Κάμπος

Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek

Cambridge No. 6 1998

ISSN: 1356-5109

Published by:
The Modern Greek Section
Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages
Sidgwick Avenue
Cambridge CB3 9DA
United Kingdom

Price per issue: £8.00
All correspondence should be sent to the above address.

Edited by David Holton and Jocelyn Pye
Layout by Liz Crossfield

Cover illustration: from the *Grammar* of Gregorios Sarafis, published at Kydonies (Ayvalik) in 1820 (see A. Koumarianou, L. Droulia & E. Layton, *Το Ελληνικό Βιβλίο 1476-1830.* Athens 1986, Plate 239)

Κάμπος. **Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek No. 6 1998**

Contents

Greek surrealist poets in English translation: problems, parameters and possibilities

David Connolly

I *Introduction*

Greek surrealist poets have been only partially and somewhat randomly translated into English in comparison with exponents of other modes of twentieth-century Greek poetry and there has been no systematic presentation in the English-speaking world of this group of highly influential poets. This is somewhat surprising if we consider the number of translations into English of poets such as Cavafy, Seferis and Ritsos. Presumably the reasons for this lack of attention on the part of British and American translators are not based on axiological criteria, as the surrealist poets represent one of the most important and influential groups in modern Greek literature with an impact on all subsequent generations of Greek poets.[1] My aim in this paper is to examine some of the peculiar features of these poets in order to ascertain to what extent these features offer themselves to translation – what translation problems arise and whether they can be adequately dealt with in English translation. How, for example, can we reconcile the conscious craft of the translator with a mode of poetry which is rooted in the subconscious, which aims at the irrational, and which uses a form of writing that is to a greater or lesser extent automatic?

There is no doubt that the Greek surrealist poets constitute one of the main factors in the renewal of modern Greek poetry and, regardless of whether or not they constitute a movement as such, what we have is a group of poets with common and obvious elements and features of surrealism – automatic writing, startling images, contradictory and logically unconnected

---

[1] According to Nanos Valaoritis (1991: 116), there was perhaps no other surrealist group in the world (with the exception of France) that was more active or exercised more influence.

phrases, unexpected metaphors, lack of similes, exchange of properties between animate and inanimate objects, elliptical syntax etc. – all of which contribute to the immediacy of poetic communication by attempting to eliminate rational response. The translator's concern then is how and to what extent these features can be conveyed in the target language (TL). Of necessity, the examples I use in my discussion will be limited to only a very few of the leading exponents of surrealist poetry and to their earliest, perhaps most surrealistically orthodox, works.

II *Surrealist poetry and the problem of translation*

Meaning and function

The translator of poetry engages in a process that involves identifying semantic content (or, more questionably, deciding on the author's intended meaning), assessing the potential effect of this meaning on the source text (ST) readers and finding suitable if not similar stylistic means of conveying both content and potential effect to the target readers. The search for poetic meaning (i.e. the poem's content, effect and style) would seem to be even more hazardous, however, in the case of surrealist poetry which contains no logically developed theme, no narrative statement or message, and where all traditional poetic forms are abandoned and (theoretically, at least) aesthetic preoccupations disregarded. According to Embirikos (1980: 326), the most orthodox of Greek surrealist poets:

> A surrealist poem does not consist of one or more subjective or objective themes logically defined and developed along conscious lines, but it is a poem that might consist of any elements that arise in the flow of its creation, regardless of all conventional and standard aesthetic, moral and logical constructions... It is a poem-happening, rather than a succession of static descriptions of certain events or feelings, described using one or another artistic style.

How then is the translator to deal with such poetry in which poetic meaning is to be found in neither content nor form? What is it that he or she must reproduce in the TL so that the translation may be faithful to the aims and function of the original? One view of translation sees it as the translator's job to recreate in the TL the poet's original vision that preceded its

verbal expression. Such a view regards even the original poem as a "translation" of this vision. Yet is this approach applicable to surrealist poetry that, at least at its outset, was a product of automatic writing? And even those surrealist poets who do not make use of automatic writing in its original technical sense – and I am thinking here of Elytis who on his own admission never accepted this aspect of surrealism – are still guided by language itself into the expression of certain ideas rather than the ideas dictating the language used (Elytis 1975: 637).

I refer as an example to Embirikos's poem "Θρυλικὸν Ἀνάκλιντρον", translated by Kimon Friar (1973: 637) as "Legendary Sofa", which begins:

> Ὁ εἰρμὸς τοῦ ποταμοῦ διεκόπη. Ἡ συνοχὴ ὅμως τοῦ τοπίου εἶταν τόση ποὺ καὶ ὁ ποταμὸς κυλοῦσε. Μέσα ἀπὸ τὰ φύλλα τῶν ἀγρῶν πρὸς τὸ γεφύρι ποὺ χτυποῦσε ὁ ἥλιος τὰ σπάρτα τὰ λευκὰ στήθη τὰ λουλούδια μέσα στὰ διάφανα πουκάμισα ποὺ ἀκουμποῦσαν στὰ χαράματα τὰ κορίτσια σκύβαν γυμνὰ ἢ σχεδὸν γυμνὰ νὰ συνθλίψουν καὶ να χαϊδέψουν γενικὰ τὰ σώματά τους καὶ τὰ σώματα τῶν ἀνθῶν...
>
> The continuity of the river was cut off. The coherence of the landscape was such that the river still continued to flow. From within the leaves of the field toward the bridge smitten by the sun the esparto grass the white breasts the flowers within the transparent shirts they placed on dawn girls stooped naked or almost naked to hug and generally to caress their bodies and the bodies of flowers...

In his *Report to Andreas Embirikos*, Elytis offers an interpretation of this poem which does not concern us here, but he goes on to make the important point that any message or meaning arising from this poem was not something the poet had in mind before sitting down to write the poem. In surrealist poetry, Elytis says, "what happens is that the 'carbon copy paper' presents things that the poet himself was not conscious of, without this meaning that these things do not correspond to his deeper self. The deeper meaning of the poem is therefore somehow perceived 'καθ' ὁδόν' [en route], during the process of writing" (1980: 36). The aim or intention of such poetry is not the expression of either ideas or a particular aesthetic. Images are used to evoke a response in the

reader but without determining the nature of the response and this is achieved by the deliberate avoidance of every logically coherent association. Such poetry, according to Elytis (1980: 37), aims at neither an elegant style nor a philosophical view, but at creating in the reader a "vibration" or "upward thrust" in the spiritual sense. It is this function that is all-important in surrealist poetry and, in the translation process, this intended pragmatic effect takes priority therefore over content (and form).

Surrealism as a movement was not therefore an artistic standpoint but a theory of action, revolutionary in character. As such, surrealist poetry overturns the categories of conventional logic to reveal other relationships between the world and the self; it unlocks the world of the subconscious, using the written word to effect an experience (βίωμα) in the reader. "One doesn't write poetry, one lives it," says Engonopoulos (1977: 147). It is poetry that presupposes an emotive and intuitive rather than a rational response. It appeals emotively, through sets of related if elliptical images, to subconscious responses in the reader, with the aim of giving the reader a new vision of his integration in the world around him.

It is for others to examine the historical reasons behind this opposition to a reality based only on logic and reason. The translator's work, having established poetic meaning in the pragmatic effect that surrealist poetry is intended to have on the reader, is to examine the techniques used by surrealist poets to create this effect and determine ways of reproducing these techniques so that the translation may function in a similar or corresponding way. It is to these specific features of surrealist poetry that I will now turn.

III *Surrealist techniques and translation parameters*

Automatic writing

Automatic writing is probably the main feature of orthodox surrealism (if not the decisive definition).[2] Although it was soon

---

[2] The recipe for *écriture automatique* was given in Breton's *Manifesto* (1924). The principle was of copying down from a kind of inner dictation whilst remaining "en dehors de toute préoccupation esthétique ou morale".

brought into question, it is, even in a modified form as a poetry of irrational surprise, a technique which, firstly, frees the poet from all rational and aesthetic constraints and the translator from all worries concerning the usual form-content dilemma. Though it must be pointed out that, in dealing with Greek surrealist poets, the translator is never dealing with strictly automatic writing, or if he is, then the conclusion is that the Greek subconscious is characterised by an inherent rhythm and aesthetic which the translator of Greek surrealist poets has to account for in his translation. For if automatic writing means a break with all traditional poetic forms and little or no concern for aesthetic effects, it also means that poets are free to use any means they wish to create the desired effect in the reader. I am thinking here in particular of Nikos Gatsos who makes use of traditional forms and fifteen-syllable verse in parts of *Amorgos*, which is purported to be a product of automatic writing (see Valaoritis and Pagoulatou 1991: 116). Hence, the translator is never entirely free from the problems of form and metre. Similarly, I might refer randomly to lines from Embirikos such as: "'Ιστάμενος ἀκουμπιστὸς στὴν κουμπαστὴ κοιτάζω" (from "Τὸ ρήμα ἀγναντεύω"), translated as: "Leaning against the bulwarks I look out" (Raizis 1981: 74), or ""Αλσος ἀλκῆς μὲ τ' ἄλικα δέντρα σου" (from "Οἱ καρυάτιδες"), translated as: "O vigorous groves with your trees of crimson" (Friar 1973: 351), where the translations fail to reproduce the pronounced rhythm and alliteration of the originals.

Secondly, automatic writing means breaking with normal word order, something more easily accepted in Greek (or even in French) than in English, which, being a non-inflected language, relies upon a fairly rigid word order to convey meaning. This is a general problem pertaining to all translation from Greek to English, yet in surrealist poetry, particular importance must also be given by the translator not only to the order of the words but to the way these words are spatially arranged. This problem of spatial arrangement is particularly important in poets like Nikos Engonopoulos, who, in his early surrealist poems, will often isolate a single word in a line, often no more than an article, so that its own peculiar force might be felt. One of the main features of surrealist poetry is the illogical yoking together of the most disparate objects. Yet all these disparate

images have a central harmony in that they create a coherent atmosphere of their own and though they well up out of the subconscious, it is clear, as Kimon Friar remarks, that "they flow into the control of a highly conscious will" (Friar 1973: 77). So, for example, in "Τὰ κλειδοκύμβαλα τῆς σιωπῆς" ("The pianofortes of silence") (Engonopoulos 1977: 83) we find the words of a typical surrealist image arranged in the following way:

χάνομαι
μέσα σὲ
σκοτεινὲς σπηλιὲς
ποὺ κρύφτουν
βαθιὰ
ραφτομηχανὲς
καὶ ψάρια
κίτρινα
ποὺ μιλοῦν
σὰ λουλούδια

which I translate as:

> I lose myself / in dark caverns / that conceal / in their depths / sewing machines / and fish / yellow ones / that talk / like flowers.

The spatial arrangement is all important and the translation should follow strictly – even, I would argue, contravening if necessary normal TL word order – for the reason that the spatial arrangement is itself meaningful, even if the content is not logical. The overall meaning derives from the association of the illogical elements in a seemingly logical regular structure. The meaning then is not *content bound* but rather, both the individual words and the association of ideas accumulate "meaning" as the poem is read, something which applies generally in the spatial arrangement in surrealist poetry.

Also particularly important in surrealist poetry is the syntax (or rather the absence of it) which follows the free flow of associations in the prose poems of both Engonopoulos and Embirikos, and which must be shown to do so in translation. For the sake of an example, I refer again to Embirikos's "Θρυλικὸν Ἀνάκλιντρον" ("Legendary Sofa"):

> ...Μέσα ἀπὸ τὰ φύλλα τῶν ἀγρῶν πρὸς τὸ γεφύρι ποὺ χτυποῦσε ὁ ἥλιος – τὰ σπάρτα – τὰ λευκὰ στήθη – τὰ λουλούδια μέσα στὰ διάφανα πουκάμισα – ποὺ ἀκουμποῦσαν στὰ χαράματα – τὰ κορίτσια σκύβαν γυμνὰ – ἢ σχεδὸν γυμνὰ νὰ συνθλίψουν καὶ να χαϊδέψουν γενικὰ τὰ σώματά τους – καὶ τὰ σώματα τῶν ἀνθῶν...
>
> ...From within the leaves of the field toward the bridge smitten by the sun – the esparto grass – the white breasts – the flowers within the transparent shirts – they placed on dawn – girls stooped naked – or almost naked to hug and generally to caress their bodies – and the bodies of flowers...

I am punctuating or normalizing the syntax of the image by the pauses I make when reading it. I should read it as it is written, without punctuation, if the free flow of associations is to be allowed to function as intended. This kind of syntax with no punctuation is a translator's nightmare, yet has to be reproduced as closely as possible, even bending the norms of the TL, and the translator should not inadvertently "punctuate" the image through altering or normalizing the syntax.

Thirdly, automatic writing seeks to join subject and object (the reader and the world) through language, without the mediation of the rational processes that make use of language as a category of logic. Automatic writing allows the operation of an "alchémie du verbe" that seeks to change the perception of life through the magical operations of language alone. By transcribing the words spilling over from the rich well of the subconscious, surrealism hoped to establish what Breton called "la fonctionnement réelle de la pensée". In literary terms, this produces what might be called a poetry of irrational surprise. What we find, then, in surrealist poems is the use of objects from mundane daily life (kitchen utensils, crankshafts, sewing machines etc.) next to strange and unusual objects – things that rationalism usually keeps apart. Surrealism links them together to build up a new logical order, challenging the very power of discourse. Individual words are, therefore, of the utmost importance and should not be sacrificed in the translation either to logic or the norms of the TL.[3] For example, in "Χειμερινὰ

---

[3] Engonopoulos refers to a conversation between Degas and Mallarmé in which Degas is complaining that although he is full of ideas, he cannot

σταφύλια" ("Winter grapes"), we find the phrase: "Μὰ τὰ δεκατρία ριζικά της σὰν τὰ δεκατέσσερά της χρόνια ἐσπάθισαν τὴν φευγαλέα συμφορά" (But her thirteen destinies like her fourteen years smote the fleeting calamities). Here, the verb "ἐσπάθισαν" (literally, "run through with a sword") has been translated (Friar 1973: 346) as "smote" (a normal collocation with sword), whereas perhaps the verbs "pierced" or "penetrated" with their sexual connotations might be more in keeping with the original. The translator, in other words, must be equally daring, equally inventive in his choice of words.

Similarly, key words that recur in different poems have to be religiously respected and translated in the same way each time. I refer as an example to certain key words listed by Elytis (1980: 39) as recurring in many of Embirikos's early poems: στέαρ, εὐνή, χοάνη, βόστρυχος, θύσανος, θρυαλλίς, μαρμαρυγή (tallow, bed, crucible, tress, tuft, wick, shimmer) etc. and which should appear in the translation as the same words. One further aspect of this problem of individual words refers to the use of words invented by the poet for their magical or incantatory qualities. So in Embirikos, words such as: "Ράγκα-παράγκα" (from "Ράγκα-παράγκα ἢ ὅταν τὰ συνήθη λόγια δὲν ἀρκοῦν"), "Ἄρμαλα Πόρανα καὶ Βέλμα" (from "Στροφὲς Στροφάλων") should be left to perform their magical function in the translation (as Friar does), and the "strange and enigmatic words" in Elytis's *Axion Esti* (1974: 18): "ΡΟΕΣ, ΑΛΑΣΘΑΣ, ΑΡΙΜΝΑ / ΟΛΗΙΣ, ΑΙΑΣΑΝΘΑ, ΥΕΛΤΗΣ" (which are anagrams of some of his favourite motifs) should be translated as equally strange and enigmatic anagrams in English (as Keeley and Savidis do): "ROES, ESA, ARIMNA, / NUS, MIROLTAMITY, YELTIS".

The surrealist poet, then, does not apply automatic writing or its gradations simply to surrender himself to the flow of the subconscious but rather to bring into question fundamental laws of the way thought functions, producing texts where not only the words and their cognitive content but also their syntax and their deeper associations might deviate from conventional discourse, and it is this intended function that should guide the translator in his approach to this aspect of surrealist poetry.

---

write poems. Mallarmé retorts that poems are written with words not ideas (see Engonopoulos 1980: 313).

The surrealist image and the basic translation unit

Surrealism does not seek to abolish reality or take refuge in another reality. Rather it seeks to cater for all aspects of reality including its irrational aspects. Its aim is to give the subconscious, dreams, the irrational, a place in the so-called reality. It creates a "surreality" which bridges the gap between the subjective and objective aiming at the creation of a new consciousness in the reader. The subject-matter of surrealism is not the physical world of external reality but the subconscious reality, the world of dream, where what prevails is the image. The poetic images from the dream world are charged with the power to shake the fixed structures of rational thought. The image is therefore the central thread in all surrealist poetry.[4]

The poetic image in surrealist poetry does not consist of two different but kindred objects, but two completely dissimilar things.[5] The image is not created by the comparison but by the juxtaposition of two dissimilar objects. Comparison presupposes a logical process whereas juxtaposition gives the freedom to the mind to apprehend without the intervention of rational thought, allowing a total perception of reality, including its irrational aspects. In surrealist poetry, the more unlikely the juxtaposition of objects or realities, the better the image. According to Embirikos,

> images move, communicate with each other and interact... none of this is confined within a strictly defined framework. The relation between them is not determined by any conscious mechanism. They are autonomous, and their arrangement is not the result of imposed will, but of an automatic and unconscious act which escapes the control of the conscious self – as in dreams.... One image might coexist with another, may imprint or superimpose itself on a previous one without erasing it (1980: 329-30).

---

[4] Breton's definition of the image is based on Pierre Reverdy: "L'image est une création pure de l'esprit [...] Elle ne peut naître d'une comparaison mais du rapprochement de deux réalités plus ou moins éloignées [...] Plus des rapports des deux réalites rapprochées seront lointains et justes, plus l'image sera forte – plus elle aura de puissance émotive et de réalité poétique."

[5] Or, as Éluard says: "Tout est comparable à tout."

I might refer, for example, to the long and autonomous images, connected only by a free flow of associations in Embirikos's poem "Κλωστήριον νυχτερινῆς ἀνάπαυλας" ("Spindle of nocturnal repose") (see Friar 1973: 347).

What does all this mean for the translator of surrealist poetry? A problem central to the translation of all texts is that of establishing the basic translation unit. The translation unit (TU) has been defined as "the smallest segment of the utterance whose signs are linked in such a way that they should not be translated individually" (Vinay and Darbelnet 1995: 21). This question of the TU is bound up with the traditional distinction between free and literal translation in that usually we can say that the freer the translation, the larger the TU; the more literal the translation, the smaller the TU, the closer to the word (as is often the case in poetry). In dealing with surrealist poetry, I would suggest that the only reasonable TU is the image – regardless of how long or short this may be – and that each separate image must be translated strictly even if it conflicts with naturalness of expression in the TL, as the pragmatic effect here again takes priority over both the cognitive content and the aesthetic factor.

The free flow of associations is simply the ability to juxtapose the image created by one word followed by a new image arising from the last word of the previous image, regardless of whether this appositional syntax corresponds to some logical progression or not. So, for example, in Embirikos's "Ἡ Στιλβιδών" ("The resplendence"), we see how this free flow of associations works and how the translator must be careful not to lose these associations if the text is to function as in the original. Embirikos writes: "Τὰ χέρια τους μᾶς σφίγγουν / Καὶ ἡ σφὶγξ μᾶς συνθλίβει ἐπὶ τοῦ στήθους της". These two lines have been translated as: "Their arms hug us / And the sphinx clasps us to her bosom" (Friar 1973: 352), which is not only devoid of any cognitive meaning, but also fails to reproduce the flow of associations. A possible solution might be: "Their arms hold us fixed / And the Sphinx clasps us to her bosom" (my translation) where the free flow of association based on sound effects is more evident.

The poetic image is the picture conjured up by the metaphor. Metaphor demonstrates a resemblance, a common semantic area

between two (more or less) similar things – the image and the object. In surrealist poetry, however, it is not resemblance but dissimilarity and the identification of these two objects or realities that creates the force of the image. This is why surrealist poetry is largely free of standard similes using "like" or "as". Analogy gives way to identification, thus creating an image of irrational surprise. What the poet says, this is the way it is, and such images should be religiously translated. So when Elytis writes "ἡ μνήμη καίει / ἄκαυτη βάτος" (1974: 40), the memory that burns *is* an unconsumed bush and does not burn *like* an unconsumed bush as it has been translated (Keeley and Savidis 1980: 44). So also, when Embirikos writes: "Εἶναι οἱ πόθοι μιναρέδες στυλωμένοι" (in "Αφρός"), the desires *are* minarets erected. If images may occasionally be altered in translating other kinds of poetry (for the sake of naturalness in the TL), this should not be the case in surrealist poetry and this constitutes another important factor in the translation process.

Tone as a factor in translation

One further factor in the translation process requires religious respect on the part of the translator and this is the question of tone. A common feature of surrealist poets is not only in the aims and techniques used but in the general tone of the poems. The very nature of surrealist poetry with its revolutionary character and its rebellion against all accepted forms of describing reality could not but lead to a tone of provocation, iconoclasm and ridicule of traditional values (partly responsible for the uproar and satire with which the poems were first greeted). The other side of this is, of course, a tone of renewal and optimism, of hope and change. This general tone has to be reproduced in the translation. It will influence the translation process and constitute another factor in the translator's choice of diction.

In addition to this, what one finds in the early poems of Greek surrealist poets is a particularly pronounced erotic tone. The titles of Embirikos's poems never seem to announce the theme; the images follow one another syntactically but without any seeming coherence and yet there is a sense that some central thread binds them together. This central thread is more often than not an underlying tone of eroticism. As Elytis puts it:

> In the whirl of the extremely iconoclastic expressions contained in his [Embirikos's] first two collections, what we see continually emerging with almost mathematical precision is Eros: not in the form of a small boy that we know from mythology but in the form of a most beautiful young girl – "our hope for the future" (1980: 45).

It can be seen then how this erotic tone is ultimately linked with the iconoclastic yet optimistic tone I have already referred to.

The erotic tone may lie in the image itself or in certain words recurring throughout the poem; words which, according to Elytis (1980: 39), not only produce "a vibration, an upward thrust, but also an ejaculation" (sic). Without being perhaps quite so ambitious, the translator must be in a position to judge the connotative aspects and weight of these words in finding corresponding words in the TL and must be careful to retain the erotic tone in the images themselves. For example, in "Κλωστήριον νυχτερινῆς ἀνάπαυλας", Embirikos writes: "...ὅπως μιὰ γυναίκα δὲν μπορεῖ νὰ κάμῃ τίποτε χωρὶς τὴν πυρκαγιὰ ποὺ κλείνει μέσα στὴ στάχτη τῶν ποδιῶν της". This has been translated (Friar 1973: 347) as: "just as a woman can do nothing without the fire she encloses in the ashes of her feet", where a translation something along the lines of: "without the blaze she encloses in the embers of her legs" (my translation), might do more to retain the obvious erotic tone of the original.

IV. *The Greek context*

Most of the factors I have discussed so far concern the translation of surrealist poetry in general. I want now briefly to look at those factors in the translation process that are specific to Greek surrealist poetry. There are two main problems here: the one linguistic, referring to the use by Greek poets of *katharevousa*, the learned or purist language, the other concerning cultural factors referring specifically to the Greek context.

The problem of katharevousa

Greek surrealism affirms the general principles of international surrealism, but manifests its originality within the framework of Greek culture, historically and also linguistically, making full use of the Greek language in all its aspects: the learned, the

demotic, the colloquial, the ecclesiastic, the ancient. One of the first reactions to the tenets of surrealism on the part of Greek poets such as Embirikos and Engonopoulos is connected with the use of *katharevousa*.

In poetry characterised by automatic writing or, at least, by irrational surprise, it would be unreasonable to exclude *katharevousa* as being a part of the Greek consciousness and perhaps we could also say of the subconscious. Just as Greek surrealism gave the same weight to the logical and absurd, the significant and insignificant, it could not ignore either demotic or *katharevousa*. Such an admixture of the popular and purist languages cannot be reproduced in English which contains no corresponding phases in its historical evolution. The only solution for the translator, as Friar (1973: 660) remarks, "is to impose on a basic English, colorations taken from the colloquial, literary and formal usages. A note of the purist may occasionally be indicated by the use of rather stilted words or expressions derived from the Latin or Greek and which, against a general Teutonic structure and diction, may sometimes take on a formal and even exotic note."

Katharevousa simply offers to the Greek poet another linguistic key with which to play and juxtapose various layers of expression rather as in a collage. Sometimes this results in an appearance of seriousness, sometimes rarity, sometimes humour. Embirikos's use of *katharevousa*, for example, rather than giving a learned tone to a poem often has exactly the opposite effect. The translator must be aware of this in each case and attempt to reproduce the pragmatic effect. One solution for the use of *katharevousa* is the use of latinate words to give a higher register to the English but this cannot be done in cases of humour, where a coarser Anglo-Saxon idiom might be more appropriate.

In other surrealist poets, however, the use of *katharevousa* does indeed add a learned or pompous tone to the poetry and can be dealt with using a higher English register. Engonopoulos, for example, uses a basically demotic idiom, punctuated with words and phrases taken from the purist, which adds a tone of formality and pedantic scholasticism which the translator has somehow to reproduce. A striking example is in the poem "Μὴν ὁμιλεῖτε εἰς τὸν ὁδηγόν" ("Do not talk to the driver") (1977: 13-14), where a pompous and pedantic tone is introduced in the line:

"Κι' αὐτὸ διότι Ἰταλός τις, ἀκούων εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Γουλιέλμος Τσίτζης, καὶ ἐπαγγελλόμενος τὸν ἐπιδιορθωτὴν πνευστῶν ὀργάνων...", which should be made equally pompous and pedantic in English: "For a certain Italian gentleman, answering to the name of Guillaume Tsitzes, and professing to be a repairer of wind instruments..." (my translation). Similarly, in Gatsos's *Amorgos*, part V marks a sudden switch to the formal tones of *katharevousa*. According to Tasos Lignadis, "this entire part is a surrealist reference to linguistic freedom, and the reference to the magnetic linguistic fields of Embirikos and Engonopoulos is obvious" (1983: 138). It should, of course, be equally obvious in translation. But is it? Sadly not! In the two translations I examined (Friar 1973: 627; Keeley and Sherrard 1981: 180), there is no indication that this part is written in a higher register than the rest of the poem. This does not imply criticism of the translators concerned. We simply have to accept that in English, this extra key is missing from the range of language.

Culture and translation strategies

According to Elytis, the appeal of surrealism to Greek poets was as a weapon to destroy the Western rationalist view of Greece and reveal the true face of Greece. "Surrealism," he says, "with its anti-rationalistic character helped us to make a sort of revolution by perceiving the Greek truth. At the same time, surrealism contained a kind of supernatural element and this enabled us to form a kind of alphabet out of purely Greek elements with which to express ourselves" (1975: 631). It is precisely these Greek elements that cause problems for the translator as any attempt on the part of the translator to make use of cultural equivalents in the translation would be to deprive Greek surrealist poets of their peculiar Greekness. If surrealism proved fruitful in Greece, this was because the Greek poets did not imitate the French, but adapted surrealism to the Greek reality. What we find then are not the complexes of the subconscious but the ecstasy. Greek surrealist poetry is characterised by a certain "ἑλληνομαγεία" or "Greek spell", to quote Nanos Valaoritis (1991: 116), consisting of things sensual, intoxicating, legendary, commonplace, of flowers, place-names, perfumes, insects, angels and sun – a particularly Greek reality

where, it might be said, irrationality (τρέλλα) is a way of life rather than a neurosis.

The translator should attempt to retain this "Greekness" in the poems without making concessions to the TL reader. The problems caused by cultural references and traditional Greek formalistic elements are nowhere more obvious than in Gatsos's *Amorgos*. According to Friar: "Although the images and meaning of this surrealist poem caused endless controversy, all agreed that the language and rhythms showed a mastery of the demotic tongue [...] , deeply rooted in the best traditions of folk song and legend" (1973: 79). Part III is written in quatrains and the traditional fifteen-syllable verse of the demotic song – yet is perhaps the most surrealistic section of the whole poem with characteristically shocking and anti-aesthetic images such as: "Καὶ νυχτερίδες τρῶν πουλιὰ καὶ κατουρᾶνε σπέρμα" ("And bats eat birds and piss out sperm" [Keeley and Sherrard 1981: 177]; "And all the bats eat birds and piss their sperm" [Friar 1973: 625]). The problem is how to render this verse into English. One solution that has been put forward is to render Greek fifteen-syllable verse using English blank verse as being a cultural equivalent (see Raizis 1981: 24). Whatever the solution, the translation should be in a traditional verse form. In Part III, there is also a cultural reference to what is immediately recognisable in Greek as a song of Death with its recurring opening lines of "Στοῦ πικραμένου τὴν αὐλή", variously rendered in the English translations as "In the courtyards of the sorrow-stricken" (Friar) and "In the griever's courtyard" (Keeley and Sherrard). Apart from the connotative loss in translation and hence the loss of pragmatic effect, I would also question the translation of "αὐλή" as "courtyard", which creates totally different associations in English. Even ostensibly simple words like sun, bread, olive tree etc. have completely different associations for the Greek and English reader (see Elytis 1975: 637) and this is a major problem in surrealist poetry where the associations evoked are all-important.

Cultural references are, of course, one of the basic problems in literary translation. From antiquity, the many and varying strategies for dealing with cultural references can be divided into two basic categories: domesticating and foreignizing. A translation may conform to values currently dominating the TL

Embirikos, A. (1980). "Amour Amour", in Ambatzopoulou (1980), pp. 325-30

Engonopoulos, N. (1977). *Ποιήματα A–B*. Athens: Ikaros

Engonopoulos, N. (1980). "Διάλεξις για την ζωγραφική", in Ambatzopoulou (1980), pp. 309-14

Friar, K. (1973). *Modern Greek poetry. From Cavafis to Elytis*. New York: Simon and Schuster

Gatsos, N. (1969). *Αμοργός*. Athens: Ikaros

Howarth, W.D., Peyre, H.M. and Cruickshank, J. (1974). *French literature from 1600 to the present*. London: Methuen

Keeley, E. and Savidis, G. (1980). *Odysseus Elytis. The Axion Esti*. London: Anvil Press

Keeley, E, and Sherrard, P. (1981). *The Dark Crystal*. Athens: Denise Harvey

Lignadis, T. (1983). *Διπλή επίσκεψη σε μια ηλικία και σ' έναν ποιητή. Ένα βιβλίο για τον Νίκο Γκάτσο*. Athens: Gnosi

Raizis, M.-B. (1981). *Greek poetry translations*. Athens: Efstathiadis

Valaoritis, N. and Pagoulatou, A. (1991). "Ένας διάλογος για τον ελληνικό Υπερρεαλισμό", *Συντέλεια* 4-5, 112-19

Vinay, J.-P. and Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative stylistics of French and English*, trs. and eds. J.C. Sager and M.-J. Hamel. Amsterdam: John Benjamin

Kazantzakis and biography*

Georgia Farinou-Malamatari

It is well known that Kazantzakis refers to religious, mythical and historical figures in his plays: Christ, Buddha, Odysseus, Julian the Apostate, Nicephorus Phocas, Kapodistrias.[1] It is less well known that he often read biographies of people who interested him,[2] particularly before he began writing a work, which sometimes then took on a different form from that which had originally been planned. Both *Report to Greco* and *Julian*, for example, had initially been conceived as biographies (Prevelakis 1984: 169-70, 266).

