Κάμπος

Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek

Cambridge No. 10 2002

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: £10.00
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. 10 2002**

Contents

Editorial

This is the tenth issue of *Κάμπος*, an event that should not go unremarked, since many an academic journal has failed to make it into double figures. Our first issue appeared in October 1993 and since then (almost) every issue has been published on time, at the start of each academic year. Only once did publication slip into the New Year, as a result of a combination of late submissions by authors and mechanical breakdown at the binders. This regularity has been possible because we are small. As everything is done by a few individuals, we are not prey to the inertia of large organisations, where competing priorities can frustrate even the most conscientious editor's carefully laid plans.

Because we are small and independent of commercial interests, we have been able to keep the selling price at a reasonable level – very reasonable compared to some journals. If we sold every copy printed we would make a profit. But of course that does not happen. Each year we distribute a number of complimentary copies, and we have also set up exchange arrangements with certain other journals or publication series. However, if *Κάμπος* is to survive into its second decade, we need to establish its financial viability and escape from the need to subsidise it with funds which could be used for other purposes. We need more paid-up subscribers, both individuals and institutions. *Κάμπος* has established itself as a serious publication in the field of Modern Greek Studies. Articles which first appeared here are regularly cited in the work of other scholars, and in bibliographies and reading lists. It seems, then, that there is a need for it.

At the end of this volume there is an index of the articles that have appeared in issues 1-10: some 51 articles by 42 different authors, whose home institutions are (or were) in Australia, Austria, Cyprus, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Israel, Sweden, Switzerland, and, of course, the United Kingdom. The range of subjects covered within the field of Modern Greek

Studies is also wide: literature, history, politics, anthropology, folklore, theatre, cinema, linguistics, music, religion, education, as well as broader cultural themes.

We have not diverged from the policy announced in the "Editor's notes" of issues 1 and 2. "Cambridge Papers" means precisely that: papers given at Cambridge by invited speakers, in the year immediately preceding. It remains our belief that *Κάμπος* can and does fulfil a role different from that of the established academic journals. We can publish relatively quickly, thanks to modern technology, but without sacrificing editorial standards. Some articles have immediate and direct relevance to the needs of undergraduates studying Modern Greek – and this can be particularly valuable on subjects where reliable studies are still lacking – while others have a more specialised research focus, and others again are directed to a more general audience. This variety is deliberate and, we firmly believe, worth maintaining. As long as resources permit, and there are scholars ready to contribute and subscribers willing to pay, we hope to continue.

The treasure of Ayios Symeon: a micro-historical analysis of colonial relations in Venetian-ruled Cyprus

Benjamin Arbel

The Cypriot village of Ayios Symeon is situated in the Karpass peninsula, about 70 km north-east of Famagusta. It is but one of many human settlements that have left few traces in the historical documentation of pre-modern or even early modern times. Two unpublished manuscripts contain evidence related to this village, based on population censuses carried out by two colonial administrations of the island: in 1565, the Venetians counted 116 free peasants in this village, registered as "Santo Simeo",[1] whereas seven years later, in a comprehensive census (*tahrir*) carried out shortly after their conquest of Cyprus, the Ottomans found at Ayios Symeon 41 households, 29 of which consisted of married couples, 11 of single adults and one of a widow, whose Greek names were meticulously registered in Arabic letters.[2] These numbers indicate that the village was rather small, and, comparing the figures in the two above-mentioned documents, it is possible to conclude that in the period under consideration its inhabitants, or at least their great majority, were free peasants (*francomati*).[3] However, apart from

---

[1] Archivio di Stato di Venezia [hereafter: ASV], Avvogaria di comun, Miscellanea Civil 179, No. Gen. 3926.

[2] Tapu ve kadastro müdürlüğü, Kuyudu kadime arşivi (Ankara), No. 506/64 [hereafter: *Tahrir*], f. 140v.

[3] This conclusion is based on the assumptions that the Venetian census referred to "souls" (*anime*), and that each household numbered, on average, four individuals. The seven-year interval between the two censuses also has to be taken into account. Serfs (*parici*) were not included in the 1565 census, but it is most likely that there were no serfs living at Ayios Symeon in 1565, as in many other Cypriot villages. For a general survey of the Cypriot peasantry under Venetian rule, see Benjamin Arbel, "Η Κύπρος υπό Ενετική Κυριαρχία", *Ιστορία της Κύπρου*, ed. Theodoros Papado-

their rare and momentary appearance in the Ottoman *tahrir* of 1572, the inhabitants of Ayios Symeon remain, on the whole, anonymous to us (the Venetian list does not include names), belonging to that vast majority of mankind that has been dubiously called "people without history". Yet, thanks to fortuitous circumstances, we get a rare opportunity to glimpse some moments in the lives of these peasants.

