monetary gain. Goldberg had borrowed the $1.2 million from a National Bank in Indianapolis and agreed to split the resale profits with her attorney and two art dealers. One dealer, convicted by a French court for art forgery, claimed to be a direct descendant of both Rembrandt and Rubins. In his sensational book *Hot Art, Cold Cash* (1993), Michael van Rijn revealed the brash exploits of a flamboyant master-dealer operating in the bizarre art underworld. So Goldberg had not acted in good faith. Largely ignorant of Byzantine art, she had failed to seek an authoritative source, choosing instead to negotiate with dubious strangers in a hasty business venture.

During the ongoing litigation, public activities pressed for repatriation of the mosaics. For instance, a large-scale petition in the *New York Times* (July 21, 1989) was headlined, “STOP THE ILLEGAL SALE OF STOLEN BYZANTINE MOSAICS FROM TURKISH-OCCUPIED CYPRUS IN THE UNITED STATES.” Organized by distinguished Byzantine scholar Doula Mouriki, the petition focused on the looting of the Kanakaria Church, referring to the mosaics as “priceless fragments.” Signed by 2,000 American academics and cultural figures, this petition was vindicated by the court’s ruling. The court gave judgment in favor of the plaintiffs: “There was nothing farfetched about Judge Noland’s decision, but what he apparently did not suspect was that his judgment, if upheld, would end by creating a new set of international standards for the purchase of ancient art, since unknown provenance, artificially high appraisals, suspicious middlemen, and lightning transactions are the stuff of the antiquities trade” (*Goldberg’s* 82). Noted German Byzantine scholar Klaus Gallas welcomed the verdict “as a necessary deterrent for the whole international art market where numerous items of ancient cultures, unearthed by illicit excavations, are traded” (14). The “bickering agents” (*CPW 2*: 189) lodged a timely appeal but lost in the higher court hearing (October, 1990). In spring 1991, with the mosaics in an Indianapolis vault waiting to go home, the American Supreme Court declined to hear Goldberg’s appeal.

The second appeals hearing, with its Byronic references, was argued in January, 1990, and decided in October, 1990. It ruled that “the church has a valid, superior and enforceable claim to these treasures, items of vast cultural, religious and monetary value, which therefore must be returned to it” (*Trial 24*). Seventh Circuit Judge Richard D. Cudahy, sitting on the same bench, upbraided the dealer for not
running a documented authenticity check before her reckless transaction. Then he took the case onto a wider standing, adding a global dimension by concurring with the UNESCO Convention on World Cultural Heritage (1972) and its subcategory in Article I defining “pictures, paintings and drawings produced entirely by hand on any support and in any material.” Cudahy stated, “The mosaics are the virtually unique remnants of an earlier artistic period and should be returned to their homeland and their rightful owner. This is the case not only because the mosaics belong there, but as a reminder that greed and callous disregard for the property, history and culture of others cannot be countenanced by the world community or by this court” (Trial 27). Keeping culture in its rightful context was a Byronic argument, too: “I opposed, and will ever oppose, the robbery of ruins from Athens, to instruct the English in sculpture…but why did I do so? The ruins are as poetical in Piccadilly as they were in the Parthenon; but the Parthenon and its rock are less so without them” (CMP 133). By the same token, Gallas, a reputable authority on the mosaics, revisited Kanakaria and was shocked to see what was in effect an updated version of iconoclasm in “the most painful bleeding wounds of the church: the naked surfaces of the apse.” He goes on to say in an article aptly titled “Where the Heavens are Plundered”: “The case of the odyssey of the mosaics, an important world cultural artifact, sets a terrifying example for hundreds, even thousands of lost works of art, which have disappeared and which on rare occasions resurface later as stolen goods on the international market in antiquities” (Gallas 14). On an encouraging note, the church has not become an animal pen or social club: “Heavy, massive, wooden doors keep the House of God closed. A Turk from the village keeps the key; he is the official warden and willingly lets you in the Christian sacred place” (Gallas 14).

The chief judge also concluded in favor of the appellants with reference to The Siege of Corinth in Byronic language: “As Byron’s poem laments, war can reduce our grandest and most sacred temples to mere ‘fragments of stone.’ Only the lowest of scoundrels attempt to reap personal gain from this collective loss. Those who plundered the churches and monuments of war-torn Cyprus, hoarded their relics away, and are now smuggling them and selling them for large sums, are just such blackguards” (Trial 23). Similarly, Byron, who declared himself to be “not a collector or admirer of collections,” had tough words for the moral degeneracy inherent in such cultural pillage at a time when Childe Harold and the marbles, the poet and the “pilferer” (or “deliverer” of endangered treasures), were concurrently