I do not know whether attention has been drawn to Eleni Kazantzaki's novelistic biographies for children (Prevelakis 1984: 308), or whether this has been related to similar projects of Kazantzakis such as *Μέγας Αλέξανδρος*, or *Στα παλάτια της Κνωσσού*. Eleni Kazantzaki also wrote a book on Gandhi, for

---

* I would like to thank the audiences of King's College (London), Cambridge, Birmingham and Oxford for their questions; especially Professors R.M. Beaton and P.A. Mackridge for their comments and insights during our discussions. The remaining inadequacies are mine. A Greek version of the paper will appear in the proceedings of a conference on Kazantzakis which took place in Chania (November 1997).

[1] "Σιγά-σιγά [...] βούλιαζα στο μελάνι· μεγάλοι ίσκιοι στριγμώνουνταν γύρα από το λάκκο της καρδιάς μου και ζητούσαν να πιουν αίμα ζεστό να ζωντανέψουν – ο Ιουλιανός ο Παραβάτης, ο Νικηφόρος Φωκάς, ο Κωνσταντίνος ο Παλαιολόγος, ο Προμηθέας. [...] Μάχουμουν να τους ανασύρω από τον Άδη, για να δοξάσω μπροστά από τους ζωντανούς ανθρώπους τον πόνο τους και τον αγώνα· τον πόνο και τον αγώνα του ανθρώπου" (Kazantzakis 1962: 542-3; henceforth ΑΓκ.).

[2] In his correspondence with Prevelakis he refers, for example, to the following biographies: E. d'Ors, *Goya* (Prevelakis 1984: 170), S. Zweig, *Nietzsche* and *Tolstoy* (ibid. 195, 272, 275) W. Irving, *Mahomet* (ibid. 281, 283), V. Hersch, *The Bird of God* [on El Greco] (ibid. 218-19), P. Bertaux, *Hölderlin, essai de biographie intérieure* (ibid. 680). He was also acquainted with R. Rolland's *Gandhi* (E. Kazantzaki 1983: 150).

which she asked Romain Rolland to write a preface.[3] It is another little-known fact that in 1940 Kazantzakis anonymously published biographies of "Columbus", "Empress Elisabeth", "Bernadotte" and "Chateaubriand" in *Η Καθημερινή*, supplying a fashionable demand for such literature in order to make a living (Prevelakis 1984: 500).

The biographical model known in Europe as "new" or "modern biography" (illustrious exponents of which include Stefan Zweig, Emil Ludwig, André Maurois, Lytton Strachey) flourished in Greece from the 1930s onwards. It was given the name *μυθιστορηματική βιογραφία*, or the French equivalent *vie/biographie romancée* – the term preferred by Kazantzakis (e.g. Prevelakis 1984: 169) – and can be defined as the narration of the life of a historical figure which depends either on cursory research or – as is more frequently the case – on secondary sources which are re-presented in novelistic fashion. The *vie romancée* is designed to combine the appeal of the novel with a vague claim to authenticity.[4]

The "new biography" had its critics in the thirties, notably the Marxist Georg Lukács in his book *The historical novel* (first published in German, in Moscow in 1937). Lukács saw the "bellettristic biographical form" as the main form of historical novel in the interwar period. Its authors, usually liberal humanists who were isolated from the life of the people, described great historical figures in essentialist terms, emphasizing biographical-psychological causalities rather than revealing their connection with the wider socio-economic conditions of the times. Instead of the heroes appearing great because their emotions and desires are closely linked with the role they are required to fulfil, their personality is presented as the origin of their vocation, and the biography undertakes to demonstrate this psychologically, through anecdotes etc. Thus, according to Lukács, while the historical novel of the nineteenth

---

[3] The request was expressed through a letter of recommendation from Stefan Zweig, but the preface failed to materialize (E. Kazantzaki 1983: 303-4).

[4] Commenting on the biography of El Greco which he intended to write in the thirties, Kazantzakis singled out "*érudition* and lyricism" as the essential elements of biographical writing (Prevelakis 1984: 169-70, 260).

century knew of everyday life and its problems and was able to concentrate them into typical situations which gave an image of the truth, the new version of the historical novel is not able to connect the private life of a great person with the generation of great ideas. Greatness is regarded here as the root cause of great acts, whereas greatness – the ability to respond to situations in a way which influences the life of the people – should really be seen as a result, measurable in terms of the success or failure of great figures in their historical task.

One of the few who survived Lukács's attack was Romain Rolland, whose biographies of Michelangelo, Beethoven and Tolstoy (all of them translated into Greek) analysed the historical contexts of their lives. Strangely, it was above all the novel *Colas Breugnon* (translated into Greek by Kosmas Politis in 1953), "a kind of interlude between his large epic and dramatic cycles", which found approval. According to Lukács, "Colas Breugnon is conceived by his author not only as a son of his time [the Regency under Louis XIII] [...] but also as an eternal type, [...] a type representative of the French popular life" (394-5).[5] The hero is a craftsman whose "wisdom is [...] drawn from popular life" (395). His characteristics are "human genuineness, subtlety and tenderness in his relations to people, his simple and shrewd decisiveness which in moments of real trial and danger soars into true heroism" (395). He has an "aloofness from the political struggles of the time portrayed, an aloofness which has been raised into a philosophy" (396), and a "plebeian mistrust for all that happens 'above'" (397). Lukács contrasts Rolland's novel to Stefan Zweig's *Erasmus* (translated into Greek by Yiannis Beratis in 1949), in which the people are treated as an "irrational mass", and the Renaissance humanist displays "an anxious and nervous shrinking back from any decision, a cautious balancing between 'on the one hand' and 'on the other hand', the conceited intellectual's attempt to transcend intellectual contradictions and social antagonisms" (398).

To my mind, this exposition reveals some striking similarities between Romain Rolland's novel, as perceived by Lukács, and Kazantzakis's *Βίος και πολιτεία του Αλέξη Ζορμπά*, similarities which can be considered in the framework of the

---

[5] References are to Lukács 1981.

interwar biographical form and in relation to Lukács's notion of *Volkstümlichkeit*.[6] A later comment by Kazantzakis seems to confirm this view: "Ο Ζορμπάς ήταν κυρίως διάλογος ενούς καλαμαρά κι ενούς *ανθρώπου του λαού*· διάλογος μεταξύ του δικηγόρου Νου και της *μεγάλης ψυχής του λαού*." (E. Kazantzaki 1983: 567, my italics). Just as Colas Breugnon has been considered a typical representative of the French people, so *Βίος και πολιτεία* has been read as a typification of the character of the Greek people. The title of the English translation and the film version, *Zorba the Greek*, contributed to this perception.

The above account shows that before Kazantzakis embarked on his novelistic career, which began in 1941 with *Βίος και πολιτεία* and ended in 1956 with *Ο Φτωχούλης του Θεού*,[7] he was already well versed in the art of biography. As usual with Kazantzakis, his interest included the most contradictory models: *vie romancée* and its critique; Carlyle's hero-worship; and hagiography in the form of the *synaxaria* and the Lives of the Saints of the Orthodox and Catholic Churches. This last influence is revealed in the title *Βίος και πολιτεία του Αλέξη Ζορμπά*;[8] the book was previously to have been entitled "Το Συναξάρι του Ζορμπά". *Ο τελευταίος πειρασμός* is sometimes given the title "Τ' απομνημονέματα του Χριστού", while in *Ο Φτωχούλης του Θεού*[9] (which is also referred to within the text as "βίος και πολιτεία" and "συναξάρι") Kazantzakis deals with the most popular Western saint, Francis of Assisi, one of the recent biographies of whom he translated into Greek during the German Occupation in 1943.[10]

The purpose of the present paper is to indicate some common elements of these two apparently dissimilar novels, *Βίος και*

---

[6] See Heller 1991: 29-31.

[7] *Βίος και πολιτεία* was written between 1941 and 1943 and published in 1946; *Ο Φτωχούλης του Θεού* was written between 1952 and and 1953, published in instalments in 1954 and in book form in 1956. See Prevelakis 1984: 499 and 650-72.

[8] References to this work are to Kazantzakis 1964; henceforth Z.

[9] References to this work are to Kazantzakis 1981; henceforth ΦΘ.

[10] Joergensen n.d. The preface to the translation, with some omissions, was included in *Αναφορά στον Γκρέκο* in the chapter "Βερολίνο – Μια Οβραία". Kazantzakis knew Joergensen's biography before 1924; cf. G. Kazantzaki 1993: 253, 258-60.

πολιτεία του Αλέξη Ζορμπά and *Ο Φτωχούλης του Θεού*, and to show that some of the similarities are due to the biographical model which underlies them. Taking as a starting point the ambivalent position of both the novels' narrators towards biography, I would like to put forward some thoughts on Kazantzakis's writing and particularly on his construction of characters and of himself as a character.

*

Both Zorbas and Saint Francis have eye-witness biographers, that is, biographers who are themselves characters in the books and spend some part of their lives with the biographee. Although the titles prepare us for texts which will move within the usual time-span of a biography (i.e. from birth to death), the beginnings and endings of the books do not coincide with the beginnings and ends of the subjects' lives. *Βίος και πολιτεία* is limited to the year that the biographer-character spends with Zorbas, while the more traditional *Ο Φτωχούλης του Θεού* starts with a moment of crisis (in the presence of the biographer), and comes to an end with Francis's death.

Zorbas's life is written by his employer, referred to simply as "the Boss" ("το Αφεντικό"). Judging by the preface, in which the distinction between author and narrator is somewhat blurred, the biographer considers that *Βίος και πολιτεία* demeans Zorbas, in the sense that it turns its live subject into a mere text, "ο Ζορμπάς, ο γεμάτος σάρκα και κόκαλα, κατάντησε στα χέρια μου μελάνι και χαρτί" (Z 8-9). In the afterword, on the other hand, the completed biography is presented as the result of the Boss's desire to salvage ("να [...] περισώσω") Zorbas's life (perhaps the Friend's/Stavridakis's life as well; see Z 365). The end of Zorbas's life coincides with the birth of his biography, since the Boss-biographer immobilizes the life-flux and thus monumentalizes the subject of his biography. Biography exorcizes death and becomes "μνημόσυνο" (or "δίσκος με κόλυβα"). The way that the various senses of the terms memory and monument are intertwined in the text suggests how appropriate the image is to biography: the biographical narrative as *μνήμα, μνημείο, μνημόσυνο, απομνημόνευμα*. This is the ultimate undertaking of *Βίος και πολιτεία*: to create a biography-

monument which will bring Zorbas to life again, allowing him to live forever as it converts life-made-text into text-made-life.[11]

In *Ο Φτωχούλης του Θεού* Frate Leone writes the biography after St Francis's death. The biographer's initial strong distrust of the demonic and uncontrolled power of writing[12] is also ironically undermined when the dead saint leaves the paradise for which he had struggled during his whole life and asks for clothes, food and housing, or in other words for a biography.

The assertion of both biographers at the beginning of their enterprise is related to the general dichotomy we find in Kazantzakis (cf. *Ο τελευταίος πειρασμός, Αναφορά στον Γκρέκο*) between life and action on the one hand and writing on the other. This distinction can be seen as a characteristic case of "logocentrism", which privileges speech over writing. Speech is seen as immediacy, presence, life and identity, whereas writing is seen as absence and difference. Speech is primary, writing secondary. Speech is further identified with nature, writing with culture. Culture functions as a *supplement* to nature in two ways: it adds to it and substitutes for it.[13] Although saintly, Francis's life is not complete. In order to become complete, it must be written, but then the biography may replace life/nature. These hesitations which occupy Frate Leone are ironically overcome through recourse to rhetoric and particularly to *metaphor*, which identifies writing with speech. For example, in Frate Leone's account of the dream which motivated him to write the biography, birds (nature) are equated with letters of the alphabet (culture):

> ήμουν ξαπλωμένος ... κάτω από ένα δέντρο ανθισμένο ... ήταν το δέντρο της Παράδεισος κι είχε ανθίσει! Κι άξαφνα, εκεί που κοίταζα, ανάμεσα από τ' ανθισμένα κλώνια, τον ουρανό, ήρθαν και κάθισαν απάνω στο κάθε κλαρί κι ένα πουλί μικρό μικρό, σαν ένα γράμμα της Αλφαβήτας, κι άρχισε να κελαηδάει· στην αρχή ένα ένα, μοναχικό, ύστερα δυο μαζί, ύστερα τρία, πηδούσαν από κλαρί σε κλαρί, έσμιγαν συδυό, συντρία, συμπέντε, και κελαηδούσαν, συνεπαρμένα, όλα μαζί. (ΦΘ 21-2; cf. E. Kazantzaki 1983: 539-40)

---

[11] Cf. Epstein 1987: 28-9.

[12] See also Beaton 1997.

[13] See Leitch 1983: 169-75.

Biography's success is assured because it has turned nature (life) into something that is also "nature" (biography). The last words of the text are:

> Την άγια ετούτη στιγμή, που, σκυμμένος μέσα στο κελί μου, χάραζα τα στερνά ετούτα λόγια και μ' έπαιρναν τα κλάματα [...] ένα σπουργιτάκι ήρθε και χτύπησε το παραθύρι· ολόβρεχτα ήταν τα φτερά του, κρύωνε· σηκώθηκα να του ανοίξω· κι ήσουν εσύ, πάτερ Φραγκίσκο, ντυμένος σα σπουργιτάκι. (ΦΘ 366)

*

In *Βίος και πολιτεία* the foreman is the biographee, while his employer is his biographer; although this peculiar biographical situation is discussed in the novel, the biographee is characterized in the preface[14] as the biographer's "ψυχικός οδηγός", "Γέροντας", and "γκουρού" (Z 7). In *Ο Φτωχούλης του Θεού* Frate Leone is described as St Francis's first disciple but also – according to the tradition – as his secretary and confessor. In both cases the biographer-disciple is presented as the biographee's counterpoint. When the biographee is "φαγάς, πιοτής, δουλευταράς, γυναικάς κι αλήτης" (Z 13), the biographer is the ascetic and intellectual aesthete who contends that he has been corrupted by art. When the biographee is an ascetic saint who tries to surpass human limits and identify with the suffering Christ (Francis's life is already an *Imitatio Christi*, i.e. an imitation of a biography), the biographer acquires the characteristics of the ordinary man. In both novels, then, we have on the one hand the presence of the eye-witness disciple and on the other the partial reversal (especially in *Βίος και πολιτεία*) of the relation biographer–disciple as it has conventionally been presented since the biographies of the Socratics.

*

In *Βίος και πολιτεία* there is an ambiguity surrounding the biographer's identity. The Boss has many characteristics in

---

[14] The preface, with a few changes, is included in the chapter entitled "Ο Ζορμπάς" in ΑΓκ.

common with Kazantzakis himself, who had worked with someone called *Yoryis* Zorbas. The Boss is acquainted with *Alexis* Zorbas. This appropriate change of only the first half of the name positions the novel between reality and fiction. (The choice of the name Alexis in a novel called *Βίος και πολιτεία* could be read as a reference to the popular eleventh-century romance *Vie de Saint Alexis*, with strong parodic overtones.)

As we have already remarked, *Βίος και πολιτεία* is not a biography in the strict sense of the term. The biographer simply transmits the "discussions" ("κουβέντες") he has with the biographee on various topics ("για [...] τις γυναίκες, το Θεό, την πατρίδα και το θάνατο" [Z 9]), setting them within a story which allows them to appear realistically motivated.

Alexis Zorbas is in a way a pretext, since although the real Zorbas did lead what one might call a novelistic life,[15] Kazantzakis did not make much use of it. He simply mixed elements of his encounter with Zorbas with the lives of other people (Stavridakis, Istrati), and with incidents and events that had happened to himself previously (his visit to the Holy Mountain with Sikelianos) or afterwards (his assignment in the Caucasus). He changed the place of action (from Mani to Crete) and he left the story-time unspecified (he worked with Y. Zorbas from 1916 to 1917), using as temporal markers only the seasons and the corresponding Christian festivals. Moreover, he inserted into the events one of his attempts at writing *Buddha*,[16] the composition of which in any case started later. The Zorbatic "Buddha" most likely combines the first two writing attempts (1922-23) – during which Kazantzakis tried to overcome "τον τελευταίο πειρασμό της τέχνης" (Z 77; G. Kazantzaki 1993: 78-9, 99, 105) – with the writing process of *Yang-Tse* (1940-1) shortly before the very rapid composition of *Βίος και πολιτεία* itself.

In short, *Βίος και πολιτεία* moves in a time–space indeterminacy which is heightened by its additional dislocation in *Αναφορά στον Γκρέκο*. There the encounter with Zorbas is located immediately after the return from Russia (ΑΓκ. 534-5), and the writing of *Βίος και πολιτεία* (ΑΓκ. 551-61) before the writing of

---

[15] Cf. Anapliotis 1960; G. Kazantzaki 1993: 16, 48-9, 111, 208, 226; and E. Kazantzaki 1983: 115-19.

[16] Cf. Bien 1977.

Οδύσεια with which it is, in a way, associated. Each time, Zorbas acquires a different biography in order to meet Kazantzakis's changing requirements.

In *Ο Φτωχούλης του Θεού* the biographee is a historical figure whom Kazantzakis knew and admired from early on in his life,[17] seeing him sometimes as a model communist (G. Kazantzaki 1993: 251-4, 258-60), sometimes as someone who achieved the complete union of man with nature (E. Kazantzaki 1983: 608-9), and at other times as a symbol of man's struggle with God (Prevelakis 1984: 650). Not infrequently, he detected similarities between his life and the life of the saint, on matters such as their parents (Prevelakis 1984: 158-9), his dermatitis (G. Kazantzaki 1993: 49), or his eye disease. St Francis is also connected with *Buddha*, in that the second prose version of that work was completed in Assisi and the author tried to draw analogies between the two figures.[18]

When he started his biography, Kazantzakis had at his disposal both the older and the more recent hagiographical traditions (Sabatier, Joergensen, Chesterton, Merezhkovsky, Hesse).[19] St Francis's biographies vary according to the interpretative appropriation of his life. The first *Vitae*, as for example *Vita Prima* by Celano (ΑΓκ. 462) and *Acta beati Francisci et sociorum ejus* (the source of the fourteenth-century Italian *Fioretti* (E. Kazantzaki 1983: 14-15, 135-6) give a picture of an itinerant life divided almost equally between prayer and preaching, and supported by work (where possible manual) or by begging, with the stress laid on voluntary self-denial and renunciation of property for the single purpose of enabling oneself and inspiring others to live a life of union with Christ.[20] Then

---

[17] He probably became acquainted with the life of St Francis during his time at the Franciscan monastery on Naxos. For additional information see Levitt 1980: 156-9.

[18] Joergensen n.d.: θ΄.

[19] See Levitt 1980: 145, 157. It would be extremely interesting to examine for what reasons and by what routes each of the above-mentioned biographers came to undertake a biography of St Francis. On Merezhkovsky see Pachmuss 1990: 4, 162-71.

[20] Habig 1973: 1272 and Brooke 1967: 177-98. For the presentation of St Francis in Dante, see Auerbach 1984: 79-98.

came the learned biography, St Bonaventura's *Legenda Major*, which was intended to replace all previous edifying Lives and to canonize St Francis as the leader of the Order.

Kazantzakis chose incidents and anecdotes from the first group, which represents a direct oral tradition transmitted by some of the saint's closest friends (Leone included). They are collections of stories arranged by character trait or theme and centre around some notable saying or remarkable act of the saint. Although indeterminate or even inaccurate in chronology and topography, these Lives are in the main considered reliable, though they sometimes border on the legendary. In the same way, *Ο Φτωχούλης του Θεού* provides a minimal and somewhat vague spatio-temporal framework, which serves as a narrative link between the events of St Francis's life and above all as a setting for Leone's discussions with him (many of them invented or quoted from other texts with a change of contexts).

*

Both *Βίος και πολιτεία* and *Ο Φτωχούλης του Θεού* structure their narrative in the manner of a biography which aims at monumentalizing, i.e. at venerating (synchronically) and perpetuating (diachronically) the memory of an elder or a teacher.

Biographers of this kind are disciples whose objective is the exposition of the life and principles of their teacher. Examples of such biographies are some of Plato's dialogues (*Phaedo*, *Apology*) and Xenophon's *Memorabilia*. In these – particularly in Xenophon – we are shown Socrates's position on several basic problems or concepts (divinity, justice, etc.). Socrates's ideas are presented through a loose series of dialogues, anecdotes, characteristic incidents, etc., rather than within a systematic biography from birth to death. Momigliano wonders whether Xenophon intended to present Socrates's real speeches and whether this was possible in any case.[21] His conclusion is that what Xenophon does is to discuss topics which had been the subject of debate by other Socratics before him:

---

[21] Momigliano 1971: 54.

> All Socrates' disciples were involved in elaborate developments of Socrates' thought which bore little resemblance to the original. Socratic disciples created or perfected a biographical form – the report of conversations preceded by a general introduction to the character of the main character – but in actual fact used this form for what amounted to fiction. (54)

I think that – *mutatis mutandis* – Zorbas and St Francis created their biographers, who in turn created Alexis Zorbas and St Francis as we know them from Kazantzakis's novels. We must not lose sight of the fact that Zorbas's "κουβέντες" are continuously under the critical or interpretative control of the Boss, who draws them out, generalizes them, extrapolates from them, or admires them. In *Ο Φτωχούλης του Θεού* Frate Leone records, but at the same time criticizes and thereby dialogizes, the saint's words (e.g. ΦΘ 292), so that the novel is not characterized by the monologism usually expected of a hagiographical text.[22]

*

If we accept that these two novels of Kazantzakis belong to the same model, that they are narratives which through anecdotes, incidents and aphorisms represent the life and ideas of two figures who are considered ideal models, then the question arises as to the exact meaning of the phrase "ideal person" and "ideal life" (since Zorbas's and St Francis's lives are quite dissimilar).

A first answer would be that for Kazantzakis the ideal is not connected with morality but with aesthetics. He creates heroes who combine their weaknesses with their strengths in such a way that neither can exist without the other. Their character emerges from these constantly changing interrelations. The unity of their selves is not something given but a goal which is achieved in an ongoing process by the addition of new habits and patterns of behaviour. They possess strong wills because of the clarity and the precision of their orientation ("Ο επαναστάτης έχει σύστημα, τάξη, συνοχή στην ενέργειά του" ΑΓκ. 489), and the cooperation of their intellectual and spiritual powers towards a common end, guided by a dominant impulse. "Οι μισές δουλειές

---

[22] Cf. Bakhtin 1981: 342, 426.

[...], οι μισές κουβέντες, οι μισές αμαρτίες, οι μισές καλοσύνες έφεραν τον κόσμο στα σημερινά του χάλια. Φτάσε μωρέ άνθρωπε ως την άκρα" (Z 273, 27, 53). Both see "το σκληρό, αγέλαστο κρανίο της Ανάγκης" (Z 344), but they do not yield to it; they each face it in a different way:

> [Ο Φραγκίσκος] υπόταξε την πραγματικότητα, λευτέρωσε τον άνθρωπο από την ανάγκη, έκαμε, μέσα του, όλη τη σάρκα πνέμα. (ΑΓκ. 454, cf. ΦΘ 100-1)
> Να λες "Ναι!" στην ανάγκη, να μετουσιώνεις το αναπόφευκτο σε δικιά σου λεύτερη βούληση, αυτός, ίσως είναι ο μόνος ανθρώπινος δρόμος της λύτρωσης. (Z 321)

Both characters perceive the world "με παρθενική ματιά, έτσι που όλα τα καθημερινά και τα ξεθωριασμένα ξανάπαιρναν τη λάμψη που είχαν τις πρώτες μέρες που βγήκαν από τα χέρια του Θεού" (Z 73, ΦΘ 182). In short, though they lead different kinds of life, both biographees face reality as if it were fiction and transform "το ασυνάρτητο χάος που το λέμε ζωή" into harmony (ΑΓκ. 171), thus becoming poets of their own lives.[23]

What has been described is very reminiscent of the Nietzschean concept of self, as it is expounded in Alexander Nehamas's *Nietzsche: Life as literature*.[24] According to Nehamas, Nietzsche "looks at the world as if it were a literary text and he arrives at many of his views of the world and things within it by generalizing to them ideas and principles that apply almost intuitively to the creation and interpretation of literary texts and characters."[25] Kazantzakis, of course, writes

---

[23] Cf. Nietzsche's view in *Beyond Good and Evil:* "It is artists who seem to have more sensitive noses in these matters, knowing only too well that precisely when they no longer do something 'voluntarily' but do everything of necessity, the feeling of freedom, subtlety, full power, of creative placing, disposing and forming reaches its peak – in short, that necessity and 'freedom of will' then become one in them." Quoted in Nehamas 1985: 195.

[24] Kazantzakis's relationship with Nietzsche is well known; see for example Levitt 1980: 108, n. 10 and Bien 1989. What interests us here is not so much the thematic influence of Nietzsche on Kazantzakis's work as Nietzsche's influence on his creative practice.

[25] Nehamas 1985: 3. My view relies heavily on Nehamas's excellent book. See particularly pp. 163-9, 193-5, 230-4. For a treatment of the same topic from a different viewpoint (literature as life), see Thiele 1990: 99-164.

literature, and to say that his characters resemble literary characters would be tautologous.

What I am trying to point out is that although Kazantzakis expresses a strong dislike of writing and a strong desire for action, in fact he managed to transform writing into action or to live writing as action. The binary opposition life/writing is not a hierarchical opposition in which writing depends on life, which is primary. The opposition is in a way rhetorical and can be reversed. Kazantzakis does so by taking his characters from myth, history, or lived experience and in each case trying "να τον δαμάσει αφομοιώνοντάς τον" (ΑΓκ. 553). His choices may surprise us at first sight, because the various lives do not have many points in common. What could be the relation between Zorbas, Christ, Kapetan Michalis, St Francis? It is an internal coherence which corresponds to the intertextual model of the hero and the saint, with the various meanings that Kazantzakis occasionally gave to these terms – martyr (ΑΓκ. 44), warrior (ΑΓκ. 89), ascetic (ΑΓκ. 95), holy fool, knight (ΑΓκ. 96), desperado (ΑΓκ. 96), outcast, superman (ΑΓκ. 394).

Since Kazantzakis could become neither a hero nor a saint, he became the author (ΑΓκ. 229)[26] – literally "το Αφεντικό" – who exercises his authority in the process of the formation of characters, which is simultaneously a process of self-formation. "Δημιουργώ [χαραχτήρες] και δημιουργώντας [τους] μάχουμαι να [τους] μοιάσω. Δημιουργούμαι κι εγώ" (ΑΓκ. 587). This procedure is not simple and clear-cut. In *Βίος και πολιτεία* for example,

---

[26] "Έγραφα και καμάρωνα, ήμουν θεός κι έκανα ό,τι ήθελα, μετουσίωνα την πραγματικότητα, [...] όλα ζύμη μαλακιά και την έπλαθα, την ξέπλαθα, όπως μου κανοναρχούσε το κέφι μου, λεύτερα, χωρίς να πάρω κανενός την άδεια. [...] Η πάλη αυτή ανάμεσα πραγματικότητας και φαντασίας, ανάμεσα δημιουργού Θεού και δημιουργού ανθρώπου, μια στιγμή μέθυσε την καρδιά μου. Αυτός είναι ο δρόμος μου, [...] αυτότο χρέος μου· καθένας παίρνει το ανάστημα του οχτρού που μαζί του παλεύει· μου αρέσει, κι ας χαθώ, να παλεύω με το Θεό. Αυτός πήρε λάσπη κι έπλασε τον κόσμο, εγώ λέξες· αυτός έκαμε τους ανθρώπους όπως τους βλέπουμε να σούρνονται στο χώμα· εγώ θα πλάσω με φαντασιά και αγέρα, με το υλικό που πλάθουνται τα όνειρα, άλλους ανθρώπους, με πιο πολλή ψυχή, ν' αντέχουν στον καιρό, να πεθαίνουν οι ανθρώποι του Θεού και να ζουν οι δικοί μου" (ΑΓκ. 174-5). See also Taylor 1983: 379-86.

Kazantzakis identifies with the Boss[27] while Zorbas resembles Istrati (Z 23), who was to replace Stavridakis (Prevelakis 1984: 60-1), who in turn resembled Rembrandt's "Warrior" (Z 56), with whom Kazantzakis himself also identifies (Prevelakis 1984: 341; cf. also ΑΓκ. 551). Such a series of substitutions takes us away from the single person, the single life or the single meaning.

After his "novels", Kazantzakis wrote *Αναφορά στον Γκρέκο* with the explicit subtitle "Novel", a book in which he invents and discovers himself, and in which the character who speaks to us is the author who has created him and who is in turn a character created by or implicit in all the books that were written by the author who is writing this one (see Nehamas 1985: 196). After becoming the Plato of many a Socrates, Kazantzakis officially became Socrates and Plato at once, biographer and biographee. After all this, to pose the question who is the real Kazantzakis is perhaps as pointless as asking who is the real Zorbas or the real St Francis.

References

Anapliotis, Y. (1960). Γιάννης Αναπλιώτης. *Ο αληθινός Ζορμπάς κι ο Νίκος Καζαντζάκης*. Athens: Difros

Auerbach, E. (1984). "St Francis of Assisi in Dante's *Commedia*", in his: *Scenes from the drama of European literature*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 79-98

Bakhtin, M.M. (1981). "Discourse in the novel", in his: *The dialogic imagination*. Trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press

---

[27] The Boss is usually read only as a biographer, not as the protagonist of his own life and *Bildung*. Thus, though we are encouraged to consider him as the biographee's negative, in fact he could also be perceived as a Nietzschean version of aesthetic asceticism; cf. Nehamas 1985: 114-37; Holub 1995: 122-7.