On 30 June 1559, three peasants of Ayios Symeon were busy repairing and whitewashing the church dedicated to the local patron saint. In their company there was another villager, a certain Zorlin, or Zorzin tu Glimin, an epileptic who for nearly a year had been going around telling people that Saint Symeon had appeared to him in a dream, revealing to him that there was a treasure hidden somewhere in the church. According to Zorzin, the Saint demanded that the treasure be uncovered and used to rebuild his church, or else it would be ruined and the village burnt to ashes.

Zorzin seems to have occupied the function of the village idiot, for nobody took him seriously and, according to later testimonies, he had been treated as a madman by the local inhabitants. Yet on that particular day, while the three villagers were working at the church, Zorzin again had one of his seizures, though he retained enough of his wits about him to insist that the stairs leading to the church be immediately removed to uncover the treasure which had been indicated by the Saint. Since they were already occupied in repairing the building, the three peasants decided to have a try. And, lo and behold, after removing the middle stair, they discovered three big clay jars full of gold ducats, and 99 additional coins of a similar sort scattered nearby. Altogether the hoard amounted to 1,721 gold ducats.[4]

Treasure-hunting seems to have been a rather common phenomenon in early modern Europe. As already observed by Keith Thomas with reference to sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England, in the absence of an alternative system of deposit banking, the possibility of coming across a hidden treasure in early-

---

poullos, 4/1 (Nicosia: Idryma Archiepiskopou Makariou III 1995), pp. 508-24.

[4] The reconstruction of the events is based on a batch of reports from Cyprus, preserved in ASV, Senato Mar, filza 22 (30 June-16 July 1559).

modern Europe was by no means a chimera;[5] to which I would add the observation that even in those few places, such as Venice, where deposit banks existed, their frequent bankruptcies must also have encouraged people to hide money and valuables in secret caches. Anyhow, our case occurred in a rural setting, in a rather remote area of a rather remote (though important) Venetian colony in the eastern Mediterranean. Moreover, at least on the face of it, it does not concern treasure-hunters using techniques of necromancy, of the kind studied by several historians during recent years,[6] but rather what appears to be a miraculous event, in which the persons directly concerned were only instrumental, and not active and intentional treasure-hunters.

Before proceeding to analyse our little story, let us put it into its historical, cultural and documentary context. A brief reminder of the political and institutional situation would probably not be out of place. Cyprus, an independent Frankish kingdom ruled by the Lusignan dynasty since 1192, came under Venetian rule, in practice from 1473, and remained a Venetian colony until its conquest by the Ottomans in 1571.[7] The island was mainly inhabited by Orthodox Greeks, but well before the Venetian takeover the local élites were dominated by the so-called Frankish aristocracy, whose ethnic and cultural profile was rather heterogeneous. Loyal to its pragmatic system of imperial government, Venice tended to leave unchanged the social, religious and cultural infrastructure inherited from the Lusignan régime, before

---

[5] Keith Thomas, *Religion and the decline of magic. Studies in popular belief in sixteenth and early seventeenth century England* (New York: Oxford University Press 1999), pp. 234-5.

[6] E.g. K. Thomas, op. cit.; Jean-Michel Sallmann, *Chercheurs de trésors et jeteuses de sorts. La quête du surnaturel à Naples au XVIe siècle* (Paris: Aubier 1986); Ruth Martin, *Witchcraft and the Inquisition in Venice 1550-1650* (Oxford: B. Blackwell 1989), esp. pp. 86-96, 148-55; Guido Ruggiero, *Binding passions. Tales of magic, marriage and power at the end of the Renaissance* (New York: Oxford University Press 1993), pp. 206-12; David Gentilcore, *From Bishop to Witch. The system of the sacred in early modern Terra d'Otranto* (Manchester: Manchester University Press 1992), pp. 228-32.