Beaton, R. (1997). "Writing, identity and truth in Kazantzakis's novel *The Last Temptation*", *Κάμπος: Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek* 5, 1-21

Bien, P. (1977), "Η δύσκολη και παρατεταμένη γέννα του Καζαντζακικού Βούδα", *Νέα Εστία* 102 (Χριστούγεννα), 97-110

Bien, P. (1989). *Kazantzakis. Politics of the spirit.* Princeton: Princeton University Press

Brooke, R. (1967). "The Lives of St Francis of Assisi", in: T.A. Dorey (ed.), *Latin biography.* London, pp. 177-98

Epstein, W.H. (1987). *Recognizing biography.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

Habig, M. (1973). *St Francis of Assisi. Writings and early biographies: English omnibus of the sources for the life of St Francis.* Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press

Heller, A. (1991). "History and the historical novel in Lukács", in: D. Roberts and P. Thomson (eds.), *The modern German historical novel: Paradigms, problems, perspectives.* New York: Berg, pp. 29-31

Holub, R.C. (1995). *Friedrich Nietzsche.* New York: Twayne Publishers

Joergensen, J. (n.d.). *Ο άγιος Φραγκίσκος της Ασσίζης.* Trans. N. Kazantzakis. Athens: Kalos Typos

Kazantzaki, E. (1983), Ελένη Καζαντζάκη. *Νίκος Καζαντζάκης: Ο ασυμβίβαστος.* 2nd ed. Athens: Ekdoseis Elenis Kazantzaki

Kazantzaki, G. (1993). *Νίκου Καζαντζάκη Επιστολές προς Γαλάτεια.* 3rd ed. Athens: Difros

Kazantzakis, N. (1962). Νίκος Καζαντζάκης. *Αναφορά στον Γκρέκο.* Athens: Ekdoseis Elenis Kazantzaki

Kazantzakis, N. (1964). Νίκος Καζαντζάκης. *Βίος και πολιτεία του Αλέξη Ζορμπά*. Athens: Ekdoseis Elenis Kazantzaki

Kazantzakis, N. (1981). Νίκος Καζαντζάκης. *Ο Φτωχούλης του Θεού*. Athens: Ekdoseis Elenis Kazantzaki

Leitch, V.B. (1983). *Deconstructive criticism: An advanced introduction*. London: Hutchinson

Levitt, M.P. (1980). *The Cretan glance: The world and art of Nikos Kazantzakis*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press

Lukács, G. (1981). *The historical novel*. Trans. H. and S. Mitchell. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books

Momigliano, A. (1971). *The development of Greek biography: Four lectures*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press

Nehamas, A. (1985). *Nietzsche: Life as literature*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press

Pachmuss, T. (1990). *D.S. Merezhkovsky in exile: The master of the genre of biographie romancée*. New York: Peter Lang

Prevelakis, P. (1984). Π. Πρεβελάκης. *Τετρακόσια γράμματα του Καζαντζάκη στον Πρεβελάκη*. 2nd ed. Athens: Ekdoseis Elenis Kazantzaki

Taylor, C.S. (1983). "Some thoughts on Nietzsche, Kazantzakis and the meaning of art", *Nietzsche-Studien* 12, 379-86

Thiele, L.P. (1990). *Friedrich Nietzsche and the politics of the soul: A study of heroic individualism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press

University of Thessaloniki

Variations on a theme: Cavafy rewrites his own poems

Peter Mackridge

The more one reads Cavafy's poetry, the more one recognizes the same motifs recurring at different stages of his œuvre. In this paper I am concerned not with the gradual metamorphosis of successive unpublished drafts of the same poem into its final version, but chiefly with those *published* poems that rework ideas and motifs from other already published poems – in other words, the genetic relationship between poems that Cavafy himself considered to be complete.

This phenomenon is particularly clearly observable when one reads the early poems through the prism of the late ones and vice versa. We can do this if we divide Cavafy's œuvre into two chief stages, "early" and "late", adopting his own view that 1911 marks the chief watershed in his poetic output but recognising that there are other less significant watersheds and that his poetic development was continuous.[1] It is perhaps particularly when we read the poems *backwards* (from late to early) rather than in their chronological order that we observe him transmuting certain material from an older poem when writing a newer one. There remains the problem of accurately establishing the date of each poem's original conception (particularly as long as the Cavafy Archive in Athens remains closed), since, while Cavafy always provided us with the date of first publication, we know that his poems usually matured over a long period, often a period of many years; however, in his 1991 edition, Savidis does provide us with relatively reliable dates of composition (Cavafy 1991). Besides, in most cases I shall

[1] Pieris (1992: 102-7) sees two important breaks before 1911, the first in 1891, when Cavafy moves from a Romantic to a Symbolist and Parnassian orientation, and the second in 1899-1901, when he abandons Symbolism and Parnassianism for the sake of realism. Pieris sees this latter break as more significant than 1911.

be comparing poems whose dates of publication are distant enough for us to be certain that they were conceived and written at a significant chronological remove from each other. I should make it clear that I am concentrating on Cavafy's 154-poem "canon"; in other words, of each pair of poems that I am comparing, each member was authorised by Cavafy for publication in his poetic works. Nevertheless, by reading the poems neither in the chronological order of their composition nor in the order in which Cavafy intended them to be published, I am defamiliarising each poem by detaching it from its immediate chronological and/or thematic context and pairing it with another poem that dates from at least ten (and in most cases at least twenty) years before or after.

Other critics have pointed to features that distinguish Cavafy's early poems from the late ones. Pieris (1992) has made a significant contribution to our understanding of these distinctive features. He states that what he calls Cavafy's "poetic character [...] is distinguished by persistent but creative repetition and by the renewed recurrence of the same things and the same themes" (1992: 227). Nevertheless, while he makes a few references to instances where Cavafy returns in a later published poem to a theme that has appeared in some earlier unpublished or rejected poem, Pieris has practically nothing to say specifically about the handling of the same themes in pairs of published poems separated by a long chronological gap.[2]

I have based the table below partly on what Pieris tells us about the differences between Cavafy's "early" and "late" period. In fact Pieris does not specifically set out to compile a list of the distinctive features as I have done in the table, and his references to these distinctions are scattered in various parts of his book. Moreover, he is not always concerned to present these features in terms of antithetical pairs, as I have tried to do in

---

[2] Pieris (1992) makes the following links between early and late poems: "Πριάμου νυκτοπορία" (unpublished) with "Άγε, ω βασιλεύ των Λακεδαιμονίων" (95), "Εν φθινοπωρινής νυκτός ευδία" ("rejected") with "Εν εσπέρα" (239n.), "Καλός και κακός καιρός" ("rejected") with "Ζωγραφισμένα" (304), "Λόγος και σιωπή" ("rejected") with "Ηγεμών εκ Δυτικής Λιβύης" (321-4), and "Όποιος απέτυχε" (unpublished) with "Ρωτούσε για την ποιότητα" (335-7).

the table. Most of the terms above the horizontal line are Pieris's (I have added page references to Pieris 1992 where appropriate); the pairs below the line are my own additions.

Table: *Some distinctive characteristics of Cavafy's early and late poetry*

Early	*Late*
vague (Symbolist αοριστία: 85)	specific
lack of location	βιωμένος χώρος (213)
Romantic	realistic (268)
metaphorical or allegorical	literal
presence of similes (218)	absence of similes
abstract	concrete (lived experience: 76)
static	dynamic
antithesis (318)	dialectic (323)
αδιαλλαξία (73), μονολιθικότητα (322)	αντιφατικότητα, ψυχολογική αστασία, ηθική αστάθεια (120)
over-personal	objective, depersonalised
over-general	contextualised
explicit irony	implicit irony
direct expression	oblique, indirect presentation
categorical expression	fictional or dramatic presentation
didactic	ambivalent
earnestness	humour
direct involvement (of poet in poem)	aesthetic distance (of poet from poem) and independence (of poem from poet)
men controlled by gods	men's fate controlled by a variety of forces, including Art, Eros, society, politics and the economy
pessimism and nihilism	aesthetic optimism (belief in the positive power of Art and Eros)

David Ricks adds that the titles of early poems tend to precede the poem (i.e. they are already *given* before we read the poem), while those of later poems are often *extracted* from them (i.e. they follow from the already given poem: Ricks 1993: 95). To give an instance of extreme polarity, the title "Η πόλις" sets

out the central allegorical symbol of the poem (and the poem becomes a set-piece, an exercise in antithesis), while "Ας φρόντιζαν" presents us with a title that is totally incomprehensible until we have read the poem. Ricks also talks of "the sententious, time-free poems of Cavafy's early career" as against "the historically rooted monologues which are perhaps his greatest achievement".

I shall now offer some brief comments on some of the features listed in the table. Similes such as the following are frequently found in Cavafy's early poetry: "Σαν σώματα ωραία νεκρών [...] / έτσ' η επιθυμίες μοιάζουν..." ("Επιθυμίες"), "Του μέλλοντος η μέρες στέκοντ' εμπροστά μας / σα μια σειρά κεράκια αναμένα –" ("Κεριά"), "είν' η προσπάθειές μας σαν των Τρώων" ("Τρώες"). Similes are more or less absent from his later poetry.

Some of Cavafy's poetry is structured on antithesis, the most obvious example being "Che fece .... il gran rifiuto", in which the exclusive Ναι/Όχι (either/or) opposition is striking. By contrast, the later poetry displays a dialectic in which the opposition between thesis and antithesis leads either to the *Aufhebung* ("removal/raising") of oppositions or to the ironic coexistence of opposite views.

From the little information available about Cavafy's manuscript revisions, we can observe a process of depersonalisation in the genesis of certain poems, or in the revisiting of an earlier theme in a later poem. Thus the earlier title "Μια νύχτα μου" became simply "Μια νύχτα" by the time the poem was published.[3] We can also observe the unpublished poem "Τεχνητά άνθη" (1903) being metamorphosed into "Του μαγαζιού" (1913), where a direct statement of personal preference in the earlier poem ("Δεν θέλω τους αληθινούς ναρκίσσους [...] Δόστε με άνθη τεχνητά") develops into an objectivised expression of the taste of a particular character in the later one.

Gods are frequently mentioned in the early poems: "Το έργον των θεών διακόπτομεν εμείς" ("Διακοπή"), "Οι άνθρωποι γνωρίζουν τα γινόμενα. / Τα μέλλοντα γνωρίζουν οι θεοί" ("Σοφοί δε προσιόντων"). The Iliadic poems such as "Απιστία" and "Τα άλογα του Αχιλλέως" present fate in the guise of gods who are

---

[3] I am grateful to Sarah Ekdawi for pointing this out to me. For details about the Cavafy Archive see Ekdawi and Hirst (1996: 3).

indifferent to human suffering. In "Απιστία" the poet himself points out (albeit from Thetis's point of view) that Apollo was responsible for Achilles's death, thus going counter to his own prophecy. In the later poems gods are mentioned as wielding power over men ("Ας φρόντιζαν οι κραταιοί θεοί", as the speaker in "Ας φρόντιζαν" puts it, or "όπως αν ο δαίμων διδώ", as Cratisiclia says in "Άγε, ω βασιλεύ Λακεδαιμονίων"), but such expressions are always placed in the mouths of historical or fictional characters and are not presented as being the poet's own words; besides, in "Ας φρόντιζαν" irony is implicit in the fact that the character who speaks in the poem lays the blame for his predicament on gods in whom the poet and his readers do not believe.

As far as his rewritings are concerned, it is as though Cavafy first deals with a topic generally and theoretically in an early poem, then goes on later to depict a specific instance of a similar situation. His abandonment of the generalising and universalising thrust that characterises many of his early poems is indicated by the fact that, of his own three categories of poems ("philosophical", "historical" and "sensual"), the "philosophical" type, which forms a significant proportion of his early poems, more or less ceases to appear after 1915 (Hirst 1995). This tendency to generalize and universalise is also shown in certain titles. In "Che fece .... il gran rifiuto", Dante's "the one who made the great refusal" (referring to a particular historical personage, Pope Celestine V) significantly comes to imply "whoever has made the great refusal". Such a tendency is also apparent in the first lines of some of the poems: "Σε μερικούς ανθρώπους έρχεται μια μέρα..." ("Che fece..."), "Τιμή σ' εκείνους όπου στη ζωή των / ώρισαν και φυλάγουν Θερμοπύλες" ("Honour to all those who in their lives [...] guard some Thermopylae or other"): Thermopylaes, like the plural Ithacas in "Ιθάκη", are overt, allegorical symbols, and a generalized moral is drawn. The same generalising and universalising tendency can be seen in the poems referred to earlier in connection with similes and gods, especially those that use the first person plural; we can also compare the poems that use the second person singular ("Μάρτιαι ειδοί", with its indefinite and non-specific "κανένας Αρτεμίδωρος" ["some Artemidorus or other"], "Απολείπειν ο θεός Αντώνιον", and "Ιθάκη", all published in 1911, plus "Ο Θεόδοτος"

[1915]), which are dominated by imperatives and other modes of command. The over-direct statements *in propria persona* that we find in the early poems are replaced in the later ones by the *embodiment* of similar attitudes in objectively presented situations. The later poems that use the imperative usually address not a character but a sensation or some aspect of the speaker's own person: in "Επέστρεφε" this is the "αγαπημένη αίσθησις", in "Θυμήσου, σώμα..." the speaker's own body, and, in "Γκρίζα" and "Τεχνουργός κρατήρων", memory; only in "Όταν διεγείρονται" is a non-specific "poet" addressed.[4]

Just as it is possible to group some of the distinctive features of the early and late poems into contrastive pairs, so we can make pairs out of some of the poems themselves, early and late, where the same motif recurs in both but its mode of presentation is different in each. Nevertheless, I am not trying to argue either that all of Cavafy's poems can be sorted into pairs (one early and one late), nor that the two poems that make up each pair that I am about to analyse are the only ones that treat the relevant themes. In what follows, I have chosen to present just a few illustrative examples.

*

One of the most effective ways of monitoring the development of both Cavafy's poetics and his philosophical outlook is to look at the changing ways in which he presents fate.

"Τείχη" (1896/1897) and "Εκόμισα εις την Τέχνη" (1921)[5]

Both of these poems, published a quarter of a century apart, are enunciated in the first person singular, and they are of a similar length (eight and seven lines respectively). More importantly, they contain some of the same vocabulary in strikingly different

---

[4] In "Μάρτιαι ειδοί" the speaker ostensibly addresses his "ψυχή", enjoining it to behave in a certain way in the future; this is strikingly different from the later exhortations to memory, body and sensation to bring back the past.

[5] A single date in brackets after a title indicates the date of the poem's first publication; two dates separated by slashes indicate the date of composition followed by the date of first publication.

contexts, and this similarity clearly points up the contrasts between the two radically different situations depicted in the two poems. The phrase "κάθομαι και απελπίζομαι" in the first poem is replaced in the second by the opening words, "Κάθομαι και ρεμβάζω". In the first poem the speaker laments his fate ("τύχη" being significantly homophonous with "τείχη"): the unspecified "they" have built walls around him, cutting him off from the outside world. By contrast, in the second, the poet is content to daydream in the confidence that Art will produce the ideal "Form of Beauty" by combining the fragmentary desires and sensations that he has offered up to Her. Art (in cooperation with Eros), is seen as a benevolent aesthetic destiny, shaping men's ends, guiding their actions in the way *She* wants, but collaborating with men in such a way that *they* gain too. It is not insignificant that the word "Τέχνη" is close in sound and orthography to "Τείχη", and that the same adverb ("ανεπαισθήτως") is used in both poems to characterise the way in which the walls have been built and the way in which Art goes about Her mysterious business.

Reading the two poems together, then, we may conclude that, whereas in the first poem the speaker seems to be lamenting his fate, the second poem shows that it is precisely this "imperceptible" shutting off from the outside world that has enabled him to become an artist: the second poem expresses the poet's "νόησις"[6] of the situation depicted in "Τείχη", of which he was unaware at the time when he wrote the first poem. The speaker, then, has overcome his earlier negative attitude to his solitude and confinement by giving himself up to the benevolent goddess Τέχνη rather than to the vagaries of the goddess Τύχη; in general, the guileful gods of the early poems are superseded by Art, who is the poet's perfect protectress. The second poem does not cancel out the first; rather, the two poems collaborate to produce a richer meaning than either one of them could have

---

[6] The poem "Νόησις" expresses the poet's later satisfaction at his realisation of the role of Art in events where he had been unaware of it at the time.

done on its own.[7] It is also significant in this regard that in a poem Cavafy wrote three years after the second poem, "Πριν τους αλλάξει ο Χρόνος", the narrator, having told the story of a couple who are forced to part by economic circumstances, wonders whether Τύχη has shown Herself to be a "καλλιτέχνις" by separating them at the height of their beauty and their love, so that each will remain forever for the other "the beautiful boy of twenty-four". Here – unusually for his late poems, where "τύχη" is hardly mentioned – Cavafy underlines the possible connection between "Τύχη" and "Τέχνη", whereas the random character of Τύχη (like that of Φύσις in "Του μαγαζιού") might be expected, in pre-Surrealist times, to be seen as the antithesis of Τέχνη.[8]

It is interesting to monitor the fate of the word μοίρα itself in Cavafy's poetry. It appears three times in his canon, each time in some way personified. In "Τα άλογα του Αχιλλέως" (1897) Zeus tells the divine horses that men are "παίγνια της μοίρας". In "Εν εσπέρα" (1917), where the word is capitalized, it is said to have put a hasty end to a beautiful relationship. It is also given particular prominence by being one of a set of five richly rhyming words (πείρα, Μοίρα, μύρα, πύρα, ξαναπήρα) in this otherwise unrhymed poem. Finally, in "Κίμων Λεάρχου..." (1928), Μοίρα (again capitalised) is said to be a προδότις, leading people to desert their lovers for the sake of new ones – but this generalization is uttered by a fictitious poet who is unaware of the actual details of the specific situation he is writing about; in other words, the generalisation is itself contextualised and therefore relativised.

*

---

[7] Pieris, taking a different view from mine of the genesis of Cavafy's poetry, claims that the "rejected" poem "Αοιδός" was "rewritten" as "Τείχη", then as "Όσο μπορείς" (1992: 78-9, 81-2).

[8] Interestingly, Elytis professes his faith in the importance of the Surrealist *hasard objectif* in the title of one of his essays, "Τέχνη-Τύχη-Τόλμη" (Elytis 1982), in which he replaces the elements of the name of Greece's posts and telecommunications organisation (Ταχυδρομεία, Τηλέγραφοι, Τηλέφωνα, known as "τα τρία ταυ") with three words that are central to Cavafy's poetry (artistic daring is referred to in "Του μαγαζιού" [1913], sensual daring in "Απ' τες εννιά" [1918]).

"Η πόλις" (1894/1910) and "Ας φρόντιζαν" (1930)

In the first of these poems we find the use of two first persons; even in this early poem the situation is presented in the form of a dialogue. In the second, published twenty years later, we again find the first person singular, but this time there is only one character. In "Η πόλις" the gap between the "false" attitude of the "you" (i.e. the quoted speaker) and the "true" situation presented by the "I" (the first speaker) is unsubtly presented. The "I"'s tone is omniscient, authoritative, categorical, judgemental and corrective. The dilemma of the character in the symbolic City, which is directly presented to the reader and directly commented upon by the "I" in "Η πόλις", is placed at an ironic distance from poet and reader alike in "Ας φρόντιζαν", in which the fictional speaker claims to have been ruined in or by a specific city (Antioch, which he describes as "μοιραία πόλις", as though it were a *femme fatale*). The first character wishes to leave the city, the second merely to change his career. In the later poem Cavafy makes no attempt to impose a single view, thus implying that he is opposed to the imposition of *any* view. Interestingly, Cavafy becomes not only less didactic as he grows older, but less pessimistic. In "Ας φρόντιζαν", as is usual in his later poems, Cavafy, instead of telling us what to believe, simply presents a situation and leaves us to judge for ourselves – or not to judge at all, if we wish. I should add that the only other instance of μοιραίος in the whole of Cavafy's canon is in "Ομνύει" (1915): "στην ίδια / μοιραία χαρά, χαμένος, ξαναπιαίνει." Here the poet is speaking directly and lamenting the situation.

*

"Περιμένοντας τους βαρβάρους" (1904) and "Εν μεγάλη ελληνική αποικία, 200 π.Χ." (1928)

In each of these poems, published a quarter of a century apart, we again find the use of the first person singular, each speaker now speaking not only for himself but on behalf his community. Even in the first poem ("Barbarians") the situation is presented dramatically, in the form of a dialogue between two speakers who with their questions and answers convey the action to the reader, while the second poem ("Colony") is presented as a

monologue by a character who is torn between calling in a "political reformer" (a management consultant in modern terms) to rationalise the running of the colony, and continuing to muddle through as before.

In both cases we are dealing with entire communities that are going through difficult times, and in both cases the speakers are hoping (or fearing) that a solution will be provided to the community's problems by outsiders ("Οι βάρβαροι σαν έλθουν θα νομοθετήσουν" in "Barbarians", "ευθύς στον νου τους ριζικές μεταρρυθμίσεις βάζουν, / με την απαίτησι να εκτελεσθούν άνευ αναβολής" in "Colony"). In each poem Cavafy depicts characters unable to govern themselves. While in the first poem the (unnamed) Romans are expectantly awaiting the Barbarians (who eventually fail to turn up), in the second the Greeks eventually decide not to invite the reformer who might have provided a solution to their problems, unaware that within a few years the (barbarian) Romans will come and take away the very freedom of choice that for the moment allows them the luxury of the dilemma whether to invite the reformer or not; the Romans will carry out political reforms on a scale the speaker could not even dream of (we can compare the Romans solving the Delphic priests' dilemma in "Πρέσβεις απ' την Αλεξάνδρεια").

The two poems are complementary, being linked by similarities in the form of inversions: the speakers in "Barbarians" actually *want* the barbarians to come, but they don't show up, while the speaker in "Colony" is unaware that the barbarians are going to arrive. Once again, similarities serve to point up the differences in Cavafy's approach: in the first poem we have a fictitious state that bears some similarities to the historical Roman Empire, and fictitious barbarians who turn out not to exist (clearly a symbolic and allegorical situation), while in the second we have a nationality (Greek) and a date (200 BC), which enable the reader to place the situation within a specific *historical* context, even though the precise *geographical* setting is not specified. Furthermore, the responses of the second speaker in "Barbarians" to the insistent questions of the first are categorical and authoritative (like the response of the "I" in "H

πόλις"), while the mental deliberations of the speaker in "Colony" are tentative and self-contradictory.[9]

*

"Che fece .... il gran rifiuto" (1899/1901) and "Μέρες του 1896" (1925/1927)

In "Che fece ...." the poet imposes a view with resounding portentousness: "εκείνο τ' όχι το σωστό" brooks no ambivalence. Even though he expresses a view in favour of non-conformity which will lead to social condemnation and exclusion – he omits the phrase "per viltate" with which Dante condemns Celestine for refusing the offer of the papacy – Cavafy adopts an alternative but still "correct" attitude. By contrast, in "Μέρες του 1896", published twenty-six years later, Cavafy presents the portrait of a particular character, "που άνω απ' την τιμή, / και την υπόληψί του έθεσε ανεξετάστως / της καθαρής σαρκός του την καθαρή ηδονή". It is true that in "Μέρες του 1896", Cavafy adopts a more categorical tone than in most of his late poems; but I think this is a deliberate tactic to make us see this poem as presenting a specific instance of the general truth stated in the earlier poem. At the same time, the second poem helps us to see more clearly what kinds of choice are implied in the first. The two poems are also linked by the presentation of characters who are brought down by their refusal to conform, as well as the use of "σωστό" ("Δεν θάτανε σωστό") in both poems. (We can compare the less categorical phrase "ως είναι (για την τέχνη μας) σωστό" in "Πέρασμα" [1917].) Perhaps the increasing openness of his society and his greater confidence in his own poetic expression accounts for the existence of the two poems, each one commenting on the other, but each standing as the historic record of the way in which Cavafy felt himself capable of speaking at the particular time. In another rewriting or revisiting of the theme of "Che fece ....", dating from the same time as "Μέρες του 1896", namely "Το 25ον έτος του βίου του" (1925), Cavafy presents a character whose desire for a particular man has led him to

[9] Only in the last two lines is the distinction between the ignorant and the know-all collapsed. This is indicated both by the metre and by the typographical layout (Mackridge 1990: 139-40).

resign himself to the social disapproval that will be the necessary consequence of his persistence in pursuing this man.

*

"Τα επικίνδυνα" (1911) and "Από την σχολήν του περιωνύμου φιλοσόφου" (1921)

Here we have two poems published ten years apart and set in Alexandria at a time when paganism is giving way to Christianity. In the first, the fictional Syrian student Myrtias is "εν μέρει εθνικός, κ' εν μέρει χριστιανίζων", while the reason why the anonymous character in the second hesitates to pass himself off as a Christian is that his parents are "ostentatiously pagan" and might cut off his monthly allowance. To be sure, the first already presents a fictional character speaking; yet Myrtias's confidence that he can give himself over to "dreamed-of pleasures, / to the most daring erotic desires, / to the lascivious drives of the blood" without fear, since, through contemplation and meditation, he will "again find his spirit, as before, ascetic", is undercut by the title, which could be seen as a direct and categorical authorial comment. By contrast, even though the ex-student in the second poem is presented in the third person, Cavafy uses the fictional technique of free indirect discourse and avoids direct comment on the character's confident belief that his looks will allow him to indulge in pleasure for ten years, after which he can start looking for a serious and respectable job. In both poems, then, a similar situation is presented, of a young man postponing the day when he will settle down to a respectable life, and meanwhile indulging in the pleasures of the flesh in the confidence that he will not be fundamentally changed by these experiences. But whereas Myrtias's own words are categorical and portentous, the other characters' words are flippant and cynical. Reading "Από την σχολήν" in the light of "Τα επικίνδυνα", we are aware that the character's confidence is illusory, but Cavafy's avoidance of words such as "dangerous" in the second poem excludes any didactic dimension from the poem. With "Τα επικίνδυνα" we can link a poem dating from between the two poems, namely "Η διορία του Νέρωνος" (1918), where Nero muses that "Πολύ αρκετή / είν' η διορία που ο θεός τον δίδει

/ για να φροντίσει για τους μέλλοντας κινδύνους", and there is a specific reference to "ηδονή".

*

"Τα άλογα του Αχιλλέως" (1896/1897) and "Ο ήλιος του απογεύματος" (1918/1919)

In both of these poems, separated by twenty-two years, there is a displacement or decentring of experience. In the first, the death of Patroclus is viewed not through its impact on his lover Achilles, but from the perspective of Achilles's horses, who are at the same time divine gifts to the hero from Zeus and the former's possessions. In the second poem, as I have written elsewhere (Mackridge, forthcoming), the speaker is visiting a room where his lover had lived but which is now being rented out as office space. In his attempt to reconstruct the room as it had been when his lover had lived there, the speaker concentrates on the positions formerly occupied by the now absent furniture. The speaker metonymically displaces his affection and tenderness from the lover to the furniture: "Θα βρίσκονται ακόμη τα καϋμένα πουθενά". Instead of wondering where his former lover is, he ponders the fate of these possessions. The absence of the lover is symbolized by the absence of the furniture. It is perhaps no coincidence that both of these poems contain, at or near the end, the same form of the tragic adjective "παντοτινή", referring to the permanence of the loss of the beloved, and the reader wonders whether to infer that the lover in the second poem is, like Patroclus, dead.

*

"Θερμοπύλες" (1901/1903) and "Υπέρ της Αχαϊκής Συμπολιτείας πολεμήσαντες" (1922)

Each of these poems has a similar beginning: "Τιμή σ' εκείνους όπου..." ("Θερμοπύλες"), "Ανδρείοι σεις που..." ("Υπέρ"). Both categories of honoured men have fallen in battle, while others are blamed by name for their fate. The earlier poem contains much generalisation that is irrelevant to the historical situation: δίκαιοι, ίσοι, λύπη, ευσπλαχνία, πλούσιοι και πτωχοί, την αλήθεια ομιλούντες, χωρίς μίσος για τους ψευδομένους.

Thermopylae is a glaringly obvious and portentous allegorical symbol. By contrast, the second poem is contextualised by its last two lines, in which the (modern) poet tells us that the preceding lines were written in Alexandria by an Achaean in the seventh year of the reign of Ptolemy Lathyros, that is, in 109 BC, thirty-seven years after the battle of Leucopetra, in which the Achaean League was decisively defeated by the Romans. Here, then, opinions and feelings concerning admired characters are no longer expressed by an uncontextualised and therefore authoritative poetic voice, but by a particular individual who is precisely situated in place and time; and the degradation of the moral environment in which the fictional poet is writing is suggested by the nickname of the contemporary ruler of Egypt, Ptolemy VIII, namely "Chickpea". Furthermore, if Seferis is right (as I believe he is), the later poem refers indirectly to a specific contemporary historical event, the defeat of the Greek forces in Asia Minor in 1922 and the expulsion of the entire Orthodox Christian population from Asia Minor (Seferis 1974: 329-30).

*

"Απολείπειν ο θεός Αντώνιον" (1910/1911) and "Εν δήμω της Μικράς Ασίας" (1926)

In the first poem the speaker directly addresses an individual who finds himself in an analogous situation to Mark Antony, one of the central figures in the crucial Roman power struggle that ended with the Battle of Actium, which in turn ensured that the Greek world would henceforth be ruled directly from Rome. The speaker's words consist of urgent and impassioned exhortations concerning the proper (that is, Stoical) way to react to crushing defeat. In the later poem, published fifteen years later, the speaker is a fictitious municipal official, a petty participant in the same events in which Antony was a protagonist. He views Antony and Octavian from a distance as no more than interchangeable names. In contrast to the speaker in the Antony poem, the speaker in this later poem expresses a flippant and cynical attitude to the political subjugation of his whole civilisation to a militarily superior outsider. Yet at the same

time he expresses a smug sense of the *cultural* superiority of the Greeks *vis-à-vis* their conquerors.[10]

*

I have intended to show that by pairing one of Cavafy's early poems with one of the later poems we can highlight certain aspects of each of them that can help us form a clearer picture of the development of Cavafy's poetics and of the world-view that it embodies. Over time, and as his experience of life and art increases, the sententious and didactic general statements of his earlier career give way to the lively presentation of specific situations and incidents whose ambiguity demands constant reconsideration on the reader's part. As I have suggested, my own pairing of poems has been based on my own personal intuitions. In this way I hope to have suggested a fruitful method of reading Cavafy's poetry and to have encouraged others to find their own connections between the early and the late poems.

References

Cavafy, C.P. (1991). Κ.Π. Καβάφης. *Τα ποιήματα*. Νέα έκδοση του Γ.Π. Σαββίδη. 2 vols. Athens: Ikaros

Ekdawi, Sarah, and Hirst, Anthony (1996). "'Hidden things': Cavafy's thematic catalogues", *Modern Greek Studies (Australia and New Zealand)* 4, 1-34

Elytis, Odysseas (1982). Οδυσσέας Ελύτης. "Τέχνη-Τύχη-Τόλμη" [first published under the title "Ανοιχτά χαρτιά, T.T.T. 1935", *Τα νέα γράμματα*, 2nd series, 1 (1) (January 1944)], in *Ανοιχτά χαρτιά*, 2nd ed. (Athens: Ikaros), pp. 93-119

---

[10] For the cultural superiority of the Greeks over the Romans cf. Artemidorus's superior knowledge in "Μάρτιαι ειδοί"; but see also "Πρέσβεις απ' την Αλεξάνδρεια", where the Delphic oracle has lost its divinely sanctioned decision-making powers and consequently its cultural prestige in the face of Roman *realpolitik*.