[7] For the Venetian domination of Cyprus, see Arbel, "Η Κύπρος", pp. 455-536; idem, *Cyprus, the Franks and Venice, 13th-16th centuries* [Variorum Collected Studies Series] (Aldershot: Ashgate 2000).

embarking on a long process of changes and adaptations intended to integrate the territory into the Venetian system of government. Only the most urgent institutional changes were introduced at the beginning of Venetian rule: the Republic replaced the Queen, the feudal *Haute Cour* was suppressed, and Venetian governors were stationed in the main towns. But legal traditions, the Orthodox Church with its Greek bishops dependent on the Roman hierarchy, the feudal and seigniorial system in the countryside, including serfdom, were for the most part left intact.

Venetian governors of overseas territories were required to report frequently on any matter of some importance to the central organs of government in Venice, and their range of autonomy in ruling the territory under their administration was limited. Their term of office usually lasted two years, during which they continuously kept the Signory posted about developments on the island. On their return, they had to present a detailed report to the Venetian Senate, and were held responsible for any misconduct during their service overseas. Periodical tours of inspection were also carried out by the so-called *Sindici*, who had the authority to arrest governors and bring them to trial in Venice. Consequently, in spite of the great distance separating Venice and Cyprus (the sea voyage could last between one and two months in each direction), the central authorities in Venice were no less well informed about developments on Cyprus than about those in other parts of their colonial empire.

The little story – to which we shall now return – is in fact a reconstruction made on the basis of material sent to Venice by the governor of Famagusta, whose jurisdiction included the Karpass peninsula. This material included not only the report written by Venice's colonial magistrate, but also the minutes of an enquiry carried out by lower officials in the village of Ayios Symeon on the governor's orders.

The discovery of a treasure hoard by three peasants in a little village could apparently not be kept a secret. As was customary in Cyprus, the lord of the village, Bernardo della Gridia, was not present, preferring to live in town. He did not even directly exploit his estate (which, most likely, was not his

principal fief), preferring to lease it for a fixed income.[8] But in the village there was an administrator, with the title of *civitan*

---

[8] The family, whose origin is yet to be established, is mentioned in numerous documents of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Jean Richard adopted Menardos's suggestion that this family name derived from Agridion, a name given to several fiefs, both in Cyprus and elsewhere; according to Richard. the village to which this family name related was Agridia located to the north west of Nicosia. See Simon Menardos, "Τοπωνυμικόν της Κύπρου", *Αθηνά* 18 (1907) 372, cited in: Leontios Makhairas, *Recital concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus entitled "Chronicle"*, ed. R.M. Dawkins, vol. 2 (Oxford: The Clarendon Press 1932), ch. 640, n. 2; Jean Richard, *Chypre sous les Lusignan. Documents Chypriotes des Archives du Vatican (XIVe et XVe siècles)* (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner 1962), p. 148, n. 2. However, the main estate of the Della Gridia family seems to have been Critia (Krideia), probably the village bearing that name in the Karpass peninsula, from which the family name must have originated. See Gilles Grivaud and Aspasia Papadaki, "L'Institution de la *Mostra Generale* de la Cavalerie féodale en Crète et en Chypre vénitienne durant le XVIe siècle", *Studi veneziani* n.s. 12 (1986) 191 (mentioning Bernardo della Gridia's feudal obligation stemming from his lordship of Critia in 1557 and 1560). Yotin de La Gridie (Γιοτήν τε Λα Γριδίε) accompanied Henry de Lusignan overseas in 1413: Makhairas, *Recital concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus* vol. 1, p. 625, ch. 640 and n. 2. Thomas de La Gridia (Τουμάς τε Λα Γριδία), *chevetin* of Sivouri, had been killed at Khirokitia during the Mamluk invasion of 1426: Makhairas, *Recital*, I, p. 665, ch. 685. Guy de la Gride appears as one of the two knights representing the Haute Cour in two royal documents of 2 March 1440 and 4 April 1441: Richard, *Chypre sous les Lusignan*, pp.148, 150, and also as a beneficiary of a fixed income from the village of Piscopia in 1468: Jean Richard (ed.), *Le Livre des remembrances de la Secrète du royaume de Chypre* (Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre 1983), p. 86. The latter could probably be identified with Guy de la Garde, who appears in another document of 1468: Louis de Mas Latrie, *Histoire de l'île de Chypre sous le règne des princes de la maison de Lusignan*, 3 vols (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale 1852-61), III (1855), p. 264 (Mas Latrie's edition abounds with misspellings). Other family members who appear in contemporary documents are dame Perrin de La Gride, who received the village of Lapithos from King Jacques II, and Morpho de La Gridia, whose name appears in a list of Cypriot incomes which may be attributed to the years 1513-1521: Florio Bustron, "Historia overo commentarii de Cipro", ed. René de Mas Latrie, *Collection de Documents inédits sur l'histoire de France. Mélanges historiques*, vol. 5 (Paris 1886), p. 420; Mas Latrie, *Histoire*, III, 500.

e banier, who appears to have learned very quickly about the event and duly reported it to the *bailo* (or *balio*) of the Karpass peninsula, who resided in the village of Koma, or Komi. This *bailo* was a district administrator who was normally elected from among the Cypriot burghers of Famagusta. The *bailo* immediately dispatched the news by horseman to the Venetian Captain of Famagusta, who received the news on the night of 1 July, precisely at nine o'clock, as stated in the papers later dispatched to Venice. Without much delay, the Captain sent out the head of his chancery to carry out an investigation on the spot, an operation that lasted a few days. In the meantime he also reported the affair to the governor-general (*luogotenente*) in Nicosia and to his councillors. Another high-ranking official, bearing the title of *provveditor general*, was also present in the colony, and was likewise informed of the affair.

As far as the circumstances of the discovery were concerned, one can hardly find any substantial disagreement in the testimonies of the various persons questioned by the officials, and the above reconstruction is therefore based on their repetitive and more or less identical versions. The slight variances that do exist stem from the different functions played by the protagonists, as well as from their corresponding whereabouts at the moment of the discovery. Zorzin tu Glimin told the investigators that the Saint had appeared to him on the morning of the previous day, telling him that those who were working in the church were supposed to discover "his" (the Saint's) treasure under the middle stair leading to the entrance. But he could not remember what was going on during his epileptic seizure. Marco tu Zacu and Zorzi tu Pieru described how Zorzin indicated where the hoard should be unearthed and described their actions leading to the discovery. Georgi tu Papa Johanni added that Zorzin had reiterated the same story about the Saint a thousand times in the past, but nobody took him seriously, believing him mad. The village priest, Papa Iani de Zacu, related that he was called to the scene by his son, who had been dispatched to him by Zorzin (apparently recovered from his seizure). When he came to the church the jars had already been placed on the altar, and the remaining 99 ducats were on the church's floor. The village administrator (*civitan e banier*), Sozomeno tu Tomasin, testified that on his return from his field he came upon a gathering around

of pure gold. Compared to the amounts of money dealt with by Venetian merchants in Mediterranean trade, it cannot be viewed as a huge sum, but in the small world of a remote Cypriot village, that sum must have constituted an enormous fortune. Even for Venetian magistrates on the island, 1721 ducats could not be regarded as a trifle. For example, in 1538 the salary of the Captain of Famagusta, one of the highest among the hundreds of Venetian magistracies, amounted to 2,000 ducats of account per year (a little less than 2,000 gold ducats), half of which was held back as caution-money. The value of the treasure unearthed at Ayios Symeon was therefore only slightly lower than the Captain's yearly income. The income of subordinate officials was, of course, considerably lower.[12]

In trying to present as complete a picture as possible to the authorities back home, the Venetian magistrates also included information related to the legal aspects of this case. Interestingly, what Navagero and Diedo could find in this respect was a section of a chapter in the Assizes of the *Cour des Bourgeois* in Italian translation. As already stated, Venice did not abolish the previous legal arrangements of the insular kingdom. In 1531, the Republic even ordered the Assizes of the *Haute Cour*, as well as those of the *Cour des Bourgeois*, the two main law codes of the Lusignan kingdom, to be translated from the Old French original into Italian, and four years later these codes appeared in print. We also know that several Greek translations of the latter were made, one of them during Venetian rule in 1512.[13] Thus, citing a chapter of this law code would not have been exceptional in this context.

It is, however, surprising to find in the quoted Assize a specific reference to treasures discovered as a result of an apparition (*in vision*, and in the French original *par avision*; the Greek translation has διά ονείρου). This section of the law actually deals with two theoretical possibilities. In the first, a treasure is dug up on the basis of information or of an apparition,

---

[12] For the Captain's salary, see Sir George Hill, *A History of Cyprus*, vol. III (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1948), p. 866.