Hirst, Anthony (1995). "Philosophical, historical and sensual: an examination of Cavafy's thematic collections", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 19, 33-93

Mackridge, Peter (1990). "Versification and signification in Cavafy", *Μολυβδο-κονδυλο-πελεκητής* 2, 125-43

Mackridge, Peter (forthcoming). "Έρως, Τέχνη και Αγορά στην ποίηση του Καβάφη", *Μολυβδο-κονδυλο-πελεκητής* 6

Pieris, Michalis (1992). Μιχάλης Πιερής. *Χώρος, Φως και Λόγος. Η διαλεκτική του ‹‹μέσα››-‹‹έξω›› στην ποίηση του Καβάφη.* Athens: Kastaniotis

Ricks, David (1993). "Cavafy translated", *Κάμπος: Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek* 1, 85-110

Seferis, Yorgos (1974). Γιώργος Σεφέρης. "Κ.Π. Καβάφης, Θ.Σ. Έλιοτ· παράλληλοι" [lecture delivered in December 1946], in *Δοκιμές*, 3rd ed., vol. 1 (Athens: Ikaros), pp. 324-63

St Cross College, Oxford

Modernism in Modern Greek theatre (1895-1922)*

Walter Puchner

Modernism in modern Greek prose and drama is closely linked with two *termini technici: βορειομανία* ("mania for the North") and *ιψενογερμανισμός* ("Ibseno-germanism"). The two terms appeared in the vocabulary of Greek critics in the last decade of the nineteenth century, at a time when, in reaction to the aesthetic impasse of "ethography" (ηθογραφισμός), literary circles in Athens were welcoming with open arms all the "-isms" of fin-de-siècle Europe (Puchner 1995). The web of issues surrounding these terms is a complex one, and relates to modern Greek civilisation's search for a new identity. The generation of 1880 had just succeeded in locating such an identity in folk culture, folk literature and the demotic language with its thematic scope and stylistic pluralism, when it seemed to come under the threat of dilution through foreign trends – trends which introduced new kinds of problems and manners of behaviour which were seen as irrelevant to the modern Greek reality. Nevertheless, Greece consisted of more than the villages of the "ethographic" novella; in order to analyse and depict the social problems and the psychology of a bourgeois culture which was only just being formed in Greece, new literary and stylistic tools and means were needed, and these had to be borrowed from a Europe where the arts were in the process of being revolutionised. Added to this need was the all-powerful imperative to imitate European literary successes, a process which had been formed and reinforced throughout the nine-

* This article is a revised and enriched version of a lecture given at Cambridge on 6 November 1996. It is based on a Greek text ("Οι βόρειες λογοτεχνίες και το νεοελληνικό θέατρο. Ιστορικό διάγραμμα και ερευνητικοί προβληματισμοί"), delivered at the Goulandri-Horn Foundation in Athens in May 1995, translated by Jocelyn Pye.

teenth century, when the few bourgeois authors would await the post from Paris to see what and how they would write.[1]

At the end of the century it is no longer Paris, but the Scandinavian countries, Germany, and Russia which are fashionable. The ideological struggles around the conceptual axes "foreign" and "indigenous" reach the scale of open hostilities even within the camp of the demoticists, since *Romiosini* – the term is an expression of the *new* national identity as opposed to the archaising and romantic "Ελλάδα" and "ελληνικός" (Mantouvalou 1983) – was in danger of being made foreign and of losing its uniqueness in the whirlwind of international "-isms" which, like unruly hordes of wolves, had suddenly and violently invaded Greece, leaping over the strongly-built and well-kept garden wall of "ethography" with its picturesque types and its "couleur locale", the everyday events of the farming community and the closed world-view of the village, which had until then functioned as the guarantee of "Greekness" in language, themes and mentality (Tziovas 1986; Jusdanis 1991). There were a number of writers and intellectuals at the end of the century, grouped around certain progressive periodicals like *Τέχνη* and *Διόνυσος* (Gounelas 1981), who resisted the calls of the leaders of the extreme demoticist movement, Eftaliotis and Psicharis,[2] as they sensed strongly that the content of a modern Greek identity could not be so

---

[1] For the role and function of success in "Europe" as a criterion for positive reception in Greece see Puchner 1992: 181-221.

[2] Cf. the article by Eftaliotis "Αληθινή και ψεύτικη τέχνη" in *Το Άστυ* 21.7.1899, where "ιψενογερμανισμός" is ridiculed: "Μερικοί μας νέοι... βρέθηκαν ξάφνω στα δάσια της γερμανικής της τέχνης και σκιάχτηκαν, ξαφνίστηκαν και πήγαν..."; this is a dig at Kambysis's column "Γερμανικά Γράμματα". But the main target is *Τέχνη*: "Μεγάλο κι ασυγχώρητο κρίμα, ν' αρχίζη ένα περιοδικό με την εθνική τη γλώσσα, κι αντίς να μας γενή περιβόλι ρωμαίικο, να κάθεται και να 'ρμηνεύει ξένες Βαβυλωνίες." The danger of the loss of national identity is also touched upon: "Δίχως ... τον εθνικό το χρωματισμό, δίχως το *προζύμι* που μας την κάμνει την τέχνη ψωμί και μας θρέφει, ... σωστό καλλιτέχνημα μήτε στάθηκε μήτε θα σταθή ... Σε κάθε του βήμα πρέπει το μικρό το έθνος να λογαριάζη και να προσέχη μην τσαλαπατηθή από το μεγαλύτερο, αφού μάλιστα ύστερ' από το χρωματισμό του μπορεί να χάση και το *είναι* του κιόλας" (Papandreou 1983: 92ff). On Psicharis's polemic see Puchner 1994.

narrowly confined.[3] It is symptomatic that the thematic guidelines of the periodical *Εστία*, which laid the foundations for the "ethographic" novella (Papakostas 1982: 80; Politou-Marmarinou 1985), were closely tied to the language question. In 1901 Dimitrios Chatzopoulos (Μποέμ), writing on Karkavitsas's *Παλιές Αγάπες*, argued: "You can be Greeks (Έλληνες), you can have a Greek soul with or without the *fustanella*, you can be Greeks (Ρωμιοί) without writing in the language of Mr Psicharis."[4] And elsewhere: "Gone are the gunpowder and the talismans, the epitaphs, the slender maidens and the witches, the *fustanellas* and the pomponed shoes – it has all evaporated like superficial smoke" (cf. Tziovas 1986: 193ff). And he adds in another article in a more polemical tone: "Autonomous Greek literature with its lowly inclination towards descriptions of master Dimitrios or the lovely slender Vasso! We can do without your autonomy for Greeks and for foreigners."[5] And the ever dialectical and conciliatory Palamas, who gave us the masterpiece of the genre with his "Θάνατος παλληκαριού"[6] – which of course in some respects already surpassed the limits of "ethography" – proclaims with sensitivity and perspicacity as early as 1895: "Ibseno-germanism should be praised highly indeed, if its life-bringing currents might possibly reach as far as the contemporary Greek soul." This is said in surprise at the exaggerated reactions against the so-called "βορειομανία", and with a sense of the impasses of "ethography" which he can already perceive.

> Σήμερα ο νατουραλισμός, και αύριον ο συμβολισμός! Ακούω γύρω μου ψιθύρους χλευασμού και ανησυχίας και θλίψεως. Κι' εγώ ανακράζω: καλώς ήλθατε, καλώς να έλθετε, νατουραλισμοί, συμβολισμοί, ιψενογερμανισμοί, και από βορρά και μεσημβρίας,

---

[3] The polemic was answered by N. Episkopopoulos (*Το Άστυ*, 22.8.1899), who shared Kostis Palamas's view: "Αι φιλολογίαι όλαι ακολουθούν τους νόμους της μιμήσεως, της εξελίξεως και της ανταλλαγής· δανείζονται αλλήλας· διαδέχονται και μιμούνται τας προηγουμένας των και αναγεννώνται και από της τέφρας των." Cf. Papandreou 1983: 96ff.

[4] *Ο Διόνυσος* 1 (1901) 74. Cf. Apostolidou 1993: 379.

[5] *Ο Διόνυσος* 1 (1901) 87. Cf. also the article "Ημείς και μερικοί ξένοι", ibid., 83ff.

[6] For a bibliography and reviews see Puchner 1995: 238ff.

> από ανατολής και δύσεως, όλοι οι εις ισμοί σεισμοί, από τους οποίους αν ανατινάσσωνται και συντρίβωνται ή εξαφανίζωνται τα παλαιά εδάφη, νέαι νήσοι και νέαι στερεαί του πνεύματος αναδύονται και θάλλουσιν.[7]
>
> Today naturalism, and tomorrow symbolism! I hear around me whispers of derision and unease and sadness. And I call out: welcome, always be welcome, naturalisms, symbolisms, Ibseno-germanisms, from the north and the south, from the east and from the west, all the tremors in the -isms, and if they make the old lands shake and crumble and disappear, new islands and new mainlands of the spirit will surface and flourish.

Palamas's weighty words form a strong contrast to the manifesto of "ethography" formulated by Karkavitsas in 1892 in the prologue to his *Stories*.[8]

In Greek drama the term *βορειομανία* clearly comes from the camp of local patriotism, and in 1894 it invaded the realm of the comic idyll (Hatzipantazis 1981) and the dramatic idyll with the renowned production of Ibsen's *Ghosts*. The performance was introduced by the very young Xenopoulos (Papandreou 1983: 21-32), who published two works in the vein of Ibsen in 1895, *Ο τρίτος* and *Ψυχοπατέρας*, and initiated the "Theatre of Ideas", the term he coined in 1920 for serious Greek drama of that period.[9] The linguistic purists reacted immediately (Athens was

---

[7] Palamas, "Εξ αφορμής μιας λέξεως" (1895), *Άπαντα*, vol. 2, p. 388.

[8] "Ο σημερινός Έλλην καλλιτέχνης, σε όποιον κλάδο και αν ανήκη, βρίσκεται πάντα μέσα σε θησαυρό ατελείωτο και δεν χρειάζεται παρά να σκύψη για να γεμίση τους κόρφους του. Είναι λοιπόν δίκαιο αντί ν' αδράχνη διαμάντια και μπριλάντια να προσέχη 'ς τα ψωροχάλικα; Είναι δίκαιο αφού και ιστορία και θρησκεία και ηρωισμοί απίστευτοι, αφού πρωτόπλαστοι ακόμα παραδόσεις κ' εθίμων πολύμορφοι σωροί και τύποι και όψεις σκληροκάμωτοι κ' εκφράσεις σχεδόν πέτρινοι και φερσίματα χιλιάδες και φύση από τον Παράδεισο παρμένη, όλα κατά σωρούς σε περιτριγυρίζουν, σε προκαλούν, πετούν σχεδόν σαν χιλιόπλουμες πεταλούδες ολόγυρά σου και φωτοβολούν 'ς το νου και 'ς τα νεύρα σου και σου γλυκοτραγουδούν πίσω 'ς τ' άσκοπα γραψίματα του παρελθόντος και μ' εκείνα να προβάλλουμε 'ς τους αναγνώστας; Όχι, χίλιες φορές όχι!..." (A. Karkavitsas, *Διηγήματα* (Athens 1892), xff; cf. Vitti 1980: 72ff).

[9] In an article on the dramatic œuvre of Dimitris Tangopoulos, "Το θεάτρο των ιδεών κι ο κ. Δ. Π. Ταγκόπουλος", *Ο Νουμάς* 711-713, Nov. 1920.

still resounding with the double success of Vernardakis's *Φαύστα* in 1893), as did the demoticists: Eftaliotis responded to Ibsen's *Ghosts* with an "ethographic" *Βουρκόλακας* [10] and issued repeated warnings about the harmful influences and dangerous side-effects of the imported "-isms". Writing from Paris in 1900, Psicharis derided the "long-haired imbeciles" who regarded themselves as "Nietzsches, Ibsens and countless other things" and read Nietzsche in the streets of Athens, and fulminated against Yiannis Kambysis, who stoked up "Germanolatry" in the "Γερμανικά Γράμματα", and against Yiorgos Drosinis, who had called Germany his "second fatherland" (Psicharis 1901: 4ff). In a letter about Palamas's *Τρισεύγενη* (1903) he praised Palamas for not using foreign "symbolisms", but indigenous ones; later, of course, he would claim that Palamas, too, wrote in the shadow of Ibsen.[11]

The defenders of "Greekness" focused their critique mainly on the enthusiastic, uncritical, and idiosyncratic reception of Nietzsche, whose philosophy had at that time been reduced to a misunderstood version of the "superman" (Veloudis 1983: 262ff and passim; Lamm 1970). Konstantinos Chatzopoulos wrote a satire entitled *Ο υπεράνθρωπος* in 1911, and in the same year

---

[10] It was published in serial form in *Εστία* in 1894 and as a book in 1900 together with the novella "Μαζώχτρα" (*Άπαντα*, ed. G. Valetas (Athens 1952), vol. 1, 592-627).

[11] In 1903 he wrote: "Αγαπητέ μου, Είναι ωραίο δράμα η Τρισέβγενη, και πρωτότυπο. Ίσως γι' αφτό άκουσες τόσα και θ' ακούσης ακόμη πολλά. Είναι πρωτότυπο, γιατί δε χρωστάς τίποτις κανενός. Έχει μέσα συβολισμό [sic], μα ο συβολισμός σου εσένα μήτε ξενίλα μυρίζει μήτε ιψενισμούς. Είναι ρωμαίικος" ("Ο κ. Ψυχάρης για την ‹‹Τρισεύγενη››", *Ο Νουμάς* 1 (1 Oct. 1903) no. 65, 1 (cf. *Ρόδα και μήλα* vol. 4, Athens 1907, 245-8) The demand for indigenous symbolisms is formulated more explicitly in the manifesto "Για το Ρωμαίικο θέατρο" (Psicharis 1901: 58-61). In 1927 Psicharis has changed his mind; in his pamphlet against Palamas he writes: "Ποιος στην Ελλάδα δεν έσκυψε το λαιμό του από κάτω από τού Ίψεν το ζυγό; Ποιος δε σκοτείνιασε το φωτεινό το ρωμαίικο τόνον με τα σύννεφα της Σκανδιναβίας; Ο Καμπύσης και ο Ταγκόπουλος πρώτα θύματά της. Η Τρισέβγενη του Παλαμά όμορφο δράμα και γενναίο. Έλα δα που μας τα χαλνά όλα η μίμηση της Δύσης. Εγώ προτιμώ ν' αφήσουμε το θέμα το άχαρο και το αχάριστο. Με βγάζει έξω από την κριτική μου την αμεροληψία. Μ' ερεθίζει κιόλας" (Psicharis 1927: 20ff; cf. Tziovas 1986: 163ff).

Pavlos Nirvanas wrote an article summing up the damage done to Greek thought by the superficial reception of Nietzsche,[12] even though it was largely through his own analyses and presentations that admiration for Nietzsche was first transmitted to Greek intellectuals (Veloudis 1983: 262ff). In drama, it was Ibsen, Strindberg, Tolstoi, Hauptmann and Sudermann who were the greatest influences on young writers at the threshold of the new century, having become known through performances, translations, presentations of their work and reviews of their successes on the European stages.[13] As early as 1894, Babis Anninos parodied the "Germanisation" of Greece in his comedy *Η νίκη του Λεωνίδα* (Hesseling 1924: 145; Veloudis 198: 245), and in 1903 Periklis Yiannopoulos vilified Sudermann's play *Honour* for eroding the morals and customs of the Greeks,[14] while as early as 1899 a charming parody of this work was published under the title *Η τιμή του Σούντερμαν*, which was recently staged at the Ethniko Theatro (1993/4). In other articles, such as "Ξενομανία" and "Όχι Ξένα",[15] Yiannopoulos prepared the way for the dogma of hellenocentrism propounded by Ion Dragoumis and others. In the latter article he takes Palamas to task for defending the staging of Hauptmann's *Coachman Henschel* in the Vasilikon Theatron against the criticisms of Dimitrios Vernardakis, who had complained that such a work could only provoke nausea.[16] His own *Νικηφόρος Φωκάς*, meanwhile, had to wait until 1905 before it was performed in the same court theatre (Sideris 1990: 94).

---

[12] "Ο Ελληνικός νιτσεϊσμός", in *Άπαντα*, ed. G. Valetas, vol. 3, (Athens 1968), 317ff.

[13] The mass of information about "northern" literatures collected at the turn of the century in the short-lived periodicals *Η Τέχνη* (1898-1899), *Ο Διόνυσος* (1901-1902) and *Το Περιοδικόν μας* (1900-1901) is astonishing: among German authors, the focus is on Nietzsche, Hauptmann, George, Hofmannsthal, but also Goethe, Schiller, Novalis, von Platen, Uhland, Heine etc.; and among Scandinavian authors Ibsen, Strindberg, Björnson, Brandes, Hamsun, Jakobson etc. (Veloudis 1983: 251). Cf. Tomadakis 1969/70 and 1970/71.

[14] "Έργα και ημέραι. Το καθήκον μας", *Ο Νουμάς* 1 (4) (12.1.1903), 4.

[15] *Ο Νουμάς*, 16.1. and 30.1.1903.

[16] "Φιλολογικά αναθέματα", *Ο Νουμάς*, 19.1.1903.

The semantic content of the term *βορειομανία* is exceptionally disparate, polemical and emotionally charged, while that of *ιψενογερμανισμός* is more clear-cut: *βορειομανία* brings together in one term geographical, climatological, thematological, stylistic and psychological parameters which already indicate the confusion in the adaptation of foreign trends so characteristic of the "Θέατρο των Ιδεών". The term was coined by Yiorgos Tsokopoulos in 1895 following the "invasion" of Greece by Ibsen.[17] "Εξ αφορμής μιας λέξεως" is the title of the article with which Palamas responded, where, as we have seen above, he uncompromisingly affirms the beneficial opening up of Greek literature to the "North". Palamas includes under this heading much older figures of English and German literature than we would perhaps expect: Shakespeare and Marlowe, Goethe and Schiller, and the Romantics Heine, Lenau, Shelley and others; alongside the contemporary authors Hauptmann and Sudermann, he places Russian literature with Tolstoi and Dostoevskii and Scandinavian literature with G. Brandes and H. Drach, Ibsen and Strindberg.[18] After first declaring his inability to understand the term, since it should logically include the older English and German authors as well, Palamas goes on, with his unfailing instinct for historical and cultural interrelations, to give the above out-of-hand catalogue of "northern" authors, thereby broadening the concept of *βορειομανία*, which had initially been nothing but the expression of an emotional reaction against the modern European movements, and giving it real substance (on Palamas as critic see Sachinis 1994). It is immediately clear that: 1) he does not restrict the term to the "modern" authors, but also includes the Romantics (as well as Shakespeare's and Marlowe's reception in German romanticism); and 2) the writers in question stand outside the Italian and French tradition of classicism and classicising drama that was so strong in Greece at the time. During certain phases of the Greek nineteenth century, Shakespeare had become the principal model for non-Aristotelian drama. Palamas broadens the concept of "northern literatures", dates it back to around 1800, and tries to give it some solid content.

---

[17] *Τα Ολύμπια*, 9.12.1895.

[18] "Εφημερίδα" 14.12.1895, in *Άπαντα*, vol. 2, 374-8.

Of course, the Romantic poetic figures of Byron and Shelley are more closely linked to Greece because of their philhellenism (Puchner 1995a: 269ff) and their reception was significant throughout the nineteenth century (Sideris 1990: 31ff). The authors of Weimar classicism, Goethe and Schiller, enjoyed renewed interest between 1890 and 1920, although the former's *Faust* and several dramatic works of the latter had already been translated and performed during the second half of the nineteenth century (Puchner 1992: 195ff). Furthermore, in Palamas's time Heine was the most translated German poet in Greece. As far as Shakespeare is concerned, it must be noted that the beginnings of his reception, in the Heptanese as well as in Athens, are not unrelated to German romanticism's enthusiasm for Shakespeare (Sideris 1964/65). Palamas insisted that Lessing in his *Hamburgische Dramaturgie,* and the German translations by Schlegel, Tieck and others, reestablished the reputation of the English playwright after the damage and disfigurement caused by shallow and sentimental renderings of his works (Puchner 1995b: 708). Vernardakis declared him at one point to be the new aesthetic model for Greek drama (in the prologue of *Μαρία Δοξαπατρή*, 1858). Even before the generation of the 1880s, then, "northernness" was already associated with an iconoclastic tendency which to some extent balanced out the archaeolatry and classicism of the time, even though the authors in question tended to employ ancient, classical themes. The case of Franz Grillparzer, who was made known in Greece by Thomas Oikonomou almost 100 years after his heyday in Vienna, is both unusual and enlightening. First it was his romantic tragedy of fate, *The great-grandmother* or *The ghost in the castle,* which attracted the belated interest of the Vasilikon Theatron, but immediately thereafter attention was turned to the plays with classical themes, *Hero and Leander* and *Medea* (Puchner 1992: 268ff; 1995b: 86f and 764f). The success of Hofmannsthal's *Electra* followed a similar route (Mygdalis 1988: 25).

With the invasion of Ibsen in 1894, the vaguely iconoclastic element was enhanced by the "foreign". The translation of Zola's *Nana* in 1880 and the more general acquaintance of the Greek reading public with the "naturalist" school had already

prepared the ground for the reception of naturalism,[19] and this led to Ibsen's being construed mainly as a naturalist and an iconoclast of the bourgeois world-view (Papandreou 1983: 16). The process of reception which followed can be characterised as confused, spasmodic and prone to misconstruction. There was already a confusion between French naturalism and realism with the "ethographic" story being pronounced "naturalist", despite the fact that it clearly possessed idyllic and beautifying traits (Puchner 1984: 317ff). "Ζολαδικός" is a stylistic and thematic adjective which was greatly over-used, and for a wide variety of purposes, by the critics of the time. Both the naturalist and the symbolist tendencies, which flooded into Greek intellectual life almost simultaneously, were slotted into the "ethographic" framework of the Greek countryside, and into the thematics of Greek folk tradition (an extreme example is the Aegean fisherman who is fairy-tale hero and superman rolled into one, in Spiros Melas's *Γυιος του ίσκιου* of 1907). Alternatively, the themes and conflicts of bourgeois literature were reproduced in an imaginary "bourgeois" world of fin-de-siècle Athens, which did not exist in that form, at least not yet (see, for example, the bourgeois problematics in Xenopoulos's *Ο τρίτος* and *Ψυχοπατέρας* of 1895, which do not correspond to any wider, objective social reality, but are conventional patterns with roots in the dramas of Dumas fils and other French playwrights, which were widely performed in Athens; cf. Delveroudi 1994: 241f). The situation was confounded still further both by the pressure of the language struggles on the demoticists and by the desire to create a national corpus of dramatic works and to raise the profile of the Greek travelling theatres and revues. Finally, the confusion was heightened by the ideological instability surrounding these artistic tendencies, which was given various expression in the dramatology of the "Theatre of Ideas", ranging from nationalism to socialism, from an undigested Nietzscheism to the eschatological Hellenocentrism which grew up in the gap between the national humiliations of 1897 and 1922 (Gounelas 1984).

This intellectual restlessness, the heterogeneous and spasmodic way in which theories were embraced and

---

[19] Cf. the manifesto of Ayisilaos Yiannopoulos in 1880, now reprinted in Mastrodimitris 1996: 271-97.

proclamations made, the spontaneous reactions, both positive and negative,[20] to the chaotic invasion of all the "-isms" from Europe, are what make the exploration of this period so fascinating and exciting. It is the period we conventionally call the "Theatre of Ideas", without necessarily meaning committed theatre or plays with an obvious ideological baggage. The use of "northern" literature in Greek theatres was opposed by the linguistic purists, who preferred the patriotic tragedy of the drama competitions (Delveroudi 1988), but also by the Hellenocentric demoticists with their local patriotism, who saw it as a profanation of the vision of a modern Greece built on folk traditions and the language of the people. It was also opposed by the travelling theatre troupes, whose amateur actors preferred to stick with their well-tried repertoire of successes, including the picaresque, the comic idyll and the dramatic idyll.[21] Finally, it was resisted by a large proportion of theatre-goers, who flocked to the revue and vaudeville theatres (Hatzipantazis and Maraka 1977) and to the Karagiozis shows, which had the most numerous audiences of all forms of theatre (Puchner 1988: 409ff). The "Theatre of Ideas" was a matter for a few intellectuals, and at first only for the Vasilikon Theatron and Christomanos's Nea Skini (Mavrikou-Anagnostou 1964), until the better roles and European success and fame began to attract the prestigious troupes of Kyveli and Kotopouli. Thus the reception of the modern European writers was usually restricted to the following four theatres: Vasilikon Theatron, Nea Skini, Kyveli and Kotopouli (for her repertoire see Anemoyiannis 1994: 335-43). After his resignation from the court theatre Thomas Oikonomou staged plays by modern European dramatists with various private troupes.

The terms "northern" literatures and *βορειομανία* are of course to some extent misleading, since the assimilation processes at the beginning of this century also included dramatists of the French and Italian traditions: the French-writing Belgian

---

[20] On different kinds of reception in Greek literature and theatre see Puchner 1988; Veloudis 1994: 283-6; Vitti 1995.

[21] The role of theatre directors, producers and actors in the development of the repertoire and the translations of dramatology was mainly a conservative one (Puchner 1992: 181ff).

symbolists Verhaeren and Maeterlinck, and D'Annunzio. But as the term *ψευογερμανισμός* suggests, in the initial phases at least, the "difficult", "gloomy" and "foreign" new trends were received as something "northern", non-Mediterranean, and identified with Scandinavia, Russia and Germany. The reception of the "far northeners" mainly took the following three forms: 1) performance and translation – it was very rare for a play to be translated without being performed (an example is Strindberg's *Η δεσποινίς Τζούλια* translated by Yiannis Kambysis in 1899), and slightly less rare for a play to be performed in the original (cf. the tours of Agnes Sorma, Adelaide Ristori, Eleonora Duse etc.); 2) articles and reports about theatrical developments in Europe in the daily press and periodicals; and 3) as a consequence of the first two, the direct or mediated influences on indigenous dramatic production. This third phase is more difficult to document, but the most interesting. Only rarely was the reception based on the reading of a work in the original (this only happened with German literature); usually French translations were used. Yiannis Kambysis and Konstantinos Chatzopoulos are an exception to this rule: their articles for the Greek press during their extended stays in Germany were a substantial contribution to the reception of "northern literatures" by the modern Greek theatre. Interestingly, Ibsen and Strindberg, as well as Tolstoi, first became known in Greece via the productions of their works on the stages of Germany.

The reception process which culminated in the last decade of the nineteenth and the first decade of the twentieth century was marked by a few significant performances in the Greek theatres: Ibsen's *Ghost* was staged in 1894, Tolstoi's *The power of darkness* in 1895, Sudermann's *Honour* in 1898, Björnsen's *Impoverishment* and Hauptmann's *Coachman Henschel* in 1902. If we consider the small number of these works in proportion to the rest of the repertoire, even of progressive theatres like the Vasilikon and the Nea Skini, it becomes clear that the ideological opposition of the demoticists was based, initially at least, on only a handful of performances. Another phenomenon should also be taken into account; not all the dramatic output of these countries is automatically considered to have a "northern" feel; there are some works, for example Gogol's *The Inspector* (staged in 1893) or

Chekov's *The Bear* (staged in 1902 by the Nea Skini), and also the Viennese boulevard and operetta, which escaped the stigma of the "far North" entirely. The "northern" works seem to have had to fulfil certain stylistic criteria, and to belong to the modernist currents of naturalism, symbolism, neo-romanticism etc., in order to be labelled "foreign", "difficult", "gloomy" and "subversive". There were very specific conditions of reception, then, which defined the "northernness" of the *βορειομανία*.

Let us now look more closely at the reception of individual dramatists who were seen to pose a threat to the "Greekness" of modern Greek theatre. We will limit ourselves to Ibsen, Strindberg, Tolstoi, Hauptmann und Sudermann.

Ibsen's works were staged in Greece in the following years: *Ghosts* in 1894; *Hedda Gabler* in 1899 with Eleonora Duse; *A doll's house* or *Nora* in 1899 by the Panellinios Dramatikos Thiasos; *The wild duck* in 1901 by the Nea Skini; *An enemy of the people* by the Nea Skini, *The pillars of society* by the Vasilikon, *Hedda Gabler* by the Nea Skini and *The lady of the sea* by the Thiasos Oikonomou, all in 1902; *Rosmersholm* in 1910 by the Thiasos Oikonomou; *Little Eyolf* in 1919 by the Thiasos Oikonomou; and in 1925 *Architect Solnes* by the Thiasos Oikonomou (this is not an exhaustive list). The greatest contribution to the reception of Ibsen in Greece was made by two men of the theatre who had close ties with Germany and with Vienna: Konstantinos Christomanos and Thomas Oikonomou (Puchner 1992: 251ff). Theoretical discussion of Ibsen was usually triggered by a particular performance (Papandreou 1983), but is not entirely restricted to reviews: in the work of Kostis Palamas, Ibsen is one of the most frequently mentioned modern foreign authors (Puchner 1995b, passim). Ibsen's influence does not end after the interwar period, but continues after the Second World War; even today it cannot be said with certainty that his reception in Greece has ended.[22]

This is even more true of Strindberg, whose plays are now enjoying an unexpected revival in the Greek theatre. He was introduced into Greece by Yiannis Kambysis, who translated

---

[22] Cf. the play *Στη χώρα Ίψεν* by Yakovos Kambanellis (*Θέατρο*, vol. 6, 91-140), based on *Ghosts*, or the translation of George Bernard Shaw's, *The Quintessence of Ibsenism* (1891, 1913) published by Dodone in 1993.

Miss Julie together with its programmatic prologue which functioned as a manifesto of naturalism.[23] In his own short prologue Kambysis develops his idea of a *θέατρο συναναστροφής* ("the theatre as gathering"):

> Θαν το ήθελα σε μια σάλα χωρίς σκηνές και σκηνικά, χωρίς ηθοποιούς, μόνον εκεί σε μια γωνία της σάλας, ένας, δύο, όσα είναι τα πρόσωπα, καθισμένοι σε καθίσματα να μιλούν το διάλογο. Το θέατρο θα το ήθελα συναναστροφή που τη δίνει ο ποιητής ή οι πνεματικοί συντρόφοι του ποιητή με προσκαλεσμένους που εκείνοι θέλουν.[24]

> I would like it to be in a room without any stage or scenery, without actors, just one or two people, as many as the play needs, sitting over in a corner of the room on chairs and speaking the dialogue. I would like the theatre to be a gathering organised by the author or by the author's intellectual friends, who would invite the people they wanted to be there.

What he proposes is not a dramatic performance at all, but a role-play in front of an invited audience. Kambysis and his enthusiastic "Γερμανικά Γράμματα" ("German letters") played a decisive part in the intensification of the phenomenon of *βορειομανία* (Fteris 1951; Grammatas 1984: 38ff). It is characteristic that the "naturalist" Strindberg received far greater attention than the "expressionist" Strindberg. *Miss Julie* was not staged until 1908 by the group of Kyveli. A long prologue was read by Grigorios Xenopoulos, as he had done in 1894 for Ibsen's *Ghosts*, in which he stresses that

> η τραγωδία αυτή δεν είναι δια να παίζεται εις τα θέατρά μας. Είναι καμωμένη επίτηδες, ως πρότυπον δια το θέατρον του Μέλλοντος το οποίον ωνειρεύθη ο Στρίντμπεργκ κι επραγματοποίησεν εν μέρει εις το Παρίσι ο Αντουάν.

> this tragedy is not meant to be played in our theatres. It is designed specifically as a model for the theatre of the Future that

---

[23] *Η Τέχνη* 10/11 (Aug.-Sept. 1899), 243-50, 251-70 (the text). Cf. Grammatas 1990.

[24] *Η Τέχνη* 10/11 (Aug.-Sept. 1899), 241ff, *Άπαντα*, ed. G. Valetas (Athens 1972), 629ff; cf. Gounelas 1977: 168.

> Strindberg dreamed of and that Antoine has, to some extent, put into practice in Paris.

It does, however, have an attraction even when played in conventional theatres:

> Αλλά και ούτω παιζομένη – όπως άλλως τε επαίχθη και παντού κατά τον παλαιόν τρόπον – πάλιν θα σας κάμη την βαθυτάτην εκείνην εντύπωσιν που κάμνουν τ' αριστουργήματα, δια τα οποία τα σκηνικά μέσα ίσως να περιττεύουν.[25]

> But even played like this – for it has after all been played in the old style everywhere – it will still impress you as deeply as other masterpieces, for which props and scenery are perhaps superfluous.

There has as yet been no comprehensive study of the reception of Strindberg's dramatic work. But the first work to be performed after *Ghosts* in 1894 and after the historic prologue by Xenopoulos with its famous formulation: "philologically we are a province of France", was Tolstoi's *The power of darkness*, which was played at the Menandros on 6 January 1895. The production used the translation by A. Konstantinidis[26] and was "concerned, above all, with the 'novelistic aspects' of the play" (Sideris 1990: 165). But the hour of naturalism had not yet come, and the play received little attention. Christomanos's production of the same play on 24 January 1902, in the Nea Skini, made a much greater impression. The director used one of his naturalist devices, namely to have real dung on the stage.[27] The performance, which lasted until two in the morning (because of the changes of scenery) was received enthusiastically by Xenopoulos, Tangopoulos and others (Mavrikou-Anagnostou 1964: 126ff). It was one of the works which earned the unrestrained admiration of Palamas (Puchner 1995b: 84, 151, 451, 462, 751, 754).

Of the German "northern" dramatists, the easier Sudermann ("naturalist of the salon") overshadowed the more extreme

---

[25] "Ο Αύγουστος Στρίντμπεργκ και η *Δεσποινίς Τζούλια*", *Παναθήναια* 17 (15-31 Dec. 1908), 140-6, pp. 144f.

[26] Konstantinidis is also the author of a comedy (Sideris 1990: 112) and another translation listed in Ladoyianni-Tzoufi 1982, nos. 186 and 330.

[27] Sideris 1990: 247. On the stylistic question see Puchner 1988: 396ff.

Hauptmann. The latter was first presented to the Greek public by Kambysis in the columns of *Τέχνη*: in his column "Γερμανικά Γράμματα" he commented on the production of *Coachman Henschel* in Germany (*Άπαντα*, 520ff), and in 1899 he published an extensive study of Hauptmann's entire dramatic work (ibid., 445-51). In *Παναθήναια* he reviewed theatrical productions in Berlin: *Coachman Henschel* in 1901, *Poor Erich* in 1902/3, *Rose Bernd* in 1903, and so on (Veloudis 1983: 357 and 638). It was Thomas Oikonomou who introduced Hauptmann to the Greek stage, with the production of the naturalist play *Coachman Henschel* in the Vasilikon Theatron in 1902 and the symbolist play *The sunken bell* in the same theatre in 1906. The former enjoyed further productions on the Greek stage.[28] The unpublished translations of the plays are by Konstantinos Chatzopoulos. As we have already seen, Palamas defended *Coachman Henschel* against the attacks by Vernardakis. The young Spiros Melas in his 1909 play *Χαλασμένο σπίτι* reproduced the milieu of the coachmen and the morbid atmosphere which is so characteristic of naturalist depictions of bourgeois society (Kambanis 1934: 349; Kordatos 1962: II 521). Hauptmann's revolutionary play *The weavers*, which Kambysis presented in the pages of *Τέχνη* in 1899, was not staged until 1911 (Veloudis 1983: 366).

There was greater interest in the less difficult Sudermann, whose commercial success almost makes him ineligible for the label of a "northern" dramatist. His *Homeland* was translated as *Μάγδα* by M. Athinaios and published in 1899 (Veloudis 1983: 355). In the same year, *Honour* was staged in a translation by Babis Anninos, *Sodom*, in the theatre Tsocha, and *Homeland*, translated as *Η πατρική στέγη* by S. Markellou, was played in the same theatre. *Honour* and *Homeland* (*Μάγδα*) were also played on tour in 1901. The performance of *Happiness in the corner (Das Glück im Winkel)*, translated by K. Chatzopoulos as *Κλεμμένη ευτυχία*, in the Vasilikon Theatron in 1903, was crowned with the success that could be expected of an easily digestible social problematic (Sideris 1990: 172ff, 253; Veloudis 1983: 351ff). In Constantinople, *Honour* was staged in 1898 and again in 1904,

---

[28] For example in Constantinople 1909. Cf. And 1977: 56.

1905 and 1907,[29] and *Μάγδα* was staged there in 1904 (Veloudis 1983: 353). Kambysis presents *Honour* in his column "Γερμανικά Γράμματα" for the first time in 1898/99, and a year after its production in Athens the parody *Η τιμή του Σούντερμαν* ("Sudermann's Honour") was published. This is enough evidence that Sudermann was the most popular German naturalist dramatist in Greece. This was not reflected, however, in the measure of his influence on the "angry youth" of 1900, on Kambysis, Horn, Melas etc. It seems that the criteria of reception were not dependent on actual performances of works. Hauptmann's *Hannele's ascension,* for example, was never staged but nevertheless clearly influenced Kambysis in his writing of *Το δαχτυλίδι της μάνας*, while specific influences of Sudermann were less common. This is connected with the fact that his most successful works are very similar to the well-written, socially critical dramas of a writer like Dumas fils which were very fashionable in the last decades of the nineteenth century, and that he did not therefore contribute anything substantially new to fin-de-siècle Athenian theatre.

To trace the paths of influence of these authors is not a straightforward task; it requires in-depth dramatological study and can only be touched upon briefly here. The findings of the research undertaken by Papandreou and Veloudis need to be examined carefully, for while it is true that the general intellectual atmosphere meant that the modern European dramatists of "the North" were a presence throughout the modern Greek "Theatre of Ideas", they were not necessarily assimilated in the same way or to the same degree by every author. The best example of very indirect and unspecific influence is Palamas's *Τρισεύγενη*: although Palamas clearly demonstrates an awareness of the Nietzschean doctrine of strength, the strong women of Ibsen's plays, the feminist movement and D'Annunzio's "poetics", none of these factors offers sufficient explanation of the enigmatic nymph-woman of his poem. The strong filter of his poetic personality and the synthetic processes of his creativity did not allow him to make direct borrowings, and this makes it difficult for us to identify

---

[29] And 1977: 51. The play was staged six times between 1898 and 1899 by three different ensembles. Cf. Stamatopoulou-Vasilakou 1990: 857.

demonstrable influences. While foreign influences *are* present in Palamas, his unsociable only daughter belongs first and foremost to the web of female figures in his own poetic work.[30]

The most prominent figures in the play-writing of this period are, of course, Ibsen and Hauptmann. But we cannot assume that their prominence means they had the greatest actual effect on Greek drama, since the latter has not yet been studied systematically and in its entirety from the point of view of "influences". The task is somewhat facilitated by the fact that the influences seem to be mainly on the thematical level, at least as far as research has shown up to now. The themes in question are conventional marriage and the ideology of the bourgeois family, with key terms like honour, property, social obligation, name, reputation, etc.; the escape from the suffocating grip of a tired bourgeois world-view through feminism, free love, creative work, and social equality; the rejection of moral hypocrisy; the overcoming of capitalist ideology which is seen to regulate behaviour, values and individual "philosophies", and so on.

The revolution of the arts is followed in Europe by the collapse of the bourgeois regimes after the First World War. The peculiarity of the corresponding developments in Greece comes from the fact that, just when the numerically slender bourgeois class of the cities had succeeded in imposing its authority and creating a literature of its own, it was required by its Western models to question its fundamental values; to concern itself with and to reproduce problems which were still foreign to it, such as the contradictions between the theory of liberal individualism and its distorted realisation in practice, or the transformation of progressive bourgeois values into a façade for social and familial oppression. The Greek authors therefore saw themselves obliged to resort to a whole range of compromises and fusions with the indigenous thematic traditions and social realities. These relations point to the existence of a certain distance between the preoccupations of the intellectual playwrights and the social reality, revealing a degree of thematic conventionalism in the "Theatre of Ideas". It applied itself to the critique of an advanced bourgeois society which did not yet exist in that form

[30] Puchner 1995b. For a Nietzschean interpretation see Grammatas 1987.

in Greece. Perhaps this is why the realistic style is combined and enriched with various additional symbolisms or with psychological melodrama. The properly naturalist themes of extreme rural and urban poverty are rare; the "ethographic" approach is still predominant in this area.

The social criticism of people like Dumas fils was directed against a cosmopolitan culture which in the Athens of 1900 had not yet reached the same stage of development and decay. The closed, backward, petit-bourgeois world of Norway was closer to the Greek reality. Yet the reception of Ibsen in Greece occurred after French naturalism had already been assimilated, and did not leave immediately perceptible traces beyond the simple adoption of themes. Thus Xenopoulos's *Ψυχοπατέρας* of 1895 can be seen as much more Zolaesque than Ibsenesque, and the "Ibsenesque triangle" in *Ο τρίτος* cannot conceal the fact that the whole dramatic structure of the play is based on the French boulevard theatre. Of course, the play's central theme of conventional marriage indicates a connection with the Norwegian playwright. But we find nothing of the psychological quality of Ibsen's cryptic dialogues; such ambivalence will not be achieved in Greek drama until the young Kazantzakis's *Ξημερώνει* of 1906. But contemporary criticism tended to apply the label *ιψενογερμανισμός* everywhere, as a way of questioning the originality of new plays.[31] It is interesting that Greek writers, deprived of a social reality against which to apply the kind of critique they found in foreign literature, were sometimes bolder than their models in their dramatic solutions: we can see this in the young Xenopoulos, in Avyeris, Melas, and Kazantzakis. Papandreou connects *Κωμωδία του θανάτου*, which thematises the conventions

---

[31] *Ο τρίτος* was played by N. Lekatsas in the Dimotikon Theatron Athinon on 3 December 1895, for one evening only and without remarkable reactions. Only G.B. Tsokopoulos bemoans "με λύπη" the traces of "ιψενισμός", specifically *Ghosts* (*Τα Ολύμπια*, 5 and 9 Dec. 1895, 39ff). The play was staged by Christomanos's Nea Skini in 1903. *Ο Νουμάς* (1, no. 55, 10 Aug. 1903, p. 3) states: "Ουδεμία πρωτοτυπία, ούτε στην πλοκή, ούτε στην υπόθεση, ούτε στους χαρακτήρας, ούτε στας ιδέας" (Papandreou 1983: 105). This sort of limited critical ability made Palamas furious (Puchner 1995b: passim).

of mourning, with Ibsen's *Ghosts* (Papandreou 1983: 106).[32] But there are not many concrete elements of similarity beyond that of theme. It is the sparse and austere dramatic economy of *Μυστικό της Κοντέσας Βαλέραινας* that relates it more generally to Ibsen's drama (ibid., 106ff). Palamas also noted this.[33] Critics have discerned modified Ibsenesque influences in *Φωτεινή Σάντρη* (1908), *Στέλλα Βιολάντη* (1909) and *Ψυχοσάββατο* (performed in 1911). After 1910, the inheritance of the French boulevard theatre displaced the "pull of the North" in Xenopoulos's drama, and he submitted to popular taste and to the attraction of box-office success.

Nevertheless, the case of Xenopoulos is indicative of the general phenomenon: the impression of dependence on the Norwegian playwright is widespread, but apart from a few thematic similarities, it is quite difficult to demonstrate any concrete borrowings. Completeness of dramatic form was familiar to Xenopoulos from the French tradition of committed drama; Ibsen's dramatic motifs are equally present in French socially critical drama and in naturalist prose. There was also the tendency of critics (whose unfounded pronouncements have unfortunately been repeated throughout the twentieth century) to put labels on indigenous playwrights and to represent all of their plays as imitations of one kind of foreign model or another; this kind of diagnosis also had the effect of crediting the critic with being in the know. The genuinely characteristic elements in Ibsen, the severe form of analytic drama, are rarely found in Xenopoulos, who usually merely reproduced the formulaic structures of light-hearted French drama; the psychological quality of Ibsen's dialogues, with their cryptic expression, the ambiguity of what is said and the unexpected developments and revelations, were beyond Xenopoulos's scope.

---

[32] The lost play has recently been discovered among the manuscripts of the Lassanios drama competition in the National Libary in Athens with the title *Ο Μακαρίτης Μαύσωλος*. The first part is published by Evangelia Petrakou, "Ένα (σχεδόν) ξεχασμένο θεατρικό έργο του Ξενόπουλου", *Παράβασις* 1 (1995) 193-226; the second and third parts will be published in the following issue.

[33] "Γρηγόριος Ξενόπουλος", *Παναθήναια* 13 (15.1.1907), 210; *Άπαντα* vol. 6, p. 467.

Ibsen belongs to the general intellectual atmosphere just as Hauptmann does. In the case of Kambysis one should also add Strindberg and D'Annunzio. Kambysis's close friend Dimitris Tangopoulos talks of the "tyrannical influence of Ibsen which is dimly visible in his early works".[34] But all we find is the naturalist element of clinical observation, heredity, the theme of science, and unhappy marriages. Only in *Φάρσα της ζωής* does one encounter direct reference to Ibsen, while in *Μις Άννα Κούξλεϋ* (1897) there is an accumulation of extensive stage directions and in *Κούρδοι* (1897) there are clear formulations of socialist ideas. There are specific references to *Nora* in *Λεκαπηνοί* (1900), and perhaps also to *Rosmersholm*. Kambysis greatly admired *Hedda Gabler*, and used its "child" motif (the manuscript) in his poem *Το πέρασμα της Μάρθας* (1897) (Papandreou 1983: 112, 167f), also used by Kazantzakis in *Φασγά*. The strong women of Ibsen's plays are encountered everywhere in Kambysis.

The influence of Hauptmann on Kambysis's writing has been asserted for the plays *Φάρσα της ζωής*, *Μις Άννα Κούξλεϋ*, *Κούρδοι* and *Το δαχτυλίδι της μάνας*, by Konstantinos Chatzopoulos, Dieterich, Sideris and Valsa.[35] The problem only becomes apparent, however, when Chatzopoulos cites *The sunken bell* and Sideris *Hannele's ascension*, as sources for *Το δαχτυλίδι της μάνας*. Yiorgos Veloudis recently added Hugo von Hofmannsthal's *The death of Titian* to that list, a play about which Kambysis wrote long before its première in 1901 (Veloudis 1983: 358f). Everything depends on the criteria by which the assimilation process is analysed, the definition of what kind of borrowing it is (whether subconscious, unconscious, conscious, the use of a work in a reference, a motto, etc.). It is also clear that compared to previous periods, e.g. Cretan theatre, this is a time of multiple influences, and also of conscious, oblique references for

---

[34] *Ο Νουμάς* 20/2 (771) (1923), 85 and 88.

[35] Petros Vasilikos (K. Chatzopoulos), "Γιάνης Α. Καμπύσης", *Ο Διόνυσος* 2 (1902) 65-73; K. Dieterich, *Geschichte der byzantinischen und neugriechischen Litteratur* (Leipzig 1902), pp. 208ff; M. Valsa, *Le théâtre grec moderne de 1453 à 1900* (Berlin 1960), p. 357 (and the Greek translation by Chara Bakonikola-Yeorgopoulou: Μ. Βάλσα, *Το νεοελληνικό θέατρο από το 1453 έως το 1900* (Athens 1994), pp. 463ff).

the benefit of the knowledgeable readers of Athenian literary circles. This situation requires its own methodological tools of analysis and synthesis. The fairy-tale drama about the death of the poet Krystallis is connected with *Hannele's ascension* and *The death of Titian* through the visions of dying, and with *The sunken bell* through the motif of climbing the bewitched mountain.

The complexity of the problems surrounding the question of "influences" is immediately apparent when one looks at the case of the young Kazantzakis: the thematisation of the artist and his work (as in *The sunken bell*), the artist who leaves his wife (with the ubiquitous name "Magda") and child to ascend the heights of creation as a demigod while his work sinks in the lake; all this is present in the work *Φασγά* written by Kazantzakis in 1907 while he was a law student in Athens. But this symbolist, expressionist, autobiographical play with the Biblical title also includes other works in its imagery and themes: it shares the themes of Palamas's *Δωδεκάλογος του γύφτου* (1907); it echoes the motifs of Nietzsche; it has a similar dramatic structure of "stations" as Strindberg's *To Damascus*; Eleni resembles Hedda Gabler (there is even the motif of a "child" – the manuscript of the drama "Ιουλιανός"; cf. Papandreou 1983: 125ff); the vision of educational reform draws a parallel with *An enemy of the people*, while a more specific reference to that work is the scene where stones are thrown at the window of Stockmann; there is the motif of the *Loreley* from Heine; the scene where the hero sees his theatre burning on the evening of the première of his new play is a reference to Wagner's Bayreuth and also draws its symbolism from the parallel scene in Ibsen's *Ghosts*, where the asylum is burning; and finally, the end of the play with the dance of fairies representing pangs of conscience again recalls Strindberg (Puchner 1993: 98-124).

Only a detailed analysis of each work can recreate the mosaic of borrowed themes and images, which is assembled and functions differently in each author. The young Kazantzakis reworked the experiences, images, emotions, ideas and motifs which he had assimilated both from books and from the performances he saw during his time in Athens. His play *Ξημερώνει* of 1906 has many links with the works of Ibsen

(possibly also with Hofmannsthal; Puchner 1993: 69-80): the doctor who is an idealogue and a visionary (such doctor figures are also encountered in Chekov, Schnitzler and Shaw), the theme of conventional marriage and the fear of social scandal (as in *Nora* and *Hedda Gabler*), the symbolism of the final scene with the death of the heroine and the sunrise, which is a replica of the final scene of *Ghosts*. Above all, the ambiguousness of the dialogue and the secretive depth to what is being said bears the mark of the Scandinavian playwright. However, in its themes and the issues it addresses, as well as in the symmetry of the love triangle, the play is based on Xenopoulos's *Ο τρίτος*, even though the young Cretan chooses a different outcome, is much more intelligent in his handling of the psychological aspects, and less theoretical as far as the ideological debates are concerned (it is only the doctor who holds forth on his ideas) (Puchner 1994a).

We should add that Kazantzakis's language, with its hidden and explicit eroticism, was pronounced by the critics evaluating the entries to the drama competitions of the time to be imitative of D'Annunzio ("δαννουντσίζει" is the verb used to stereotype such language). This was especially true of *Θυσία*. But this play, based on the Bridge of Arta story (it was written in 1908 and later called *Ο Πρωτομάστορας*),[36] also achieves an original synthesis of Nietzschean inspiration with the desperado hero, who is, typically, a gypsy (cf. *Δωδεκάλογος του γύφτου*). At the same time it borrows some motifs, and even some of the wording, from Palamas's *Τρισεύγενη* (1903), such as the singer and the scene of Smaragda's public revelation of her love affair (Puchner 1994a). The board of judges declared this to be a "symbolic play of the Maeterlinck school" (Katsimbalis 1958: 1566). It would be more accurate, however, to ascribe influences of the Belgian symbolist to Kazantzakis's one-act play *Κωμωδία: Τραγωδία μονόπρακτη* of 1908, which reproduces many of the motifs of *The blind* and *The intruder* (Puchner 1993: 145ff), although critics have so far pointed only to similarities with

---

[36] The same ballad motif was dramatized by Ilias Voutieridis, *Το Γιοφύρι της Άρτας* (1905) and by Pantelis Horn, *Το Ανεχτίμητο* (1906). For a comparison see Puchner 1992: 318ff.

the much later plays *Huis clos* by Sartre and *Waiting for Godot* by Beckett.[37]

Another example of how carefully one must tread on the slippery ground of "influence" is the case of the young Melas. Even though he himself denied any Nietzschean influence on his 1907 play *Γυιος του ίσκιου* (as well as any influence of D'Annunzio on his language; cf. Melas 1960: 32ff), and the characterisation of the work by some critics as a dramatisation of the superman-fisherman of the Aegean is a reductive misinterpretation (e.g. Liyizos 1980: 176ff; Thrylos 1966), there are nevertheless some didactic passages which clearly reproduce the clichés of the Greek version of Nietzsche's "superman". The fact that Melas did not read German is no obstacle to such an influence: he knew French, and in any case these themes were by 1907 common property among Greek intellectuals (Veloudis 1983: 362). But all this does not mean very much, because the "superman" motif is only one of many echoes and references which can be found in the play: there is the Greek folk wisdom of the life-giving force of the wind, Wagner's *Flying Dutchman* (especially the last scene), Ibsen's *The lady of the sea* with which there is even a similarity of names (Wangel–Vangos); certain motifs like the violin with which Vangos expresses his pain recall Palamas's *Τρισεύγενη* and *Δωδεκάλογος του γύφτου*, and the spiteful neighbour is called kyra-Kali, which is a reference to the traditional lament of the Panayia (as a bad neighbour also in *Τρισεύγενη*; cf. Puchner 1995b: 225f; Bouvier 1976). In *Κόκκινο πουκάμισο* (1908), Ibsenesque psychological states are interwoven with Nietzschean atheism and with the traditional personification of Fate and Fortune; added to this is a Shakespearean "fool" in the dockers' taverna, and a Charos figure, the captain of a fishing boat. In *Χαλασμένο σπίτι* (1909), Papandreou has seen the influence of Ibsen on the play's form (Papandreou 1983: 127), and Veloudis has pointed out the similarities with Hauptmann's *Coachman Henschel* and *Before sunset* (Veloudis 1983: 362), to which we must also add

---

[37] First remarked upon by Pantelis Prevelakis, *Καζαντζάκης. Ο ποιητής και το ποίημα της Οδύσσειας* (Athens 1958), p. 286, and then by Karl Kerényi, *Streifzüge eines Hellenisten* (Zurich 1960) (the passages about Kazantzakis also in Greek in *Νέα Εστία*, Christmas 1959, 33-59).

Friedensfest. Liyizos also sees Hauptmann's influence in *Το άσπρο και το μαύρο* (1913) and *Μία νύχτα μία ζωή* (1924) (Liyizos 1980: 125, 150), without however specifying where exactly he locates the influence. Such late echoes of Hauptmann have also been claimed for Kazantzakis's *Οδυσσέας* of 1922, which is perhaps related to the former's *Odysseus's bow* (1914) (Papachatzaki-Katsaraki 1985: 56), and for Pantelis Horn's *Φιντανάκι* of 1921, which has parallels with some elements of *Rose Bernd* (1903) (Liyizos 1980: 128ff; Veloudis 1983: 363f and 640). But these issues need to be clarified in much greater detail.

Tangopoulos's works have also been said to contain specific references to Ibsen: in *Ζωντανοί και πεθαμένοι* (1905) there is the heroine's abandonment of her home (as in *Nora*), and the child motif (from *Hedda Gabler*); the beginning of *Αλυσίδες* (1907) vaguely resembles the beginning of the second act of *The wild duck*; the presence of the deceased in *Καινούργιο σπίτι* (1908) recalls *Rosmersholm*, and so on (Papandreou 1983: 114ff). But the similarities are mainly ideological ones; Tangopoulos's theoretical positions are developed on stage in lengthy discussions by the characters of his plays; this is a basic element of Ibsen's social dramas. Palamas, who distinguishes two tendencies in the "Theatre of Ideas", an ideological and a symbolist one, locates Tangopoulos in the former,[38] on the grounds that his characters are vehicles for ideals, stiff and one-dimensional, "πιο πολύ σπαρτιάτες παρά Αθηναίοι, πιο πολύ αλφιερικοί παρά ιψενικοί" (more like Spartans than like Athenians, more Alfieresque than Ibsenesque) (Papandreou 1983: 118). Markos Avyeris uses a few lines of Ibsen as the motto to his *Μπροστά στους ανθρώπους* (1904), but this rural drama of honour is much closer to the atmosphere of Tolstoi's *The power of darkness*, although there are some differences (Papandreou 1983: 120ff). Nirvanas's early play *Ο αρχιτέκτων Μάρθας* (1907) refers by its very title to *Architect Solnes*, and the protagonist's wife has some of the traits of

[38] "Σκέψεις αθεάτριστου", epilogue to the second volume of *Θέατρο* by Pavlos Nirvanas (Athens 1922).

Ibsen's Nora, even though the ideological message is no longer Ibsenesque.[39]

These are the results of the research that has been carried out in this area so far, and they of course require further verification. This research should be extended to include a greater range of dramatic works (Delveroudi 1982) and to cover other aspects of the subject beyond the direct thematic and ideological links. It remains to be explored how these influences relate to the two major developments of modern Greek theatre after 1905: on the one hand, how aestheticism was taken over by the socially critical function of drama (taking its cue from the same authors, Ibsen, Strindberg, Hauptmann etc., who move on to a symbolist and expressionist phase), and on the other hand, how the organised socialist movement and the development of the labour question led to a much greater ideological charging of the plays than had been the case in the last two decades of the nineteenth century (Grammatas 1987: 116-29, 130-43).

The particular functioning of the term *βορειομανία* was, however, specific to the "Theatre of Ideas". The Viennese boulevard and operetta of the interwar period no longer functioned in this way, and with Pirandello, who was brought to Athens in 1925 by Melas's short-lived Theatro Technis, with Paul Claudel and García Lorca, Greece was visited by eminently Mediterranean authors. They were succeeded by the psychological and poetic realism of American authors like Eugene O'Neill, which became part of a new context where the distinction between "north" and "south" no longer held much meaning. The next northern dramatist who was to have a catalytic effect in Greece, Bertold Brecht,[40] no longer had the characteristics of a "national" author or of a specific geographical location; his political theory, adapted for the stage, is based on conditions in all the corners of the world. The "dark forests" of his birthplace no longer give off the mists of Hauptmann's Silesian landscapes

---

[39] The observation was made by Konstantinos Chatzopoulos: see Petros Vasilikos, "Για ένα κοινό και για ένα δράμα", *Ο Νουμάς* 6 (278) (13.1.1907), 7 (also in Papandreou 1983:123).

[40] First mentioned in the *Ιστορία της γερμανικής λογοτεχνίας* by Thomas Walter (Athens 1931), p. 256. Cf. L. Mygdalis, *Ελληνική βιβλιογραφία Μπέρτολτ Μπρεχτ* (Thessaloniki 1977), p. 44.

or Ibsen's fjords. With the generation of the thirties, Greek cultural identity discovered indigenous foundations (Makriyannis, Theofilos, Karagiozis, *rebetika*), and the political polarisation drew exclusively on the ideological aspects of Brecht; his aesthetic theories had little practical consequence for the drama of the post-war period. The new internationalism in literary exchange (with the performance of theatrical works from South America, Africa, etc.) neutralised the concept of "northern literature" by making "the North" refer now to the whole of the northern hemisphere.