[13] Maurice Grandclaude, *Etude critique sur les Livres des Assises de Jérusalem* (Paris: Jouve & Compagnie 1923), pp. 30, 38; Hill, *A History of Cyprus*, III, 770-1.

without obtaining beforehand licence from the Lord of the land (i.e. the king), in which case it is considered to be a theft and is dealt with accordingly. In the second possibility mentioned in the Assize, licence is requested and granted, and the uncovered hoard is then divided as follows: one half to the king, and the other half divided between the landowner and the person who discovered the treasure; if the latter is also the landowner he is entitled to one third of the hoard, whereas the remaining two thirds supposedly belong to the royal treasury.[14]

The case of Ayios Symeon, as presented by the various persons involved, does not exactly resemble the cases described in the Assize. The information about the treasure had been spread by a person who was believed to be mad by his fellow villagers. It had been common knowledge for ten or eleven months, but nobody was ready to believe in it. Admittedly, the diggers did not ask for a licence, but their initiative was spontaneous and not pre-meditated, at least it was presented as such by everyone involved in the operation. In any case, the final decision as to the fate of the treasure was left to the Venetian Senate, which was supposed to pass its verdict on the basis of the material sent from Cyprus in mid-July 1559.

* * *

At this point the first chapter of the plot is concluded. To analyse it one can follow at least two complementary lines of interpretation. The first, more speculative in nature, would be an attempt to explain in more rational terms the miraculous event. The second would leave the story as it is, trying to learn something from the indirect evidence it offers, the *modus operandi* of the various persons and institutions involved in this affair.

The author of this paper is not easily led to believe in supernatural intervention and miraculous apparitions, and is therefore

---

[14] Cf. "Assises de la Cour des Bourgeois", ed. Beugnot, in *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades*, vol. II (Paris: Imprimerie Royale 1843), pp. 214-15. The law bears the number 283 (in other versions 246 and 276). The Italian transcription refers to "No. 124"; for a Greek version see C. Sathas, *Bibliotheca Graeca Medii Aevi*, 9 vols. (Paris: Maisonneuve 1880-90), VI, pp. 220-2.

to receive the part pertaining to him by law. A few days later, however, he expressed his willingness to use the money to rebuild the church and to maintain a priest there. Another person, described as "the prior of the church" (*il prior della chiesia*), also demanded that the money be used to rebuild it.

There was also some kind of arm-wrestling between two senior Venetian magistrates: both the Captain of Famagusta, Piero Navagero, and the *Provveditor General*, Andrea Duodo, purported to have the authority to decide about the fate of the treasure. Apart from defending the honour and status of their respective offices, both magistrates must have hoped to gain some personal profit from judging the case, as was habitual in the Venetian judicial system. Captain Navagero even included in his dispatch to Venice a note specifying that many cases concerning treasures had been dealt with by his predecessors, and that they were normally resolved by dividing the sum into three parts: one to the state (*al dominio*), one to the Captain, and one to the informant [?] (the word referring to the last is difficult to decipher). But in view of their disagreement, the two senior magistrates finally resolved that the entire dossier be passed to the central authorities in Venice for a final decision. Thus it is that the documents pertaining to the affair have come to be preserved in the Venetian State Archives.

The material sent to Venice is accompanied by a report signed by both Navagero and Duodo. The general description of the affair is supplemented by a few remarks that shed additional light on this story, or reflect the writers' impressions. The gold ducats are said to have been old ones (*ducati d'oro venetiani antiqui*), and the church is also described as very old (*molto vechia*). Both magistrates consider Zorzin to be a poor chap suffering from seizures of epilepsy (*malcaduco*) and regarded as a madman by his fellow villagers.

Finally, Captain Navagero reports having deposited in the colony's treasury 517 ducats as the part belonging to the state (constituting about 30% of the total), intending to bring the remaining sum to Venice upon his return, which was due to take place shortly afterwards.