References

And, Metin (1977). "Η δράση του ελληνικού θεάτρου στην παλιά Κωνσταντινούπολη", *Θέατρο* 59/60, 39-59

Anemoyiannis, Yiorgos (1994). *Μαρίκα Κοτοπούλη. Η φλόγα.* Athens

Apostolidou, Venetia (1993). *Ο Κωστής Παλαμάς ιστορικός της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας.* Athens

Bouvier, Bertrand (1976). *Le Mirologue de la Vierge. Chansons et poèmes grecs sur la Passion du Christ. I. La chanson populaire du Vendredi Saint.* Geneva

Delveroudi, Elisabeth-Anna (1982). *Le répertoire original présenté sur la scène athénienne 1901-1922.* Doctoral thesis. Paris

Delveroudi, Elisabeth-Anna (1988). "Η καλλιέργεια του πατριωτικού αισθήματος στη θεατρική παραγωγή των αρχών του 20ού αιώνα", in: G. Mavrogordatos and C. Chatziosif (eds.), *Βενιζελισμός και αστικός εκσυγχρονισμός.* Iraklion: Panepistimiakes Ekdoseis Kritis, pp. 287-314

Delveroudi, Elisabeth-Anna (1994). "Βεντετισμός ή ‹‹έργα με θέση››: η ανανέωση του δραματολογίου στην Αθήνα κατά την τελευταία δεκαετία του 19ου αιώνα", in: *Ζητήματα ιστορίας των*

νεοελληνικών γραμμάτων. Αφιέρωμα στον Κ.Θ. Δημαρά. Thessaloniki: Paratiritis, pp. 219-42

Fteris, G. (1951). "Ο Γιάννης Καμπύσης και η έλξη του βορρά", *Νέα Εστία* 50, 1470ff

Gounelas, Dimitris (1977). "Εισαγωγή [στα τρία μονόπρακτα του Καζαντζάκη]", *Νέα Εστία* 102 (1211), 165-82

Gounelas, Dimitris (1981). "The literary and cultural periodicals in Athens between 1897 and 1910", *Μαντατοφόρος* 17, 14-45

Gounelas, Dimitris (1984). *Η σοσιαλιστική συνείδηση στην ελληνική λογοτεχνία 1897-1912*. Athens

Grammatas, Thodoros (1984). *Το θεατρικό έργο του Γιάννη Καμπύση*. Ioannina

Grammatas, Thodoros (1987). *Νεοελληνικό θέατρο: Ιστορία - δραματουργία*. Athens

Grammatas, Thodoros (1990). "Από το ‹‹Intima Teatern›› του Στρίντμπεργκ και το ‹‹Θέατρο συναναστροφής›› του Καμπύση στο ελληνικό αστικό θέατρο", in: *Δοκίμια Θεατρολογίας*. Athens, pp. 135-49

Hatzipantazis, Thodoros (1981). *Το Κωμειδύλλιο*. Athens

Hatzipantazis, Thodoros and Maraka, Lila (1977). *Αθηναϊκή Επιθεώρηση*. 3 vols. Athens

Hesseling, D.C. (1924). *Histoire de littérature grecque moderne*. Paris

Jusdanis, Gregory (1991). *Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Culture. Inventing national literature*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press (Theory and History of Literature, 81)

Kambanis, A. (1934). *Ιστορία της νέας ελληνικής λογοτεχνίας*. 4th ed. Athens

Katsimbalis, Yiorgos (1958). "Ο άγνωστος Καζαντάκης", *Νέα Εστία* 24, 1558-66

Kordatos, Yiannis (1962). *Ιστορία της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας*. 2 vols. Athens

Ladoyianni-Tzoufi, Glykeria (1982). *Αρχές του νεοελληνικού θεάτρου (βιβλιογραφία των έντυπων εκδόσεων 1637-1879)*. Ioannina

Lamm, Ursula (1970). *Der Einfluß Nietzsches auf die neugriechische Literatur*. Doctoral thesis. Hamburg

Liyizos, Mitsos (1980). *Το νεοελληνικό πλάι στο παγκόσμιο θέατρο*. 2 vols. Athens

Mantouvalou, Maria (1983). "Ρωμαίος–Ρωμιός και Ρωμιοσύνη", *Μαντατοφόρος* 22, 34-72

Mastrodimitris, Panayiotis (1996). *Ο* Ζητιάνος *του Καρκαβίτσα*. (New edition.) Athens

Mavrikou-Anagnostou, M. (1964). *Κωνσταντίνος Χρηστομάνος και η Νέα Σκηνή*. Athens

Melas, Spiros (1960). *50 χρόνια θέατρο*. Athens

Mygdalis, Lambros (1988). *Ελληνική βιβλιογραφία Γκέρχαρντ Χάουπτμαν (1899-1984) και Ούγκο φον Χόφμανσταλ (1901-1986)*. Thessaloniki

Papachatzaki-Katsaraki, T. (1985). *Το θεατρικό έργο του Νίκου Καζαντζάκη*. Athens

Papakostas, Jannis (1982). *Το περιοδικό "Εστία" και το διήγημα*. Athens

Papandreou, Nikoforos (1983). *Ο Ίψεν στην Ελλάδα. Από την πρώτη γνωριμία στην καθιέρωση 1890-1910*. Athens

Politou-Marmarinou, Eleni (1985). "Το περιοδικό Εστία (1876-1896) και το διήγημα", *Παρουσία* 3, 123-52

Psicharis, Yiannis (1901). *Για το Ρωμαίικο Θέατρο. Ο Κυρούλης, δράμα. – Ο Γουανάκος, κωμωδία*. Vol. 1. Athens

Psicharis, Yiannis (1927). *Κωστής Παλαμάς. Φιλολογική κριτική μελέτη*. Alexandria

Puchner, Walter (1984). *Ευρωπαϊκή Θεατρολογία. Ένδεκα μελετήματα*. Athens

Puchner, Walter (1988). *Ελληνική Θεατρολογία. Δώδεκα μελετήματα*. Athens

Puchner, Walter (1992). *Το θέατρο στην Ελλάδα. Μορφολογικές επισημάνσεις*. Athens

Puchner, Walter (1993). "Το πρώιμο θεατρικό έργο του Νίκου Καζαντζάκη", *Παρουσία* 9, 63-160

Puchner, Walter (1994). "Ο πρόλογος ‹‹Για το ρωμαίικο θέατρο›› (1900) του Ψυχάρη. Ένα ιδιότυπο μανιφέστο του ‹‹Θεάτρου των ιδεών››", *Παρουσία* 10 [1996], 45-83

Puchner, Walter (1994a). "Δραματικά πρότυπα στο πρώιμο θεατρικό έργο του Νίκου Καζαντζάκη", *Νέα Εστία* 136 (1616), 1398-1405

Puchner, Walter (1995). "‹‹Θάνατος παλληκαριού›› ή η ανεπαίσθητη υπέρβαση του ηθογραφισμού", *Νέα Εστία* 137 (1623), 229ff, 238ff

Puchner, Walter (1995a). *Ανιχνεύοντας τη θεατρική παράδοση*. Athens

Puchner, Walter (1995b). *Ο Παλαμάς και το θέατρο*. Athens

Sachinis, Apostolos (1994). *Ο Παλαμάς και η κριτική*. Athens

Sideris, Yiannis (1964/65). "Ο Σαίξπηρ στην Ελλάδα", *Θέατρο* (1.12.1964 and 1.6.1965)

Sideris, Yiannis (1990). *Ιστορία του νέου ελληνικού θεάτρου.* Athens (revised ed. [first ed. 1951])

Stamatopoulou-Vasilakou, Chrysothemis (1990). *Το ελληνικό θέατρο στην Κωνσταντινούπολη το 19ο αιώνα.* Dissertation. Athens

Thrylos, Alkis (1966). "Ο θεατρικός Σπ. Μελάς", *Νέα Εστία* 80 (947), 55

Tomadakis, Vasilios (1969/70). "Νεοελληνική βιβλιογραφία. Τα περιοδικά ‹‹Τέχνη›› και ‹‹Διόνυσος››", *Επιστημονική Επετηρίς της Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής του Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών* 20, 120-54

Tomadakis, Vasilios (1970/71). "Νεοελληνική βιβλιογραφία. Το περιοδικό ‹‹Το Περιοδικόν μας››", *Επιστημονική Επετηρίς της Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής του Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών* 21, 251-90

Tziovas, Dimitris (1986). *The nationism of the demoticists and its impact on their literary theory (1888-1930).* Amsterdam

Veloudis, Georgios (1983). *Germanocraecia. Deutsche Einflüsse auf die neugriechische Literatur 1750-1944.* 2 vols. Amsterdam

Veloudis, Georgios (1994). *Γραμματολογία. Θεωρία λογοτεχνίας.* Athens

Vitti, Mario (1980). *Ιδεολογική λειτουργία της ελληνικής ηθογραφίας.* 2nd ed. Athens: Kedros

Vitti, Mario (1995). *Η παράδοση της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας, παράδοση ευρωπαϊκή.* Athens

University of Athens

"Berlin", Cyprus: photography, simulation, and the directed gaze in a divided city

Paul Sant Cassia

I *Prologue*

The "end" of Heroes Street in Nicosia, previously one of its main arteries but now a *cul-de-sac* with an artificial dead-end, is a site which encapsulates some of the basic themes in the recent political history of Cyprus. At the end of the street is a raised military observation post with the message "Nothing is gained without sacrifices, nor freedom without blood" (Τίποτε δεν κερδίζεται χωρίς θυσίες και η ελευθερία δίχως αίμα). Tourists and visiting Cypriots from other towns take photographs of the Green Line/Dead Zone beyond, an area left abandoned by the 1974 Turkish Invasion, now patrolled by UN forces. To the right of the platform is a sign: "Nicosia: The Last Divided Capital of Europe". In a room below the sign are photographs of destruction from the invasion together with a book for visitors to write their comments in, the majority of which are by Greeks and Greek Cypriots. The photographs show refugees, destroyed churches, and mutilated bodies hanging out of bombed buildings. Outside there is a life-size, free-standing, thick metal plate sculpture, with the outline of a figure cut out of it. The title of the sculpture is "Ο Αγνοούμενος" (The Missing Person). This is a powerful work designed not for tourists but for Greek Cypriots, because of its monolingual Greek title. One looks through it – there is nothing to see, except that very fact. The sculpture is literally a silhouette. As a sculpture it is analogous to purchasing a mystery jigsaw puzzle in a plain box, and discovering that it consists only of the pieces that constitute the outer frame. It is a subversive work because it plays upon the tension of complete-incompleteness, of either having had its content removed, or of never having had that content in the first place, and thus representing a category. If it is a category whose category is it? Is

it a category of memory, or of the state? Is it a nationalist work or a profoundly anti-statist one?

This paper explores the construction of the directed gaze in a divided city. How are we expected by political authorities to look around us? How are images and representations of one's group and the other used? In this paper I explore the directed gaze through the use of images in Cyprus by reference to two key issues: the representation of missing people and of the Green Line. Both enable us to approach the past, notions of suffering, and the future. I suggest there are some basic differences between Greek and Turkish Cypriots in the way they use images and narratives. Such differences may well be culturally based. I then explore how the events at Dherynia in 1996, when two Greek Cypriot demonstrators were killed, were managed and choreographed through images and narratives. I suggest that the August 1996 violence was a choreography of the state in Cyprus to establish its legitimacy. The state emerged as the demiurge of order through disorder. Violence was therefore not an accidental by-product of the state in establishing its goal, civil order.

II *Introduction*

Between 1963 and 1974 over 2,000 persons, both Greek and Turkish Cypriot, disappeared in Cyprus. They disappeared in the course of hostilities between Greek and Turkish Cypriots from 1963 onwards, and during the mainland-Greek-backed coup of 1974 and the subsequent Turkish invasion.[1] Responsibility for the disappearances appears straightforward in some cases, more murky in others. Few bodies have been officially recovered. There are major differences in the manner Greek and Turkish Cypriots regard the missing. Briefly put, whereas the Turkish Cypriots regard their missing as *kayıp*, that is as disappeared/dead/lost, the Greek Cypriots regard their missing as being of unknown fate, *agnooumenoi*: as not-(yet-)recovered, at best as living prisoners, at worst as concealed bodies requiring proper and suitable burials. Significantly, while English renderings of *agnooumenoi* now include "disappearances", the Greek Cypriots

[1] For good discussions on this period see Panteli 1984 and Hitchens 1984: 61-100.

do not use the proper Greek word for this (ξαφανίστηκαν), which implies a finality and non-recoverability, like the *desaparecidos* in Argentina and elsewhere, although they tap the nuances of the affinity to this term for political reasons. They prefer to employ the nuances of "not known (as yet), but-potentially-knowable". The Turkish Cypriots claim they lost a considerable number of civilians who disappeared between 1963 and 1974. By contrast, the Greek Cypriots claim that their missing date from the 1974 Turkish invasion. Officially the Turkish Cypriots claim 803 missing persons, the Greek Cypriots 1,619.

While widely quoted and known within their respective communities, both figures are regarded as inflated from the official UN perspective. In December 1995 the total number of cases officially presented by both communities to the UN-sponsored Committee of Missing Persons was 1,493 Greek and Greek Cypriot files and 500 Turkish Cypriot files.

Turkish Cypriots claim that while 99% of their missing were innocent civilians, Greek Cypriots mainly lost military casualties (61.19%).[2] For the former the problem of the missing began in 1963, the first year of intercommunal troubles in the Republic of Cyprus. The Greek Cypriots counter that their missing were captured by the Turkish army, that they disappeared in captivity, and that the Turkish and Turkish Cypriot claims that these men are dead go against the evidence and show that they want to close the issue without accepting responsibility.

There are further differences in perception. The Turkish Cypriots have long been encouraged by their leaders to perceive their missing as dead, from a desire to distance the Turkish Cypriot community from the Greek Cypriots, whom they blame

---

[2] This figure corresponds to the number of reservists/soldiers submitted by the Greek Cypriot authorities, men between the ages of 16 and 39. The statement is correct but is somewhat disingenuous. Until 1974 the Turkish Cypriots did not technically possess an army, although many men were involved in military activities as members of irregular paramilitary groups. Nevertheless, it appears correct that a number of Turkish Cypriots were chosen taxonomically as victims of Greek Cypriot aggression and were innocent civilians. By contrast the majority of Greek Cypriots missing date from the 1974 coup and invasion.

as the culprits. Indeed for the Turkish Cypriot leadership, especially Mr Denktash, the missing are proof that Turkish and Greek Cypriots cannot live together. For the Turkish Cypriot leadership it is important that the missing are dead, while for the Greek Cypriots it is important that they may still be alive, and that the main culprits are not the Turkish Cypriots (with whom they claim they coexisted peacefully in the past) but the Turkish army occupying half the island. Turkish Cypriots maintain that these men died in the hostilities during the invasion or "Peace Operation" as it is called by mainland Turkey, or during the coup and in the week following the coup. But they have refused to return their bodies for reburial. For the Greek Cypriots the missing, together with the enclaved and the refugees, constitute a powerful semantic field for talking about the past and their current predicament. By contrast, for the Turkish Cypriots the issue of the missing is a closed chapter, an example of their oppression by the Greek Cypriots in the Republic of Cyprus, a state of affairs that the Turkish "Peace Operation" ended. Thus whereas the Turkish Cypriots appear to wish the matter closed in its present manifestation, but keep the memory and memorials of their oppression alive, the Greek Cypriots wish to maintain the issue open in a present continuous tense, as an issue that is very much alive and will only be buried when the missing are finally returned and their bodies laid to rest.[3]

The two groups employ different persuasive strategies to convince listeners of their case. Turkish Cypriots appeal to "reason" or "reasonability" to convince third parties that the Greek Cypriot missing are actually dead and to be seen as war casualties, and that the Greek Cypriot leadership has concealed the truth for propaganda purposes. They quote testimonies of Greek Cypriots to show that there were far greater casualties during the coup than was admitted by the Sampson Junta-controlled government, and that the Greek Cypriots are blaming the Turks and Turkish Cypriots for Greek-Cypriot-induced crimes. By contrast, they emphasise that their missing have

---

[3] For a discussion on views of history see Papadakis 1993: 139-54. For a discussion on the role of the missing as *ethnomartyres*, see Sant Cassia (forthcoming).

died as a result of a conscious policy of genocide. Greek Cypriots tend to appeal to "emotion" and "sentiments" to convince third parties, with evidence from bodies such as Amnesty International and the European Commission on Human Rights (Council of Europe), that their missing are victims of the crime of enforced disappearance by Turkey: "It is a crime which perpetuates the sufferings of the missing and their families, a crime which constitutes the most flagrant violation of the basic and fundamental human rights of both the missing persons and us, their families" (PCC: 7). Parallel persuasive strategies were employed in post dirty-war Argentina (Robben 1995).

III *Representations of suffering*

In Cyprus, as in Northern Ireland, "Victimage is the generic institution shared by all sides of the conflict as their common material denominator and as the operator of all political exchange" (Feldman 1991: 263). But victimage is evoked differently by Greek and Turkish Cypriots. This is not a case of mere inversions. An examination of how photographic representations of the issue of missing persons are used provides valuable insights into the iconography of suffering and the constitution of victimage. There have been some excellent studies of differences between Greek and Turkish Cypriot Museums (Papadakis 1994). In this section I explore a paradox in the iconographic representation of suffering. This is that whilst published Turkish Cypriot photographic material is effective locally among Turkish Cypriots but, I suggest, less effective internationally, Greek Cypriot published photographic material has the reverse effect, namely that whilst it may be less effective locally (or nationally), it is much more compelling on the international level. The differences are not because Greek Cypriots have greater access to international fora, or that Greek Cypriot claims for their missing persons are all "propaganda" as Turkish Cypriots claim. In Cyprus, narratives and images are authored, circulated and consumed with an aim to convince. That does not make them any less "true" or valid, and we have to ask why certain groups choose to represent their experiences and suffering in certain ways. I am interested here in the grammar and iconology of suffering. There are substantial differences in the articulation of photographs as representations of suffering, their

accompanying narratives, the structures of the images, and the relationship of photographs as mnemonics or representations. In this section I suggest that the Turkish Cypriots use photographs "directly" as self-evident representations of truth and of "what really happened", thereby asserting an unambiguous political resolution. By contrast, I suggest that Greek Cypriots employ images according to a particular tradition of iconography and narrative, often drawing upon traditions of laments that are literary or mythical. More importantly, they employ a triangular relationship between the person depicted in the photograph, the absent person evoked, and the viewer. Such photographs may be less powerful but they are haunting and pose a question.

Greek Cypriot photographs can be grouped into three types: (i) colour photographs of groups of (often black-clothed) women demonstrating in vigils and holding up photographs of their loved ones (sons/husbands), suggesting an unresolved political-humanitarian issue (very similar to the Argentine mothers); (ii) a famous picture taken by a Turkish war correspondent of five Greek Cypriot soldiers kneeling on the ground with their hands raised behind their heads in evident distress surrounded by armed Turkish troops (the soldiers disappeared after the photograph was taken); and (iii) photographs of single individuals, usually an old woman holding a photograph of her son, or a child holding a framed wedding photograph of his mother and father, thus appealing to the third-party viewer. Others depict groups of men in captivity in Turkey with some encircled faces of the missing.

Much Greek Cypriot symbolism surrounding the missing is a complex mixture of Christianity and Hellenism. Many claimed that the Turks, "as Muslims", may not attach that much importance to burials, "but we as Christians do". There are indeed theological differences in the treatment and significance of bodies between Christianity and Islam, although from fieldwork among Turkish Cypriot relatives I confirm that such differences had little effect in diminishing their pain. But such differences are reflected in the representation of bodies. The mothers of the missing recall the Panayia mourning her son prior to the resurrection. I have often asked myself why this particular photograph of five kneeling soldiers surrounded by

Turkish troops has been used so many times, and why it is so powerful. After reading Paine's analysis of the 1994 Hebron Massacre (Paine 1995), I began to appreciate its potency. The photograph shows individuals in an act of total physical submission both facing, and with their backs to, their captors. It is known that these men were killed soon after in Pavlides's Garage, Nicosia. With this background knowledge the photograph becomes particularly powerful. The mental linkage of physical submission → killing that the photograph evokes then subliminally slips into a prototypical act of religious submission before sacrifice, *their* sacrifice. The bodily semiotics thus evoke the association: capture → murder → sacrificial killing/massacre/desecration/sanctification. In addition there is the look. As Pier Paolo Pasolini wrote: "It is always the victim's look that suggests the violence which will be done to him or her."

Turkish Cypriot photographs usually depict: (i) the individual person who disappeared, formal photographs as found in stand-up frames in Cypriot living rooms; (ii) bodies that appear to have been photographed *in situ* after a massacre or a killing – here the detail is almost forensic; finally, (iii) there is the face of the survivor as a reflection of the terror experienced by the disappeared. The clearest example of the latter is the cover of the 1993 Turkish Cypriot book which uses a powerful photograph of a highly distraught woman with clasped hands being consoled and held by other women, with the caption: "PRIZE WINNER: A British photographer, Donald McCullin, won the overall prize in the annual World Press Photo contest in the Hague with this picture showing a Turkish-Cypriot woman after she learned the terrible news about her husband", although no date is given (CRTCMP 1993).[4] As Berger points out, McCullin's most typical photographs "record sudden moments of agony [...] that are utterly discontinuous with normal time. [...] The image seized by the camera is doubly violent and both violences reinforce the same contrast: the contrast between the photographed moment and all others" (1985: 39). This provides a handle to understanding the underlying themes of Turkish Cypriot photographic material. The framed studio portraits,

[4] The date is probably 1963 or 1964.

the bodies photographed from above focused on the carnage created by bullet-exits in domestic settings that transform homes into morgues through the polluting and desacralizing eruption of bodily matter, and the sudden terror on the face of the recipient of the news of the events, have two common interrelated features. First, they indicate a time outside time, an event discontinuous with everyday experience by its very terminality and intensity. Indeed, like rituals to which they can be approximated, they occur outside normal time. After having viewed the photographs, just as after having gone through a ritual, the viewer-participant is left with no doubt that for both the subjects and himself, life cannot, indeed should not, be the same again, and one cannot revert to one's previous mental framework. The connection with ritual, in particular the employment by subjects of photographs of their agony as redemptive rituals of suffering, is one I want to return to. In particular, I suggest that the employment of such photographs has a direction away from the event as non-repeatable, transforming it from senseless death of subject self/barbarism of the Other to an archetypal sacrifice/lesson. Berger writes:

> As we look at them, the moment of the other's suffering engulfs us. We are filled with either despair or indignation. Despair takes on some of the other's suffering to no purpose. Indignation demands action. We try to emerge from the photograph back into our lives. As we do so, the contrast is such that the resumption of our lives appears to be a hopelessly inadequate response to what we have just seen (1984: 38).

A second, related, feature is that the photographs, especially of bodies, anaesthetise the viewer. It is not persons as subjects who are photographed but wounds. Such wounds transform the body into impossible object, and thus barely recognizable subject. We cannot gaze at these pictures of excessive eruptive suffering without anaesthetising our sensibilities. As Berger notes: "The reader who has been arrested by the photograph may tend to feel this discontinuity as his own personal moral inadequacy. *And as soon as this happens even his sense of shock is dispersed:* his new moral inadequacy may now shock him as much as the crimes being committed in the war"

(ibid. 39-40, original emphasis). He concludes that such a picture becomes "evidence of the general human condition. It accuses nobody and everybody" (ibid. 40).

"Nobody and everybody" – but only to a certain extent when scanned in newspapers in the centre where, I would suggest, this means: "Not us, but them." But when such photographs are employed by subjects themselves to depict their suffering to the metropolis using the very images harvested by the international media as emblems of suffering, the situation changes. The flagging of photographic authorship by metropolitan observers is important. Foreign (war) correspondents and photographers confirm and authenticate the claims made. But they do more than this. The verificatory strength of the photograph as a conjurer of facticity authenticates the experiences of subjects as constituted by suffering. To many right-wing nationalist Turkish Cypriots such photographs as representations of suffering *qua* suffering confirm their belief that they are victims of genocide, and authenticate their claims to the wider world. Terms like holocaust, genocide and ethnic cleansing are strong words that have been loosely used, but it is precisely their lability that should interest us here. Such photographs and associated narratives by subjects as representations of their suffering become markers of irreversible time. They become a watershed of "history" as a series of events to which there must be no return, and they contain an imperative for a clear, unidirectional solution. Furthermore, the Turkish Cypriot community entered the world stage of the mass media during the inter-ethnic disturbances of 1963-4. Turkish Cypriots became an imagined community through these experiences (Anderson 1991) and they increasingly imagined their community through these photographs, which circulated in the local, but even more importantly, the international media. Following the disappearances Turkish Cypriots withdrew into armed enclaves. But as Susan Sontag wrote: "One's first encounter with the photographic inventory of ultimate horror is a kind of revelation, the prototypically modern revelation: a negative epiphany. For me, it was photographs of Bergen-Belsen..." (quoted in Berger 1984: 57). For many Turkish Cypriots, I would suggest, such a negative epiphany was through viewing

photographs of their own missing people or casualties during the 1963-4 disturbances.

Turkish Cypriot photographic material thus appears unidirectional and unambiguous, in the mould of nineteenth-century realism. As with this genre they presume an "omniscient observer detached from and external to the scenography being presented" (Feldman 1994: 90). The conclusions suggested by the photographs are likewise unambiguous: "This is what happened to us, and the only way we can never experience anything similar again is for us to live separately from the Greeks." They are directed at the Turkish Cypriots, and used to reinforce collective experiences as well as to document (and prove) their experiences for the international media. Similarly, such photographs do not depict missing people as absences. They are depicted as dead – *kayıp*. Even McCullin's famous photograph of the distraught woman, whilst triangular, is unambiguous. The subject is the woman's grief and agony, but whilst the face and the body posture refer to an event away from the photograph, we are left in no doubt that that event was not just unambiguous, but also final. It depicts a moment of intense anguish, but the event is irrecoverable.

Consider the photographs employed by Greek Cypriots, the most famous one being that of the captured missing soldiers. This is triangular in that it links the soldiers, their captors and the viewer, who is actually the Turkish army correspondent who took the photograph. It is the metaphoric space created by this triangulation that contains the question: "What has happened to these men?" Similarly the photographs of mothers holding up photographs are triangular in that they link the mothers, the photographs of their loved ones, and the absences that the photographs evoke. Such photographs are questions, not statements, and they take place in real time in contrast to the Turkish Cypriot photographs that concentrate on an unrepeatable event of horror. Greek Cypriot photographs highlight and sustain a continuing drama which the viewer may identify with more effectively than with the Turkish Cypriot photographic material. The photographs of missing persons that their womenfolk hold in their hands, modern equivalents of the *soudarion* (the cloth used by Veronica to wipe Christ's face on Calvary and which received his image), are links to the past,

and evidence of the past. They take place in real time and record, by evoking, a past that is recoverable at least symbolically through answers to the questions posed by the very act of displaying the photographs.

There is an absence of such questions in Turkish Cypriot material. Because the Turkish Cypriot leadership was particularly concerned to declare their missing as dead in the interests of (what they considered to be) compassion and political realism, and therefore concentrated on presenting the *kayıp* as (dead) *shehits* (martyrs), they by-passed tackling the existential, but necessary, aporia of recollection for the relatives. One Turkish Cypriot whose father disappeared in 1964, when he was a little boy, told me with some anguish that he knows he had a father "because he appears in an 'English book'" (probably a UN compilation) with his name and biographical details. Appearance in a foreign book, rather than a Turkish Cypriot one, documenting the disappearance of a person facticizes his existence. In short, for this Turkish Cypriot as well as for others, confirmation of a parent's existence was through the recording of his disappearance. Such disappearances are culturally interpreted by the Turkish Cypriot political leadership as a death although no evidence may be available. By contrast for the Greek Cypriots a person's existence is pursued through the act of continually asking for information about his fate. Whereas Greek Cypriots record an absence to conjure up a presence that has to be re-explained as a disappearance, Turkish Cypriots record a disappearance as a death, and hence for the relatives a proof of having lived. It is these differences that help explain that, whereas the Turkish Cypriots begin by utilizing photographs of dead people as metaphors for the disappeared, the Greek Cypriots record representations of absences as metaphors of a presence that needs to be commemorated, much like an icon.

I suggest this helps explain differences between Turkish and Greek Cypriots in their approaches to memory and its relation to experience. Underlying this are differences in the political fabulation of the past and its appeal to "memory" and "experience". The Turkish Cypriots, because of their pressing political problems, especially between 1963 and 1970 when they tended to view their survival as being at stake, use photographs

in a relatively matter-of-fact way, whereas the Greek Cypriots use them as representations of what is in effect an iconic predicament: representation as participating in some fundamental way in that which it represents. The former is what John Berger called a "unilinear way – they are used to illustrate an argument, or to demonstrate a thought which goes like this: ————→ " (1984: 60). For the Turkish Cypriots photographs have the function of ensuring that the past is not forgotten by being documented. This oscillation operates between two incontestable semaphores: "History repeats itself" (*TCNN* 5: 4), and "Never Again". Documentation through photography creates facticity. The uncertainty of disappearance easily slides into, and becomes the province of, the certainty of death. Photographs of the dead/representations of death thus colonize and imbue the representations of the missing in Turkish Cypriot material. When one looks at Turkish Cypriot photographic material there is no doubt that one is looking at photographs of people who died through disappearance, whereas for the Greek Cypriots they are photographs of people who disappeared through dying. The *Fact Note on Missing Persons in Cyprus* published by the Turkish Cypriot Human Rights Committee December 1996 shows a school photograph with the following caption:

> All these children disappeared in August 1974 and have not yet been accounted for by their known abductors. Primary school pupils at Turkish Cypriot village Murataga on opening day on 1 September 1973. The school did not re-open on 1 September 1974 because all the pupils had disappeared in August 1974 following Greek Cypriot armed attacks on the village.

Such photographs state unambiguous facts. As Berger notes, some photographs are used "tautologically so that the photograph merely repeats what is being said in words" (1984: 60). They point to an event so traumatic that it exists outside time, but nevertheless marks an ineradicable chasm between the before and the after. It legitimates the genesis of the total and complete separation of the Turkish from the Greek community through a prototypical act of destruction. Such photographs seek to illustrate collective experiences through images where

Turkish Cypriots have been encouraged by their nationalist political leadership to objectify themselves as subjects of suffering. Such images do not appeal to individual memory. Rather they illustrate a collectivised ethnic memory empty of individual experiences. This is congruent with the attempt by the Turkish Cypriot leadership to manufacture a collective past and to provide it with a series of representations.

By contrast the Greek Cypriot approach is Platonic-recollective. It evokes an absence and potentially anticipates a resurrection. This may well have roots in the Christian tradition, including its iconography. Many photographs, like icons, employ a double image – an image within an image. The most famous photographs of the mothers depict them holding up images/photographs of their loved ones. These photographs suggest a double suffering: of the missing person, but even more importantly of the relatives. The spectator identifies not so much with the objects, the missing persons, but with the subjects, the mothers. Here it is useful to distinguish between the internal and the external signified. The internal signified is the suffering of women. It is not a heroic but a quotidian suffering faced by civilians the world over as a result of war or oppression. The external signified is therefore that of continued oppression through the denial of information on the fate of the missing. It is thus a continuing story. The dominant tense is the continually extending present, the *passato continuo* rather than the *passato remoto*, the tense employed by the Turkish Cypriot photographs. In the western iconographic tradition the theology of women's faces has long been used to signify ecstasy or suffering (Feher and others 1989). Yet the hand-held photographs, like the crucifix, commemorate an absence, a body that is not there. It is through the identification of their fate that the living achieve their soteriology, and the missing their resurrection – their *anastasi* to be buried properly according to Christian rites. Through the equivalent of such second burials (Bloch and Parry 1982) they are loosened from the earth and this world, and united with both their loved ones and God. They are *martyres*. Whereas the Turkish Cypriot photographs commemorate a black epiphany and move unidirectionally, Greek Cypriot ones anticipate a soteriology through resurrection-reunion, and they move backwards and forwards from the image to real-time

experiences and back again. Such photographs are effective because they evoke individual memories and emplot them along various lines of recollection. Some further observations of Berger are useful: "Memory is not unilinear at all. Memory works radially, that is to say with an enormous number of associations all leading to the same event" (1984: 60). He uses a star image with lines radiating from a single (empty) point as illustration. Berger suggests that, "If we want to put a photograph back into the context of experience, social experience, social memory, we have to respect the laws of memory. We have to situate the printed photograph so that it acquires something of the surprising conclusiveness of that which *was* and *is*" (ibid. 61, original emphasis).

I suggest that Greek Cypriot photographs are visually compelling because they are able to move from the *was* to the *is*, and back again. This may be more effective internationally than Turkish Cypriot material employed to sustain the TRNC's (Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus) line that Greek and Turkish Cypriots cannot live together. Such campaigns may have a decreasing purchasing power in an increasingly integrated Western Europe the further back in time such images recede, but they are effective among Turkish Cypriots.

IV *Staging, simulation and transgression*

I will now examine the employment, management and choreographing of images across the Green Line which divides the South, or the Republic of Cyprus, from the Turkish-occupied North and the TRNC, which is recognized only by Turkey. The term Green Line is used by United Nations personnel; the Greek Cypriots officially call it the Buffer Zone. It is also informally called the "Νεκρή Ζώνη" (Dead Zone). The Green Line is an important topos to examine as this is where the ethnic self confronts the other. To the Turkish Cypriots it is the borders of their state. The Green Line is the interface between conflicting interpretations of truth and falsity, and of the real and the symbolic. It is also the site where Greek and Turkish Cypriots put on poster displays, each highlighting the monstrosity of the other. Viewed from the Greek Cypriot side, on the other side of the Green Line everything is literally *entre parenthèses*. All references to the TRNC in the Greek Cypriot media are prefaced

with the term "ψευδο-κράτος" (false but also lying State, and the State as the product of lies), or "the so-called". Here nothing is true except lies (ψέματα). The Green Line is an interface of ritual transgressions, e.g. of women crossing the line to return to their homes, or of motorcyclists attempting to cross "the last boundary in Europe". Such transgressions become further ritualised through their calendrical "inevitability". They occur at "black anniversaries" of the coup and the invasion. The Green Line becomes a mirror for those on the Greek side, and a distorting window through which everything seen on the other side is inverted. Through this looking-glass border, mimesis and exchange conspire to create and service images of the self through the other. In summer 1995 works on the Turkish side of the Green line in Nicosia were interpreted as threatening "tank roads" by the Greek Cypriots and explained by the Turkish Cypriots as a "children's playground". Children, icons of transparency, become symptoms of guile. As the *"Nekri Zoni"* (dead zone) it is a place *of* death, a place where transgressions are staged and managed for the purposes of representation. Here, order, lawlessness and violence are choreographed by both sides to be represented in photographs, posters and the media.