The excitement over the discovery of the hoard is understandable, considering its substantial value. 1721 gold ducats, weighing some 3.5 grams each, made up around 6 kg (or 13.23 lb)

the church. After hearing what it was all about, he immediately sent a message to Matio Colte, the district administrator (*bailo*) of the Karpass peninsula, residing in the village of Komi (Koma).[9] Other villagers, Piero Turda, Zorzi Papa, Zorzi de P[ier]o Derdi, did not have much to add to the previous testimonies. Piero Valderio, a burgher from Famagusta who himself occupied on several occasions different public offices, such as *bailo* of Karpass and Viscount of Famagusta, and who, according to the investigation, must have held some responsibility over the churches in the area, appeared before the Captain of Nicosia testifying that for some ten months Zorzin had been telling him too about the apparitions of Saint Symeon.[10]

Before long other persons became involved in the affair. Nicolo Sguropolo, lessee of the village, belonged to a respectable burgess family from Nicosia, whose members had often been involved in the lease and the administration of villages in the royal, and later in the Venetian, administration.[11] He claimed to be entitled to a portion of the hoard. Bernardo della Gridia, Lord of Ayios Symeon, after having been informed about the discovery of a treasure in his village, presented a formal request

---

[9] In the Ottoman census of 1572 there are three rather big villages bearing such a name, or a similar one: Komi, a location which included a bazaar, with 192 households and a total income of 40,000 *akçe;* Naphtakomi [Hephtakomi], with 174 households and a total income of 35,000; and Koma, with 94 households, including one Moslem, and a revenue of 12,280: *Tahrir*, ff. 126v-129r.

[10] On this personality, see Piero Valderio, *La guerra di Cipro*, eds. Gilles Grivaud and Nasa Patapiou (Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre 1996), p. 3.

[11] A medical doctor, Dimitri Sguoropoulo [sic], received an annual provision from the Crown in 1469: Richard, *Livre des remembrances*, p. 57, No. 119. A certain Nicolo Sguro is mentioned in the list of persons who received lands from Jacques II in the 1460s: F. Bustron, "Historia", p. 421. Zenio Sguropulo, described as "citadin de Nicosia", bought a serf from the royal domain in 1494: Georgios Ploumidis, *Οι βενετοκρατούμενες ελληνικές χώρες μεταξύ του δευτέρου και του τρίτου τουρκοβενετικού πολέμου (1503-1537)* (Ioannina: Panepistimion Ioanninon 1974), p. 125; the name of a certain Alvise Sguropulo appears as a *provisionato a cavallo* in a list of Cypriots who participated in the *mostra*, or military array, arranged in 1560: Grivaud and Papadaki, "L'Institution de la *Mostra Generale*", p. 192.

tempted to offer an alternative explanation for this story. Yet, a conspiracy theory, which would regard Saint Symeon's apparition and its consequences as an invention intended to justify or to cover up a different reality, is rather difficult to substantiate, considering that none of the many persons directly or indirectly involved, many of whom had conflicting interests in this affair, showed any sign of disbelief in the simple tale which was told by Zorzin and the three peasants and was supported by other people who had known Zorzin before the discovery of the hoard. Our rational way of thinking leaves us perplexed in view of such a unanimous consensus.

The church was described as very old and the coins discovered under its stairs as "antique". But the hoard allegedly included only Venetian coins, which somehow points to a Venetian connection. Supposing that they were really discovered on the spot, one can only imagine that they had been left there under personal duress or during a political crisis. We can only offer a few speculations for the latter possibility. The period of Venetian domination was, on the whole, comparatively peaceful, certainly before the Ottoman invasion of 1570. The previous war with the Ottomans lasted between 1537 and 1540, but apart from some minor raids, Cyprus was not one of its main arenas of military operations. Moreover, the description of the ducats as "antique" excludes a linkage with events that took place merely two decades earlier. One would rather think of the bloody struggles that characterized the pre-Venetian period, such as the Mamluk invasions of the 1420s, the struggle for the crown during the 1460s and early 1470s, or the wars between the Cypriot kings and the Genoese, who held Famagusta between 1373 and 1464. In fact, the Venetian presence on Cyprus had begun long before the island formally became part of the Venetian empire. Could it be that information about a treasure hidden under the church's stairs somehow reached the ears of poor Zorzin, in whose confused mind it was later transformed into an apparition? Perhaps, though one could probably offer other, equally convincing explanations.

Speculation would not, in fact, lead us very far. It would probably be more instructive to accept the story at face value and to examine the course of its development. Indeed, the very fact that no one questioned its veracity is in itself most significant.