A particular set of images and narratives were employed in Cyprus during the demonstrations and attempted crossings of the Green Line by dismounted motorcyclists on 10 and 14 August 1996, the anniversary of the second round of the 1974 Turkish invasion. There is contestation over the numbers involved and the intentions of the participants. To the Greek Cypriots the events were peaceful demonstrations against the Turkish occupation. Turkish Cypriots claim that "thousands of Greeks and Greek Cypriots armed with iron bars, knives, sticks and stones supported by the Greek soldiers ready for action in their dug outs attacked the Turkish Cypriot border".[5] To the Turkish Cypriots they were illegal transgressions into their sovereign territory. Although the ride to the borders was cancelled by the Greek Cypriot organizing group, "scuffles broke out when Greek Cypriot protesters were confronted with members of the Turkish terrorist

---

[5] *TCNN* 10: 1. The Grey Wolves have strong informal connections with right-wing politicians and the military. They are based in Turkey but maintain cells in Cyprus.

group 'the Grey Wolves' in the buffer zone who were waving large wooden sticks and iron rods against them. [... The] 'Grey Wolves' were brought to the island a few days before the rally."[6] During the events two Greek Cypriots were killed: Tasos Isaak, a refugee, beaten to death in the buffer zone on 10 August; the second, his cousin Solomos Solomou, on 14 August, when he casually shinned up a flagpole, cigarette in mouth, attempting to pull down the Turkish flag, and was shot some four times.[7] Let us begin with the representation of the first killing. Tasos Isaak was caught attempting to cross the Green Line by the Turkish Cypriot police and non-uniformed men (the majority). Turkish Cypriots consider that beyond the Green Line lies their state, the TRNC. They thus consider the Green Line or the Buffer Zone as the outer perimeter of their borders.[8] Whilst entangled and caught in barbed wire Isaak was repeatedly beaten with sticks and killed in the space of fifteen seconds. The attack was brutal, disproportionate to the alleged offence, and attracted deserved international condemnation.[9]

The events were caught by the media and the film was repeatedly shown on Cypriot TV in slow motion. Two particular sets of images were critical. The first set is the juxtaposition of a mass of persons with raised clubs surrounding Isaak's body with another image of UN personnel reaching the body after the crowd had dispersed. The first shows intense fury through the raised, tense arms of the closely packed bodies surrounding Isaak; the second disintegration, panic, impotence through the extended arms of UN personnel reflecting the contagious pollution attendant upon reaching a body whose status as alive

---

[6] *Cyprus Bulletin* (PIO Office, Nicosia), Vol. 34, No. 17 (19 August 1996), 2-3.

[7] According to Greek Cypriots the perpetrator was a mainland Turkish national long settled in Cyprus and a Minister in the TRNC cabinet. It occurred close to a Turkish Cypriot observation post.

[8] I am using terms such as borders, the TRNC, the Republic of Cyprus, without any parenthesis. I am interested here in demystifying these terms, which can be better pursued through the lack of such qualifications. It does not constitute either recognition or denial of the claims of the TRNC, and I hope this paper will contribute towards the demystification of the pernicious rationalisation of violence.

[9] It was condemned by the European Parliament on 19 September 1996.

or dead is not known. The first image is that of *discharge*: the transmutation of individual fear into a single collective, transformative but polluting, violent act. Here some thoughts of Elias Canetti on crowds are useful: "The most important occurrence within the crowd is the discharge. Before this the crowd does not actually exist; it is the discharge which creates it. This is the moment when all who belong to the crowd get rid of their differences and feel equal" (1973: 18). Such a crowd can be seen as a baiting crowd which

> forms with reference to a quickly attainable goal. The goal is known and clearly marked, and is also near. The crowd is out for killing and it knows whom it wants to kill. It heads for this goal with unique determination and cannot be cheated of it. The proclaiming of the goal, the spreading about of who it is that is to perish, is enough to make the crowd form. This concentration on killing is of a special kind and of an unsurpassed intensity. Everyone wants to participate. [...] There is no risk because the crowd have immense superiority on their side. The victim can do nothing to them [...] he has been made over to them for destruction; he is destined for it and thus no one need fear the sanction attached to the killing. [...] There is another factor which must be remembered. The threat of death hangs over all men and, however disguised it may be, [...] it affects them all the time and creates a need to deflect death on to others. The formation of baiting crowds answers this need (Canetti 1973: 55-6).

Images of threats precipitate fear and hence violence. I hope to show that the stimulus to violence was far from "defensive"; rather it was "demiurgic" (in the classical Greek sense of forcing through a new state of affairs) and had useful political effects whatever the intentions of the politicians. Perceptions of threats were anchored in the images of a community of suffering that have permeated the officially sponsored Turkish Cypriot historical imagination. By contrast the Greek Cypriot crowd can be seen as what Canetti has called a "reversal crowd" – an attempt to reverse a painful sting, often tied to promises of liberation, and operative in messages of redemption.[10]

---

[10] The distinctions are not absolute. There were also elements of a baiting crowd in the Greek Cypriot crowd; the two are often found together but the relative determination and weighting of elements vary.

The second set of images concentrate on the camera as the substitute for, and stimulus to, the violent act. The Turkish Cypriot leader Rauf Denktash (known to be a keen photographer) was also shown photographing events from a vantage point.[11] The juxtaposition of the repeated raising of sticks on the sequestered body, like the Rodney King beating in Los Angeles, and the seemingly inscrutable image of Denktash behind a camera had the effect not only of suggesting that he was impassive to the events taking place, but also of transforming its agency. It appeared that the beatings and the show of force were being staged for him to photograph and record. As Denktash's hobby is photography this was further evidence to Greek Cypriots of his "monstrousness". The structuration was triangular, linking the beatings, the "photographer-orchestrator", and the viewer. To the Greek Cypriots, this was not just a murder, it was a staged murder, and it was staged to further fabricate the "falsity" of the Turkish Cypriot state. As Feldman has observed for a different context (that of interrogation and torture), to which the present one bears some similarity, especially in its approximation to sacrifice, "the entire action oscillates at the boundaries of spontaneous violence and fabricated performance" (1991: 121). To the Greek Cypriots the transgression was (unfortunate) spontaneous violence and the killing fabricated performance. To the Turkish Cypriots by contrast the transgression was fabricated performance, and the killing an unfortunate example of spontaneous violence.

The killing of Isaak (and Solomou) can be seen as legitimation rituals of the state. By this I mean two things. First, this was a tragedy closer to what Girard has called "a balancing of the scale, not of justice but of violence" (1988: 45). Secondly, I want to suggest that the events involving crowds, politicians, the military, the media, ideologies, violence, and narratives were too complex, multilayered and seemingly uncontrollable to be approached except by reference to some "abstract" overarching entity such as the state. The *direction* of the symbolism (sovereignty, borders, transgressions, legitimacy,

---

[11] "The Turkish Cypriot leader, Mr Denktash himself was present at the developments watching and photographing the last few moments of the first victim's life" (PIO leaflet 139/1996).

morality) both in the Republic of Cyprus and its other, the TRNC, points to the state. Through the sacrifices of Isaak and Solomou, political authority constituted itself as legitimate through its generation of a supremely "illegitimate/immoral" act. Through (i) the offering of the live body of Isaak as free agent across the Green Line, (ii) the rejection of transgression by surrogate agents of the state, or the collective beating of his body as polluting, threatening other by the state's exact monstrous double, its other of illegality, and (iii) the carrying back of his broken body as sacrificial matter, the state cunningly staked out its claim to embody authority through its manichean splitting into representations of the "good/legitimate" and the "bad/illegitimate" state. The state thus scripted itself as the only conceivable form of legitimate power. Yet this was a simulated power that manifested itself through the production of simulations. As Nietzsche observed: "Truth cannot be regarded as the highest power. The will to semblance, to illusion, to deception, to becoming, to change (to objective deception) is to be regarded here as deeper, more original, more metaphysical than the will to truth, to reality, to being – the latter is itself merely a form of the will to illusion" (quoted in Baudrillard 1996: 9).

For the Turkish Cypriots the Green Line is the border of their state, the TRNC. In the vocabulary of justification provided by the discourses of the state it therefore had to be "protected" from transgressions, physical, symbolic and somatic. The Greek Cypriots interpreted that same violence as the *lack of order,* even anti-order, and hence delegitimized the TRNC whilst legitimating the Republic. For the Turkish Cypriot political leadership, transgression *qua* transgression generated both value of the state (and of the order that the state as the TRNC claimed to protect in its territorial jurisdictions), and the state of values (peace, and freedom from attacks from Greek Cypriots) through which the state as TRNC legitimated its existence. As Girard has observed, "The more a tragic conflict is prolonged, the more likely it is to culminate in a violent mimesis; the resemblance between the combatants grows ever stronger until each represents a mirror image of the other" (1988: 47).

The killing of Isaak, "accidental" as it may appear, had therefore a greater, and concealed, significance. It was the

supreme act of a mutual conniving at staging an act as an accident, a dissimulation, where two parties perceive the results as unintentional and even tragic, yet nevertheless can derive "benefits" from the results by reciprocally accusing the other of conscious agency. Each side created an other, a spectral image, yet each other, in striving to escape from and deny that definition, further reinforced that spectral image. Mimesis flowed from attempted escapes from spectral alterity. Each side believed that the events occurred through the other's will, and thereby confirmed the reality of the spectral other. Each side projected the other as the author of events, whilst they themselves were merely "responding" to those events. Agency was dissimulated through response. Yet as Nietzsche observed, agency is not the author but the product of doing (Feldman 1991: 3).

We can now see the killings of Isaak and Solomou as a double sacrifice. From the perspective of the Greek Cypriots it was an unambiguous sacrifice of two young men and the "animality" of the Turkish Cypriot forces of law and order that were indicted. Isaak and Solomou were buried with state honours as *iroomartyres* – hero martyrs. The conjoining of the two terms was new to Greek Cypriot political vocabulary, although martyrs may act heroically in accepting the tortures inflicted upon them, and Christianity has a long tradition, since early times, of grafting itself onto the classical tradition to synthesize its own iconography (Perkins 1995). Early Christianity appealed to Stoicism, but not to the almost thoughtless hubris of the Homeric hero. It is worthwhile recalling Vernant's observations on the Homeric hero, as they disclose aspects of character that must have been far from the intentions of the state eulogists and politicians, yet nevertheless come closer to reflecting the features of the young men who crossed the Green Line. As Vernant points out the Homeric hero, such as Achilles, has a "edgy irritability and a profound obsession with humiliation" (1991: 53). He is a marginal figure and can think of "nothing but rivalry, dispute and combat" (ibid. 52). He lacks *aidos*, the feeling of reserve or restraint felt by others who are wiser, and "as a heroic character, Achilles exists to himself only in the mirror of the song that reflects his own image" (ibid. 59). The demonstration was organized by motorcyclists who have a

reputation not very dissimilar to the Homeric heroes. Like Achilles, their love for a καλός θάνατος is even reflected in their ironic epithet as *kamikazes*. Most people in Cyprus give them a wide berth. Those who died were much closer to Homeric heroes than to Christian martyrs, but in the nationalist language of the state, it was through their death that they became martyrs and αθάνατοι (immortal). Killing created a victim; victimage created martyrdom. Yet the media cascade of images of the crowd as hunting pack and Denktash as photographer-orchestrator made it appear to Greek Cypriots as a staged killing and thus pre-figured Isaak as a *selected* (not *ex post facto*) sacrificial victim. It shored up and reinforced the lines of separation between the two communities, and was thus a rite of separation through a single cataclysmic aggregation.

For the Turkish Cypriots the meanings were different. The incident appeared as an attack by the most unruly elements of Greek Cypriot society dedicated to their destruction. Transgression was perceived as a polluting presence, and as directed against the Turkish flag. Defilement of and by the body becomes the language of transgression and response. Tansu Ciller, the Turkish Prime Minister, threatened to cut off the hand of anyone who desecrated the Turkish flag. As Loizos (1988) has pointed out, defilement of the ethnic other through the selective debasement of valued symbols and the body (such as exposing genitals) is common practice. The seeming casualness with which Solomou shinned up the flagpole, cigarette in mouth, travestied the Turkish flag even more than the actual attempt to pull it down. Yet whilst the Turkish Cypriot leadership was keen to demonstrate that the TRNC was a state and had all the paraphernalia of a state (borders), it was the *Turkish*, not the Turkish Cypriot (TRNC), flag that Solomou attempted to pull down. To Greek Cypriots that very nonchalance turned him into a hero, a modern *kamikaze*. But by shooting a man with a cigarette in his mouth, hardly a physically hostile stance, the Turkish authorities turned Solomou into a victim, and thus encouraged a slippage into the interpretation of the event as murder – a position adopted by the Greek Cypriot authorities.

It is precisely this slippage that turned the event into what Girard called a sacrificial crisis. During it, "the difference between blood spilt for ritual and for criminal purposes no longer

holds" (1988: 43). He notes: "the difference between sacrificial and nonsacrificial violence is anything but exact; it is even arbitrary" (ibid. 40). "The sacrificial crises, that is, the disappearance of the sacrificial rites, coincides with the disappearance of the difference between impure violence and purifying violence. When this difference has been effaced, purification is no longer possible and impure, contagious, reciprocal violence spreads throughout the community" (ibid. 49). This was not possible. Nevertheless confrontation was heightened and the groups retained their distinctiveness, a reversal of Turner's *communitas.*

Official Turkish Cypriot material presented the events as an "attack on our borders", asserting that such individuals were "hooligans", and that the transgressions were the initial steps towards hoisting the Greek flag in northern Cyprus (*TCNN* 7). The latter was clearly unrealisable given the heavy presence of Turkish troops. The following is a Turkish Cypriot gloss on the second killing:

> Among them Solomos Solomou was determined to bring the Turkish flag down and hoist the Greek flag in it's (sic) place. He was going to be a "hero" [...]. Encouraged by these terrorist leaders, Solomos made that fateful dash to the Turkish Cypriot border. He was so determined, the UN soldiers were unable to stop him. He started to climb the flag pole, despite the warning shots fired in the air he carried on climbing. He would not be allowed to bring a nations (sic) flag down, would not be allowed to bring down the symbol of our sovereignty. To some people, their flag might be a piece of cloth but for us, our flag is the symbol of our freedom, symbol of our sovereignty, and symbol of our future in Cyprus. *We the Turkish Cypriots paid dearly for that sovereignty and for that future. More than 1000 missing people, hundreds of destroyed villages, thousands of dead women, men, children and our mass graves are there to remind us that we paid dearly for our future in Cyprus.* [...] We will not give up our sovereignty or our future in Cyprus. This was the situation in August 1996 in Cyprus. Let us turn back the clock to the situation in October 1931 during British rule in Cyprus...[12]

---

[12] *TCNN* 10: 1 (December 1996). The emphasis is in the original.

The key themes are linkage with the past, the emphasis on sacrifices to achieve a sovereignty which alone can prevent a slippage to the hell of that past, and that history "repeats itself", especially in the unchanging motives of the opposing group. There is little doubt that sovereignty is fetishised especially when it is equated with a flag. Indeed it may be claimed that the greater the practical, political, isolation of the TRNC and its lack of international recognition, the greater the emphasis on the symbols, rather than on the substance of sovereignty. It is my contention that many of the actions of the TRNC are likely to remain highly objectionable and symbolically overdetermined, precisely because there are few other modes of behaviour available.[13]

The events of August 1996 could not have been other than highly "symbolic". It was thus almost "necessary" for the TRNC to demonstrate to the Greek Cypriots, and to the wider world, that it was a genuine state, not just a ψευδο-κράτος. It was not the transgressions as such that led to the killings. It was the killings that made (demiurged) the transgressions. It was, in short, violence as a mutually reinforcing system of signs that conjured up the TRNC. Violence (the manufacture of a victim) became a sign of transgression-response generating its own discourse. It was through the sign of violence that statehood conjured itself. Rather than seeing the causation as:

Transgression → Violence → Sovereignty

we should see it as:

Victim Selection through Violence = Transgression → Sovereignty

Thus the classic Radcliffe-Brownian and Weberian definition of the state as the upholder of the social order through its monopoly of violence should be reversed. Rather, the power system that claimed statehood conjured itself as the upholder of

---

[13] In June 1998 the TRNC increased its telephone rates across the Green Line to the Republic to overseas tariffs because, it claimed, these are international calls.

violence orchestrating social disorder to claim its monopoly of the social order. The official unilineal explanation:

Signifier = Transgression/ Signified = Sovereignty

should be changed to a more mutually constitutive one:

Signifier → Sovereignty ↔ Signified = Transgression.

Violence, realised through popular action and the crowd, many of whom were the Grey Wolves from Turkey, was the most unambiguous sign needed to shore up the simulacrum of the state with sovereignty as its signifier. The state was conjured not so much through imposing order, but rather through a killing that scripted a transgression, signifying a sovereignty to be "protected" against those very transgressions.

Some ironies further suggest fabrication and we can now appreciate how the gaze is directed and structured in this divided island. Although the Turkish Cypriot political leadership claims that the demonstrations took place at the borders of the TRNC, their delineation is extremely vague for two reasons. First, they are not recognized by the Greek Cypriots, the most important party, and secondly, they are also vague in their geographical delineation. Certain areas are subject to competing claims; others appear to be not subject to any active claim. Some others are used by farmers, and shepherds and tourists regularly inadvertently wander across the border/buffer zone to the other side. They are questioned and then released.[14] The border, in short, is more a mental social construct realised through doing and simulation, and a function of relations between the two communities, than a strictly defined geographic one. The paradox is that not only is the general strip across the island that constitutes the Green Line highly mapped out and dangerous (because of mines and armed soldiers), it is also subject to intense scrutiny by the military gazing through high

---

[14] Such wanderings and police investigation with no untoward consequences paradoxically do more to retain practical legitimation of the TRNC's claim to territorial sovereignty than the Dherynia killings. Power is *routinised* and hence *de facto* accepted through not being contested.

magnitude devices, a veritable panopticon where the "jailors" scrutinise each other. The Green Line is structured in terms of what can and what should not be seen, and by "seen" one means photographed. Indeed all the Green Line is intended to be seen, *and seen as not intended to be seen.* Along it at specific points are signs forbidding photography. As this is one of the most highly photographed, surveilled, and militarised borders in the world with specially constructed photographic vantage-points, photographic displays and poster campaigns, it would be bizarre to accept this as simply a case of some areas being viewable and others concealed from view for "practical", "military" purposes. Given the intense, twenty-four hour surveillance, secrecy is unlikely to be sustainable for long. Rather, some sites are constructed as the touristic equivalent of "back regions" to be apparently hidden from view, and others as "front regions" (MacCannell 1992). Except that some sites are fabricated to be demanding a concealment from the seemingly aggressive intrusiveness of photography. Such signs create a site, marking it out as significant territory to be "defended", even if they may contain no military secrets, but attracting military attention towards them away from other (perhaps more unheralded military) areas.

The slippage between shooting a gun and shooting a photograph is particularly apt, but also highly problematic. The sites from where photographs are shot, i.e. invited, such as the end of Heroes Street, appear almost irenic. Sites which order a looking by forbidding photographs, and therefore a non-looking in the language of the appropriating eye, appear to be bristling with hidden aggression. The camera replaces the exposed gun as the intrusive device that must not be bared and displayed. It becomes a surrogate, and a metonym through prohibition, of the gun. Dissimulation takes over.

From the Greek Cypriot side, photography is carefully harnessed to the creation of sites, again from a triangular perspective. There are sites to be photographed *against*, thus linking the photograph viewer, subject-person, and location in a discursive triangle. The conscious parallelism of Heroes Street is with the Berlin Wall, and the viewer is left with little doubt that he is gazing from "West Berlin" onto East Germany/ Turkey/the Soviet Union. The smart Eastern Europeans now

milling in Nicosia further reinforce the impression of a time-lag, where local divisions belatedly emulate global ones, except that the other side is even more brutal. The underlying narrative to the historically ironic eye is that this is the tail end of a war that froze, to be resolved by diplomacy ("Bigger Powers"), or through the collapse of "the other side"/East Germany/ Communism. Significantly, there are no equivalent sites on the Turkish Cypriot side to gaze from. The gaze there is directed to the *past*, such as the Museum of Barbarism, but it is not geographic.

The creation of significance is thus pursued through the alliance of prohibition of the directed gaze with a topography staked out through the apparent unambiguity of the flag. Flags along the Green Line are not so much nationalist markers of identity, important though this indubitably is. Rather, they become the focus of the photographic gaze, struggling to mark out borders of territories in a highly contentious situation, where even the participants are uncertain about the exact contours of such borders or boundaries, or how they should respond to transgressions. Flags as photographed sites become metonyms for territory, and thus loci for deadly rituals. The demonstrations took place adjacent to the TRNC's claimed border. Because it has been refused negotiation or recognition by the most significant party, the Republic of Cyprus, this border is bound to be vague in practice. To escape from that vagueness which is inimical to statehood, territory and sovereignty have to be (i) created through actions like killings that invest space with the association sacrifice-transgression and re-choreograph the alignment of forces facing each other, and/or (ii) semantically shifted to other markers such as the flag as metonym of territorial jurisdiction. This is much more specific. Yet the flag was not the TRNC flag but the *Turkish* flag. That indeed was the aim of the demonstrators. Both sides correctly read each other's intentions yet dissimulated their *ex post ante* actions. An offence against the Turkish flag became an attack on the sovereignty of the TRNC, which claims recognition as a separate sovereign state. Finally, if the transgressions took place, this still involved the taking of two lives. Yet there were no judicial investigations or legal procedures followed by the organs of the TRNC after the deaths, such as an inquest. It is worthwhile

noting that the police of the TRNC operates under the control of, and is subject to, the Turkish military, and Turkey is the only country that recognizes the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the TRNC.

The loss of two lives can therefore be seen as a sacrifice upholding the ideology of a unitary nation-state as the only conceivable, practicable and realizable form of political organization in Cyprus. Statehood *qua* nation-statehood was legitimated through its refraction into a manichean alterity/splitting. In Cyprus the state emerged as the demiurge of order through disorder. Violence was therefore not an accidental by-product of the state in establishing its goal of civil order. Rather, violence was the supremely constitutive act through which the state legitimated itself as the only imaginable political reality. The state constituted itself through nationalism, and nationalism imagined and fantasised itself through the state.

References

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities.* London: Verso

Baudrillard, J. (1996). *The perfect crime.* London: Verso

Berger, J. (1984). *About looking.* 2nd ed. London: Writers and Readers

Bloch, M. and Parry, J. (eds.) (1982). *Death and the regeneration of life.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Canetti, E. (1973). *Crowds and power.* Harmondsworth: Penguin

CRTCMP (Committee of Relatives of Turkish Cypriot Missing Persons) (September 1993). *Question of Missing Persons in Cyprus. Myth and reality.* Cyprus

Feher, M. and others (eds) (1989). *Fragments for a history of the human body.* New York: Zone

Feldman, A. (1991). *Formations of violence: the narrative of the body and political terror in Northern Ireland.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Feldman, A. (1994). "From Desert Storm to Rodney King via ex-Yugoslavia: on cultural anaesthesia", in : C. Nadia Seremetakis (ed.), *The senses still.* Boulder: Westview Press

Girard, R. (1988). *Violence and the sacred.* London: Athlone

Hitchens, C. (1984). *Cyprus.* London: Quartet Books

Loizos, P. (1988). "Intercommunal killing in Cyprus", *Man* 23, 639-53

MacCannell, D. (1992). *Empty meeting grounds. The tourist papers.* London: Routledge

Paine, R. (1995). "Behind the Hebron Massacre, 1994", *Anthropology Today* 11.1, 8-15

Panteli, S. (1984). *A new history of Cyprus.* London: East-West Publications

Papadakis, Y. (1993). "The politics of memory and forgetting in Cyprus", *Journal of Mediterranean Studies,* 3.1, 139-54

Papadakis, Y. (1994). "The National Struggle Museums of Nicosia", *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 17, 400-19

PCC = Pancyprian Committee of Parents and Relatives of Undeclared Prisoners of War and Missing Persons (n.d.). *The case of Cypriots missing since the Turkish invasion.* 4th ed. (no date but post-1994)

Perkins, J. (1995). *The suffering self: pain and narrative representation in the Early Christian era.* London: Routledge

PIO = Public Information Office (1996). *Cyprus Bulletin* Vol. 34, No. 17 (19 August 1996). Nicosia

PIO = Public Information Office (1996). *Greek Cypriots killed for saying no to occupation.* PIO leaflet 139/1996. 2nd ed.

Robben, A. (1995). "The politics of truth and emotion among victims and perpetuators of violence", in: C. Nordstrom and A. Robben (eds.), *Fieldwork under fire.* Berkeley: University of California Press

Sant Cassia, P. (forthcoming). "Missing Persons in Cyprus as Ethnomartyres", *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook* 14

TCNN = Turkish Cypriot Network News, Voice of Turkish Cypriots, Issues 5 (August 1996), 7 (September 1996) and 10 (December 1996). Barnet

Vernant, J.-P. (1991). *Mortals and immortals: collected essays.* Princeton: Princeton University Press

University of Durham

Dimitrios Vikelas in the Diaspora: memory, character formation and language*

Dimitris Tziovas

Dimitrios Vikelas (1835-1908) was a key figure in Greece during the second half of the nineteenth century and occupies a central position in its literary and cultural developments. For most people, his name is associated with the revival of the Olympic Games in Athens in 1896;[1] for literary historians, however, his reputation rests on the publication of the short novel *Loukis Laras* (1879).[2] Though he cannot be considered an inspiring, imaginative and gifted writer, he marks the transition from ideal to real and expresses the trend away from the intense individualism and the melodramatic imagination of the period of 1830-1880 towards the development of a prosperous and

---

* An earlier version of this paper was presented at a colloquium organised by the Σύλλογος προς Διάδοσιν Ωφελίμων Βιβλίων in Athens (3-4 April 1997).

1 Petros N. Linardos, *D. Vikélas: Από το Όραμα στην Πράξη* (Athens: Epitropi Olympiakon Agonon 1996).

2 Vikelas played a significant role in the rehabilitation of Byzantium during the nineteenth century. He wrote a number of essays on Byzantium in order "to avenge the insulted memory of Byzantium" and to answer the criticisms of Gibbon and Montesquieu. Some of his essays appeared in English, mainly in *The Scottish Review* (e.g. "The Byzantine Empire", *The Scottish Review* 8 [July & October 1886] 258-86), and then reprinted in book form (*Seven essays on Christian Greece* [1890], subsequently enriched in its French version *La Grèce Byzantine et Moderne: Essais historiques* [Paris 1893]). The translator of Vikelas's essays into English was Lord Bute, who believed in the continuity of Greek culture and initiated the Byzantine Revival in architecture in Scotland. On Bute and Vikelas see R.J. Macrides, *The Scottish Connection in Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* (St John's House Papers, No. 4, Centre for Advanced Historical Studies: University of St Andrews 1992) and Alexandros Oikonomou, *Τρεῖς Ἄνθρωποι: Δημήτριος Μ. Βικέλας (1835-1908)*, vol. 2 (Athens 1953), pp. 449-51.

civilised urban society based on the values of hard work, discipline and family cohesion.

Although Vikelas travelled a great deal and moved from country to country, paradoxically he was instrumental in turning Greek fiction towards domesticity. Contrary to what one would expect from a well-travelled and cosmopolitan individual, he did not set his stories abroad (with the exception of "Ἀνάμνησις") nor did he introduce flamboyant characters; instead, he turned his attention to humble people and to local communities. Perhaps this tendency can be explained by his attempt at writing fiction for instruction and moral improvement rather than for entertainment. In this respect, he is one of the least entertaining writers of nineteenth-century Greece, but his emphasis on locality and domesticity might partly account for the interest of foreign translators, who increasingly towards the end of the nineteenth century demanded local colour from Greek fiction.

Characteristic is the title, *Tales from the Aegean*, of the English translation of his stories published in 1894. In his introduction to this translation, Henry Alonzo Huntington stressed the local colouring and the movement away from foreign imitations in Greek fiction of the time; he also noted that Roidis's *Pope Joan* is "passed over for no other reason than that work which might have been done in any latitude cannot be said to have assisted the evolution of a distinctively national type of fiction," while *Loukis Laras* "is now generally regarded as the most finished specimen of Neo-hellenic romance."[3] What is emphasized in this introduction, which is very likely to have been written under Vikelas's guidance,[4] is the trend towards an accurate and sincere depiction of Greek life. Vikelas is described as the "founder of a school" of Greek short story writing and the attractiveness of his stories "lies partly in the sincerity with

---

[3] Demetrios Bikelas, *Tales from the Aegean*, translated by Leonard Eckstein Opdycke (Chicago 1894), pp. 8-9. The stories were translated from the French and it is worth noting here that in the introduction the novels of Grigorios Palaiologos are described as forgotten (p. 8).

[4] Mario Vitti claims that Vikelas was behind Juliette Lamber's *Poètes grecs contemporains* (Paris 1881). See his *Ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής Λογοτεχνίας* (Athens: Odysseas 1987), p. 257.

which they image Greek life of to-day."[5] In other words, Vikelas seems to have orchestrated from abroad his presentation as the founder of realism in Greece, and his image as someone who, despite being a diaspora Greek, shied away from cosmopolitanism by concentrating on the representation of Greek history and the ethos of his country not only in his fiction but also in his travel writing about Greece. There, again according to H.A. Huntington, "one catches, as it were, the last flutter of the vanishing fustanella."[6]

In his autobiography, however, Vikelas presents himself in a modest and self-deprecating manner as a quiet, orderly and not very bright individual.[7] "I was not destined to be a revolutionary," he says, and describes himself as an unaccomplished businessman and man of letters.[8] In spite of this unflattering self-image, Vikelas managed to write a novel which received substantial critical attention and praise when it was published and is the most widely-translated Greek novel of the nineteenth century. *Loukis Laras* was translated into at least eleven European languages.[9] It was translated into English by J. Gennadius in 1881, with an introduction which deserves some attention, as it outlines the developments in nineteenth-century Greek fiction.

In presenting a brief overview of Greek fiction during the nineteenth century, Gennadius aims to highlight the importance and originality of *Loukis Laras*:

> Although less pretentious than any of the tales and novels we have quoted, *Loukis Laras* is more remarkable than its predecessors on many grounds, as we believe the foregoing remarks will have shown. It marks a fresh and more healthy

---

[5] D. Bikelas, *Tales from the Aegean*, p. 10.

[6] Ibid., p. 12.

[7] Dimitrios Vikelas, *Η Ζωή μου* in: *Άπαντα*, ed. Alkis Angelou, vol. 1, (Athens: Sillogos pros Diadosin Ofelimon Vivlion 1997), p. 48.

[8] Ibid., pp. 103, 188, 225.

[9] *Loukis Laras* made five Greek editions while Vikelas was alive, and from 1879 to 1894 three in Italian, two in German, English and Russian and one each in French, Danish, Swedish, Dutch, Spanish, Hungarian and Serbian. See Alexandros N. Letsas, *Δημήτριος Βικέλας* (Thessaloniki: Makedoniki Vivliothiki 1951), p. 23.

> departure in modern Greek literature. The matter compressed within its two hundred pages contains substance sufficient to make up the regulation three-volume novel. Much creative power has been displayed in the moulding of the very meagre facts which have served as the basis of the work. Its sentiment is tender, without lack of a strong imagination. And the underlying sense of quiet humour is no less pleasing than the absence of any political cavil. Finally, as a specimen of the actual Greek prose style, it is more even and perfect than anything produced of late years.[10]

One has the feeling that Vikelas had launched a concerted effort to promote his novel not only by encouraging its translation into major languages within a few years of the original publication, but also through articles published in Greek periodicals by leading foreign scholars such as Wilhelm Wagner, Wilhelm Lange, Karl Krumbacher and Antoni Rubió i Lluch. Although the image he puts forward through his writings is that of a modest and reserved gentleman, Vikelas must have been a great publicist taking advantage of his network of friendships and acquaintances throughout Europe.

He started publishing poetry in 1862 in London and then moved to prose with *Loukis Laras* and his short stories written from 1877 onwards. In 1893 he gathered in one volume, under the title *Διαλέξεις και Αναμνήσεις* (*Lectures and Recollections*), his talks, essays and obituaries, and in 1903 published the first part of his incomplete autobiography *Η Ζωή μου* (*My Life*). He also published his travel writings about England and Scotland (they are included in *Διαλέξεις και Αναμνήσεις*), Greece and Sweden,

---

[10] D. Bikelas, *Loukis Laras*, translated from the Greek by J. Gennadius (New York: D. Appleton and Company 1881), pp. 12-13; British edition (London: Macmillan 1881), pp. xxii-xxiii. This translation was reprinted in 1971 by Doric Publications in London. In her preface to the translation, which appeared during the military dictatorship in Greece, Helen Vlachos stressed the historical value of the text. In the blurb on the dust-jacket of the book the connection with the resistance to military dictatorship becomes more apparent: "The abiding relevance of *Loukis Laras* is tragically undeniable; its theme is as momentous now as it was a century ago, and, for today's Greeks living in and out of that country, it carries a deeper significance. Loukis Laras has rightly been chosen to inaugurate an important series of nineteenth-century Greek classics that are to be published under the Doric imprint."

and translated six plays by Shakespeare.[11] All his published texts have recently been reprinted in eight volumes, edited by Alkis Angelou and published by the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, founded by Vikelas himself in 1899.[12]

His mature life can be divided into three periods. The first (1852-1876) represents the years of his commercial activity and his sojourn in London, the second (1878-1895) is associated with his intellectual activities and his movement to Paris, and finally his Athenian period (1896-1908) when he moves to Athens and devotes his life to public activities for good causes.[13] As we can see, Vikelas spent most of his life outside Greece and can be described as her cultural ambassador, writing articles in French and English, corresponding with leading scholars and intellectuals and helping Greek writers publish their work outside Greece. He may have been instrumental in assisting Vizyenos to publish his first short story in French, even before it was published in Greek. Since he was able to establish contacts and strike up friendships with a number of European writers, Vikelas must have been good at public relations and this perhaps annoyed Psycharis, leading eventually to the breakdown of their relationship.[14]

By the time of the publication of *Loukis Laras* two trends can be identified in Greek fiction. The first trend is more critical and challenging to the nascent Greek state and society; it is closer to the satirical and comical plays of the period and is represented mainly by Grigorios Palaiologos, Iakovos Pitzipios and Emmanuel Roidis. Perhaps it is indicative of their stance that the first two left Greece disgruntled and moved to the Ottoman Empire during a time when the euphoria of national

---

[11] He translated *King Lear, Romeo and Juliet, Othello, Hamlet, Macbeth,* and *The Merchant of Venice.*

[12] Angelou, in the fifth volume of his edition, omits, wrongly in my view, Vikelas's title Διαλέξεις καί Ἀναμνήσεις and replaces it with the term Δοκίμια, to the confusion of readers familiar with the first edition of the book.

[13] A sketch of Vikelas's life can be found in Maria Terdimou, *Χρονολόγιο Δημητρίου Βικέλα* (Herakleion: Dimos Herakleiou Kritis 1991).

[14] See Alexandros Oikonomou, *Τρεῖς Ἄνθρωποι: Δημήτριος Μ. Βικέλας (1835-1908)*, vol. 2, pp. 543-8.

independence was diminishing and a more critical attitude was developing.

The other trend was more idealistic and constructive, aiming at improving Greek society, strengthening its European orientation and contributing towards enhancing its prosperity and morality. This type of fiction, represented by Alexandros Rizos Rangavis and Vikelas, had as its aim the improvement of Greek society either through the allegorical presentation of oriental and exotic tales, and stories of slavery, or through the presentation of technological developments in the West, as is the case with Rangavis, or through the projection of ideal and model characters such as Loukis Laras or Papa-Narkissos, as happens in the fiction of Vikelas. There were, of course, novels, such as *Thanos Vlekas*, which combined both trends by criticising social evils, like brigandage, and at the same time projecting paradigmatic characters.

Although the representatives of both categories of fiction agreed on the inadequacies of Greek society and shared similar didactic intentions, they seem to disagree on the method for dealing with these inadequacies. The former opted for an emphasis on the critical representation of society, and the latter looked to society's moral or educational improvement and worked with analogy or allegory.

Writers who spent most of their lives wandering outside Greece, such as Rangavis and Vikelas, did not have organic links with Greek society nor did they know it well enough to depict it. Approaching Greek society from the perspective of the diaspora, both made a genuine effort to contribute to its development. As they were associated with the Greek-speaking periphery or spent many years outside Greece, they can be considered, together with Vizyenos, Greeks of the diaspora.

These three writers, who all made a substantial contribution to Greek short-story writing in its early stages, share some additional characteristics. All of them wrote poetry (Vikelas was influenced by Rangavis to begin with), but today they are better known for their prose. They also established links with Britain, but in different ways. Rangavis was married to a Scottish lady and wrote his travel impressions from Victorian Britain, making reference to the development of the railway system in Britain. Also, most of his protagonists are lords and

ladies. Vikelas, as mentioned earlier, spent several years in Britain, while Vizyenos wrote most of his stories in London. Furthermore, they were well-acquainted with English literature: Rangavis with Walter Scott and Edward Bulwer-Lytton, among others, Vizyenos at least with Shakespeare, while Vikelas, apart from his translations of Shakespeare, read the *Pickwick Papers* by Charles Dickens, *Adam Bede* by George Eliot, and Walter Scott and Charles Kingsley.[15]

Finally, and most importantly, memory and autobiography were important for all of them. Rangavis wrote four volumes of memoirs published posthumously (1894-1930) and used the word "recollections" for his travelogues. Vizyenos wrote autobiographical fiction which was described by Palamas as a kind of family memoir,[16] while for Vikelas, as we shall see, memory and autobiography played an important role.

It can be argued that memory is one of the hallmarks (the other being peregrination and travel) of Greek fiction during the nineteenth century. Either as personal memory in the form of autobiography or as historical memory in the form of the historical novel, it can be said that memory plays a significant role, gradually giving way to experience. With *Loukis Laras* Vikelas combined individual with historical memory, and he can be seen as the writer who based his prose work, whether fictional or non-fictional, on memory.

The literary genre which seemed most suited to Vikelas's artistic temperament was the memoir, as it combines storytelling and recollection, historical perspective and biographical detail, critical analysis and nostalgic excursion, enjoyment and didacticism. Indeed, the author himself highlighted the need for this kind of memoir, showing that very few had been written, or at least published, in Greece:

> If our most influential politicians, as well as other Greeks, had found the time and developed the habit to write down their memoirs, it would have shed a great deal of light on our contemporary history. In Europe it is the French in particular

---

[15] Ibid., pp. 87, 90.

[16] K. Palamas, "Τό Ἑλληνικόν Διήγημα, Α΄ Βιζυηνός", *Ἅπαντα*, vol. 2 (Athens: Govostis, n.d.), p. 160.

> who have adopted and excelled in this genre, and have enriched their literary tradition with various memoirs which are as enjoyable as they are didactic. It is true that historical truth is on occasions in danger of being distorted by the obsessions, the superstitions and the inclinations of the recounted events, in which the writer himself took part. But apart from anything else, this enlivens and bestows colour on the account.[17]

It would indeed be possible to argue that all Vikelas's prose texts are structured in the memoir style. It is not only in *Loukis Laras*, which is explicitly a memoir based on the narrative of Loukas Zifos (or Tzifos), but in all his stories, that a special emphasis on memory can be discerned. In fact, in his story entitled "Recollection" ("Ανάμνησις") he highlights the untempered power of memory and of childhood impressions: "Childhood impressions are truly indelible. Their images remain forever engraved in the memory – events which occurred many years ago pass before our eyes and remain alive for ever in the depths of our imagination and they emerge at once, unprovoked, without us knowing how or why."[18] Vikelas worked not so much with his imagination as with impression and recollection.[19] Moreover, he wrote his prose fiction relatively late in his career and almost all of it is based on specific events or documents. In other words it is a factual fiction.

In fact, it is difficult to divide Vikelas's prose clearly into fiction (*Loukis Laras, Stories*), autobiography (*My Life*) and essays (*Lectures and Recollections*) because all four books are related to each other and do not allow strict and clear generic characterizations. His voluminous book *Lectures and Recollections*, in particular, contains a number of texts of lectures in

---

[17] Dimitrios Vikelas, *Ἡ Ζωή μου*, p. 127. See also *Λουκής Λάρας*, ed. Marianna Ditsa (Athens: Hermes 1991), p. 123. All references in the text are taken from this edition and page numbers are given after each quotation.

[18] Dimitrios Vikelas, *Διηγήματα*, ed. A. Sachinis (Athens: Estia 1979), p. 173.

[19] Even in his travel writing, e.g. *Ἀπό Νικοπόλεως εἰς Ὀλυμπίαν* [1886] (Athens: Ekate 1991), his visits to countries and cities evoke memories: "All these memories take shape and life when you have seen Mesolongi as I saw it today..." (p. 105). See also pp. 16 and 149.

the essay style as well as festive speeches, obituaries and travel writings. Certain lectures from this volume, like "Settembrini's Recollections", could well have been cast into stories *à la manière de* Vikelas. The two elements which in my opinion run through and link all four books are memory and biography.

Vikelas is one of those men of letters who introduced historic depth and the evolutionary conception of time into modern Greek prose. One would not be far off the mark in claiming that the whole of his prose œuvre is one "perpetual recollection", and perhaps this is due to the fact that the years of his childhood and youth were better than his mature years, which he does not describe in *My Life*, restricting himself to memories of childhood and youth. The second volume of his autobiography, which would have dealt with his mature life, was never published. In the final analysis, Vikelas was a man who lived with his memories, and who fondly remembered the happy days of his youth; he himself explained the reason thus:

> These memories of fleeting encounters and transient relationships remain as happy times which the soul can remember fondly; they are like rays of sunshine, brightening up our shadowy past. Perhaps the duration of these memories depends on each person's character and on the way in which he lives. Perhaps they have more significance for me than others because I spent my youth under the influence of the *ideal* and because my adult years were blackened by many shadows.[20]

It is of course likely that his childhood years were not completely unclouded as he was also troubled by the dilemma: businessman or writer – something which his environment imposed on him while he himself repressed it, having already solved it within his own mind.[21]

If Vikelas was more of a businessman and less of a writer it would have been possible to say that he wrote the first Greek capitalist manifesto in the form of a novel. However, this

---

[20] *Η Ζωή μου*, p. 118. There might be an allusion here to the fact that his life was troubled for a number of years by the mental health of his wife Kalliope, who suffered from melancholy and tried to commit suicide more than once.

[21] Ibid., pp. 103, 141, 188-9, 191.

capitalist inclination (or pleasure, as he called it himself) towards financial profit is tempered by the realization that money does not bring happiness: "because the amassing of riches is not in itself a source of happiness. Freedom – this is the true and sound motivation of the working man!" (*Loukis Laras*, 174). Loukis Laras is in effect introduced to us as an anti-hero with narrow horizons ("The khan was my world and patriotism was my trade balance", 50-1), tiny in stature and range (49, 51). Indeed he himself confesses his anti-heroism: "I was not made for a soldier's life. I inclined towards trade" (150). In this work one could point to the juxtaposition of two attitudes towards life, of two philosophies: heroism, which presupposes a type of linear, dynamic and progressive culmination, and conservatism (and Vikelas was a self-confessed conservative), which favours organic recurrence, introversion and deliberation. On Loukis's return to Chios and his meeting with the prisoner Despina, the cyclical pattern asserts itself, even in the plot of the narrative.

Distance and memory comprise the matrices of Vikelas's writing, contributing mainly in *Loukis Laras* to the demystification of Romantic philhellenism and the heroism of 1821, replacing the ideal of revolutionary action with the ideal of order and prosperity.[22] Vikelas was, perhaps paradoxically, a conservative modernizer, because on the one hand he promoted the conservative ideals of family values and of taking the "middle road" (even through his heroes), and on the other hand he sought the modernization of Greek education and society. The diaspora is associated for Vikelas with writing as a means of communication and recollection, while the homeland is connected with actions beneficial to society. As M. Ditsa notes:

> Vikelas writes and for the most part first publishes all his œuvre (with the exception of his autobiography) during the time when he resides abroad permanently or for extended periods. He lived permanently in Athens for approximately ten years (always travelling abroad at least once a year), and during this period up

[22] See *Α. Παπαδιαμάντης Αυτοβιογραφούμενος*, ed. P. Moullas (Athens: Ermis 1974), pp. ιζ΄–ιη΄.

until his death (1898-1908), he is concerned with work for the public good.[23]

Vikelas's sojourn outside Greece and away from his mother heightens his sense of nostalgia and remembering, which in turn leads him to idealize certain people. His conservatism combined with his nostalgia should help to explain his tendency to sketch gentle, selfless characters in his prose. And this focus on people and on memory could be the result of the fact that Vikelas did not settle in, or create a special bond with, the foreign places in which he lived. He did not like Odessa, for example, neither did he make any effort to learn Russian.[24] But in England, too, he remained in the company of his uncles and aunts and in the environment of the trading office in which he worked.[25] Moreover, he was not well acquainted with English,[26] a fact which held true for many other of his compatriots who, for this reason I imagine, found it necessary to publish journals in England written in French.[27]

He had an especially close relationship with his mother and they were in frequent communication. It was to her that he sent his impressions of his travels, which later comprised the primary material for writing his recollections. Indeed, it seems that he kept a kind of diary of his travels and of his reading, something which must have been of use when he rearranged and compiled his recollections.[28]

Vikelas gives the impression of a particularly sensitive and nostalgic man, who because of his various places of origin,[29] and because he frequently moved from place to place, could not

---

[23] Marianna Ditsa's introduction to *Λουκής Λάρας*, p. 77. As the author notes, Vikelas discovers his Macedonian origins at the same time as he settles in Greece (p. 79).

[24] *Η Ζωή μου*, pp. 52-3.

[25] Ibid., pp. 164-5.

[26] Ibid., p. 102.

[27] I am thinking here of journals published in London such as *La Revue d'Orient* (1861), edited by Iakovos G. Pitzipios.

[28] See *Η Ζωή μου*, pp. 166 and 235-6.

[29] Although Vikelas was born in Ermoupolis and his parents in Constantinople, his grandfather on his mother's side was born in Ioannina and his paternal grandfather in Veroia.

attach himself to one particular place. As a result, he attempted to attach himself to people and even objects. The events he describes in relation to his uncle's desk are typical; he says, for example, "by a quirk of fate [the desk] continues to follow me even today, identifying itself with my existence."[30] His uncle Vasileios Melas brought this desk to Athens with his other furniture. After his death it ended up the property of his brother's eldest son Michael.

> But it does not make its new owner reminisce about the past, it is not associated with memories from his youth. [...] When the Society was founded for the distribution of beneficial books I asked him to leave it to me, and now, already an old man, I work at the desk I used to work at in my youth. At every moment its appearance brings to mind memories from that period of my life. Even inanimate objects have their say. They speak to our souls as old friends and endear themselves to us.[31]

This event strengthens the view that Vikelas's childhood was the happiest time of his life and that his memories from this period were like a fairy-tale.

Another reason for the emphasis on his childhood through his memories could be Vikelas's conviction that: "The impressions and the teachings received during childhood have a direct influence on the individual's subsequent moral life."[32] He also repeats this view elsewhere in his autobiography[33] and on two occasions it is accompanied by a reference to a well-known line from Wordsworth: "The Child is Father of the Man", taken from the poem "My Heart Leaps Up" (1807).[34] Vikelas admits that he admires and is inspired by the English poet,[35] but the double reference to the line indicates that Vikelas adopts the Romantic

---

[30] Ibid., p. 148.
[31] Ibid., pp. 148-9.
[32] Ibid., p. 19.
[33] Ibid., pp. 108, 113.
[34] In some ways Vikelas adopts the Romantic attitude to memory, and Wordsworth's *Prelude* is Romanticism's most autobiographical poem. Vikelas's interest in Wordsworth's poetry is also confirmed by A. Andreades, *Un Hellène ami de la France – Démétrius Bikélas*, Conférence faite le 12 Février 1910 à la salle du Parnasse (Athens 1910), pp. 11-12.
[35] *Η Ζωή μου*, pp. 167 and 232.

philosophy concerning the significance of childhood. The Romantics (Novalis, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Schiller) discovered the child as a source of freshness, unfamiliarity and rejuvenation in their attempt to restore the Edenic primary experience.[36] For them the child represented an escape from routine to a wondrous world, to the unfamiliar. The emphasis on childhood was not a sign of infancy but a recognition of the defining character of childhood and of the spiral course of mankind, which never escapes from childhood, but still incorporates a sense of development.

Vikelas's autobiographical recollections are a type of *Bildungsgeschichte*. This Romantic genre insists not on Christian transcendence and redemption but on the painful process of personal development, self-awareness and individual perfection. The emphasis lies on consciousness, self-knowledge and the sense of development, thus highlighting the evolutionary history of human consciousness. Its purpose is not to unite the individual with God, but to reconcile the subject with the object. Consequently the history of mankind, as of the individual, is not conceived of as a preparation for a celestial life but as a process of personal education, self-awareness and moral edification from childhood up to maturity; its ultimate aim is not to identify with God but is a gradual culmination of self-awareness and personal completion.

The Christian model of history (*Heilsgeschichte*) which presupposes the Creation, the Fall and the Redemption is translated to the level of human consciousness as stages or "moments" of self-knowledge (*Bildungsgeschichte*).[37] Theological history is modified to become a history of education, of gradual self-knowledge, adopting the voyage of discovery as its blue-print, a kind of Odyssey where the end is a return to the beginning. Vikelas uses autobiographical recollection to return to his youth and to his native origins, his birthplace. Of course, it is not a matter of the voyage being cyclical, but spiral. In other words it is not a mere return, but a return enriched with learning and self-knowledge, a type of Romantic *Bildungsgeschichte*,

---

[36] M.H. Abrams, *Natural Supernaturalism: Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature* (Palatino: W.W. Norton 1971), pp. 380-1.
[37] Ibid., pp. 96, 187-90.

which in turn leads us back to the reason for Vikelas's emphasis on characterization.

With reference to characterization, I would like to highlight the emphasis that Vikelas puts on the shaping, the education and the moral edification of the individual. This formation process is illustrated by means of biography. Biography is part of this characterization process since a number of his prose texts contain personal characterizations in the shape either of brief biographies or of obituaries. In addition, biography is linked with national history in the following statement from *Loukis Laras*: "The history of the individuals constitutes that of the nation"(123). It has to be said that what survives from his rather ordinary fiction are the characters which he draws, from Loukis Laras to Papa-Narkissos and Philippos Marthas. But in his other texts, too, one can find a number of character-sketches which blur the boundaries between biography, obituary and character study. For example, in *Lectures and Recollections* Vikelas presents us with the work and personalities of many foreign Hellenists: Emile Egger, Wilhelm Wagner, Marquis de Queux de Saint-Hilaire and Gustave d'Eichthal.

In *My Life* he dedicates two chapters to his uncles Leon and Vasileios Melas. Leon Melas is his role-model and the person with whom he identifies most. Neither uncle nor nephew, as the latter admits, was destined to become a successful businessman, both being predisposed to memoir writing. Vikelas mentions that his uncle was prompted to write his recollections by reading *Loukis Laras*[38] but did not complete them, leaving only an outline of his autobiography. He also shared his interest in the education of the young with his uncle, and this was prompted by his disappointment with the present state of affairs.

> His disappointment with the present was moderated by his hope, which was mostly based on the gradual education of future generations. This is the reason that the education of Greek children became his main concern and his exclusive preoccupation.[39]

---

[38] *Η Ζωή μου*, p. 129.
[39] Ibid., pp. 139-40.

Apart from his role-model uncle, he also depicts other people. He does not concentrate only on well-known figures, such as Stephanos Xenos or Alexandros Rizos Rangavis or Spyridon Trikoupis, but pays special attention to describing sensible and virtuous people like his aunt Loutsika and his brother-in-law Aristeides Oikonomos.[40]

Recollection and character formation collaborate in *Loukis Laras* also in order to chart the process of gradually growing old and the difference between maturity and youth. Vikelas often refers to the different ways in which the old and the young consider things and how the present sometimes alters the sense of the past.[41] Although the young seem to forget it, Vikelas insists that a recollection of the past is useful in many ways;[42] man should be aware of his past and of his experiences, and this is the indirect message of the last sentence of his novel: "Oftentimes, when I see my daughters and my granddaughters dressed up nicely, when I see my wife adorn her white hair with the latest European fashions, I remind her of the trousers she wore when I led her disguised on Pandelis's donkey and we both burst out laughing and give thanks to God from the bottom of our hearts" (240). However, in filtering the past through memory from the perspective of the present, he indirectly outlines both social development and his preference for older social practices.[43] Ultimately, his tendency towards recollection serves to boost his ideal of moral edification as much as his nostalgia ("Memories of my childhood often appear to me like a dream," 119).

At the basis of Vikelas's characterization lies the more general philosophical and pedagogic notion that man is not born but is moulded, that genius is not enough on its own, but education and study are also required. Indeed, he insists that sometimes it is beneficial to the poet or to the author to educate himself in ways which go against his natural inclinations.[44]

---

[40] Ibid., pp. 114-15, 219-21.
[41] See *Loukis Laras*, pp. 33, 48, 82.
[42] Ibid., p. 56.
[43] Ibid., pp. 176-7.
[44] Dimitrios Vikelas, *Διαλέξεις καί Ἀναμνήσεις* (1893), now in *Ἅπαντα*, vol. 5, p. 54. See also *Ἡ Ζωή μου*, pp. 126, 138 (but as an example of

The emphasis on education[45] and study also gives Vikelas an easy answer to the question of the role of art: is there a moral duty or can it be exclusively art for art's sake? In accordance with this view, art and the press should contribute to the moral edification of the reader. And this edification, of course, is not legislated for or controlled by rules, but via the cultivation and elevation of public opinion. As will be shown below, the idea of the middle road and of common sense has particular significance for him. Vikelas gives particular significance not only to the gradual formation and cultivation of public opinion but to the education of the author, who must "first learn to write before he makes an attempt at authorship", drawing on the work of ancient authors as well as the products of younger writers, "studying them closely and critically, without blind enthusiasm".[46]

The fact that Vikelas lived abroad not only increased his nostalgia, but also helped him to view all things Greek from a dispassionate and more detached perspective. His conservative temperament and his judicious approach collaborated with the distance that the diaspora afforded him, driving him to make reasoned judgements, especially concerning language. It is not only his conciliatory character that leads him to the middle road, but also his time abroad, especially that spent in England. Vikelas's middle road is not merely a compromise between *katharevousa* and demotic but the need to establish a written language which is different, on the one hand, from the spoken language or its dialects, and, on the other hand, from the archaic. The creation of an easy-to-understand, uncontrived literary language was necessary for him as a standard which would refute neither demotic nor *katharevousa*, acknowledging to some extent its polyglossia and linguistic hierarchy as was the case, in his experience, in other countries. Vikelas did not want to impose a single form of language or a conciliatory

---

inconsistency), and p. 113. Cf. Ditsa, op. cit., p. 42* and *Loukis Laras*, p. 150.

[45] See "Περί ἀγωγῆς" in *Διαλέξεις καί Ἀναμνήσεις*, pp. 61-75 and "Γυναικεία Ἀγωγή" (1904) from the journal *Ἐθνική Ἀγωγή* (now in *Ἅπαντα*, vol. 8, pp. 192-204).

[46] D. Vikelas, *Διαλέξεις καί Ἀναμνήσεις*, p. 60.

linguistic construct, but advocated the use of a suitable language for each occasion. He was driven by pragmatism and everyday experience, not by theory. He did not attempt, then, to solve the language question with a theoretical proposal but on the basis of what was occurring in other languages. And in this case England's example was probably a decisive factor, as is obvious from the following argument:

> In no other country is the written language indistinguishable from the vernacular. Linguistic uniformity has been achieved absolutely nowhere. It is generally believed that English has supremacy over other languages in this respect. But if one opens any English novel (for example that of Mrs Wood entitled *The Village Tragedy*, one of those which have been read most during the last two years), one would see that while the narration is in the usual literary tongue, the dialogue is written in the language of the interlocutors, a language which is difficult for foreigners to understand having learnt the language from books alone. Such diglossia does not seem curious to the English. Why should we not also endure this?[47]

The intense social stratification in England demands an analogous linguistic stratification, something which Vikelas puts into effect in his translations of Shakespeare:

> I dared to make use of this language in translating the dramas of Shakespeare, altering it out of necessity in accordance with the subject and the speaking characters; because Juliet's nanny speaking to the child speaks differently from Hamlet philosophizing. The philosophizing Hamlet uses terms and forms which the nanny did not learn at school. Otherwise the language that they both use is, in my opinion, identical.[48]

It seems that his experience of social diversity, especially in England, is what led Vikelas to his opinion regarding linguistic variety, that there should be one commonly accepted primary standard language (perhaps following the pattern of the ruling social class) and others secondary to it.

---

[47] Ibid., pp. 19-20.
[48] Ibid., p. 22.

not overestimate Greece's position, nor should they embrace the notion of the chosen people: "We in Greece usually consider that the whole world has its gaze constantly directed at us, that it is mostly concerned with us."[69] On reading these down-to-earth reflections by Vikelas, I am struck by how timely they are now and how little things have changed since his day. In the final analysis, then, the diaspora may have sharpened Vikelas's nostalgia, his tendency towards recollection and perhaps his conservatism; it also, however, increased his critical pragmatism.

Vikelas's case might help us to draw a tentative typology of the Greek diaspora writers during the period 1860-1930. The three main figures of this period, Vikelas, Psycharis and Cavafy, represent different positions towards mainland Greece. Vikelas is more constructive and pragmatic, Psycharis tends to be polemical and pugnacious, and Cavafy, as the most detached of them, ironic and critical. All three contributed differently to literary and cultural developments in Greece and this fact demonstrates the diversity and vitality of the Greek diaspora towards the end of the nineteenth century. It also shows that nineteenth-century Greek culture is a creation of rebels such as Roidis and Psycharis as much as of conservatives such as Vikelas, or even Palamas, despite the latter's occasional radical rhetoric.

It will be interesting in particular to draw a comparison between Vikelas and Cavafy. As near-contemporaries and coming from business families, both are critical of Greek society, but they represent two contrasting attitudes. Cavafy's stance is more challenging and uncompromising, whereas Vikelas's is more conciliatory and constructive. Their diaspora perspective must have had a direct effect on their literary writing too.

Vikelas based his work on memory and moral edification, looking towards his homeland critically but also nostalgically. On the other hand, Cavafy shunned nostalgia and morality, replacing them with irony and provocation. The former writer tried to bridge the gap between diaspora and homeland; the latter exploited it creatively, maintaining their separation. In short, Vikelas sought to raise standards and improve social

---

[69] Ibid., p. 184.

values, Cavafy fought to undermine them. The combination of history, memory and diaspora produced in the case of Cavafy a great poet and a self-effacing individual, and in the case of Vikelas a rather ordinary writer but a great public figure.

University of Birmingham

About the contributors

David Connolly studied Ancient Greek and Medieval and Modern Greek literature and holds a PhD in the theory and practice of literary translation. He has lived and worked in Greece since 1979; for a number of years he taught at the British Council in Athens, acting as head of translation there, and was subsequently Lecturer in literary translation at the Ionian University in Corfu. He has published numerous articles on translating and on various aspects on Greek literature. His published translations include works by Nikiforos Vrettakos, Odysseas Elytis, Kiki Dimoula, Nikos Engonopoulos and Haris Vlavianos.

Georgia Farinou-Malamatari is an Associate Professor of Modern Greek literature at the University of Thessaloniki. Her main interests are in Greek prose of the last two centuries and in literary theory. She is the author of several articles and two books on Papadiamantis (1987) and Beratis (1994). She is currently working on life writing, particularly the relations of biography and fiction in twentieth-century prose.

Peter Mackridge is Professor of Modern Greek at Oxford University and a Fellow of St Cross College. His chief publications are: *The Modern Greek language* (Oxford University Press 1985; Greek translation 1990) and *Dionysios Solomos* (Bristol Classical Press 1988; Greek translation 1995). He has co-authored *Greek: a comprehensive grammar of the modern language* (with David Holton and Irene Philippaki-Warburton, Routledge 1997) and edited two novels by Kosmas Politis and the volumes *Ancient Greek myth in Modern Greek poetry* (Frank Cass 1996) and *Ourselves and others: the development of a Greek Macedonian cultural identity since 1912* (with Eleni Yannakakis, Berg 1997).

Walter Puchner studied and taught at the University of Vienna, before settling in Greece. He taught for twelve years at the

University of Crete and is now a professor in the Department of Theatrical Studies at the University of Athens. He has published numerous books and articles on Greek and European theatre, as well as on folk poetry. His most recent books include: *Ο Παλαμάς και το θέατρο* (Kastaniotis 1995), *Φιλολογικά και θεατρολογικά ανάλεκτα. Πέντε μελετήματα* (Kastaniotis 1995), *Studien zum griechischen Volkslied* (Österreichisches Museum für Volkskunde 1996), *Κείμενα και αντικείμενα. Δέκα θεατρολογικά μελετήματα* (Kastaniotis 1997), and *Ο Κωνσταντίνος Χρηστομάνος ως δραματουργός* (Kastaniotis 1997).

Paul Sant Cassia has taught anthropology at the Universities of Turin, Cambridge and Malta. He currently teaches at the University of Durham. He has conducted fieldwork in Cyprus since 1977, as well as in Tunisia and Malta. He is the author (with Constantina Bada) of *The making of the Modern Greek family: Marriage and exchange in nineteenth-century Athens* (Cambridge University Press 1992), and is currently writing a book on social and political memory in Cyprus.

Dimitris Tziovas is Professor of Modern Greek Studies at the University of Birmingham. His most recent publications include the editing of a volume on *Greek Modernism and beyond* (Rowman & Littlefield 1997), and he has recently completed an edition of the short stories of A.R. Rangavis (to be published Athens 1998). He is also general editor of the Birmingham Modern Greek translations series.