The readiness of so many people of such a variety of social and cultural backgrounds to accept the story as truth may indicate that apparitions of this kind were not considered to be such an exceptional phenomenon. True, the Assizes, the laws of the kingdom, which had a clause specifically referring to the discovery of a treasure following an apparition, had originated in the distant years of the thirteenth century, but the reactions to the affair and the reference made by the Venetian authorities to that specific Assize suggest that it was not regarded as obsolete. If there were any individuals, either Cypriots or Venetians, who did not believe in saintly intervention, they certainly did not dare to make their suspicions public. In fact, this complete credulity indicates how such a story could be a perfect cover-up for any illegal act.

The use of the Assizes also helps to clarify the legal aspects of Venice's colonial administration. Venetian policy in the legal sphere was quite clear. As far as the criminal law was concerned, Venetian legislation served as a common law for all Venetian territories, and had, in principle, priority over local traditions. But in the civil sphere, Venetian magistrates throughout the empire were instructed to pass judgments on the basis of local laws and legal traditions, using the Venetian laws only in cases where local laws did not provide an adequate response to a specific problem. Venetian magistrates were also granted authority to pass sentences "according to their own judgment", when neither local nor Venetian law offered any solution. However, beyond these general principles, a long process of assimilation on the one hand, and the growing tendency of intervention by Venetian institutions on the other, increased the weight of Venice's legal tradition in the judicial systems of the Republic's overseas territories.[15] The way in which the treasure of Ayios Symeon was treated is a case in point. The Captain's report reveals that previous cases had already been decided not exactly according to the order established in the relevant Assize, but rather by allotting one third of the money to the public treasury, one third to the deciding magistrate, and one third to the informant;[16] and he adds that he proceeded in the same

[15] Arbel, "Η Κύπρος", pp. 460-5.

[16] The papers even mention a specific case, dealt with on 2 April 1555.

manner in the present case. His decision was only obstructed by the intervention of the *provveditore*, who was probably hoping that part of the hoard would reach his own pocket.

The treasure episode also demonstrates to what extent it is impossible for a colonial administration to function properly without the collaboration of its colonial subjects. The village's *civitan e banier*, the *bailo* of the Karpass peninsula, the head of the Captain's chancellery, to whom one may add Piero Valderio, who occupied at different periods both the office of *bailo* and that of Viscount of Famagusta, were all Cypriots, either Greeks or Latins. Of course, these persons occupied subordinate offices, the main positions of command being reserved for Venetian magistrates. But it is also obvious that without the assistance of these subordinate officials, who had a command of Greek and were well-acquainted with local laws, customs and traditions, the Venetian administration would have remained quite helpless.

These Cypriots who served the colonial administration or collaborated with it in many ways, constituted a rather heterogeneous, and by no means small group of people. Part of them were Latin or Greek aristocrats, such as the Lord of Ayios Symeon, who resided in Nicosia and was a member of its urban council, where he could hope to be elected to various public offices or gain different advantages from the Venetian rulers.[17] Others were burghers, mostly Greek but not necessarily so, such as the leaseholder of Ayios Symeon, who belonged to a respectable Greek family from Nicosia. From his social milieu were recruited those Cypriots who served in the *Secreta*, or main chancery of the colony in Nicosia, as well as alongside every Venetian magistrate on the island, such as the governor-general (*luogotenente*) and his two councillors, the financial officers (*camerarii*), the Captains of Famagusta, Paphos and Saline. Finally, as exemplified in the case of Ayios Symeon, hundreds of Cypriots must have served as functionaries in the nearly one

---

[17] Benjamin Arbel, "Urban Assemblies and Town Councils in Frankish and Venetian Cyprus", *Πρακτικά του Δευτέρου Διεθνούς Κυπριολογικού Συνεδρίου*, Vol. 2 (Nicosia: Society of Cypriot Studies 1986), pp. 203-13, republished in: Arbel, *Cyprus, the Franks and Venice*, art. IV.

thousand villages that existed on the island, many of which were owned by the state.

At the same time, this case also reflects the power hierarchy prevailing in the Cypriot judicial system. The code known as "Assises de la Cour des Bourgeois" apparently pertained to the Burghers' Court headed by the Viscount. Such courts existed both in Nicosia and in Famagusta (the latter would probably have been the appropriate one in our case),[18] but the Burghers' or the Viscount's court is not even mentioned in the documentation, probably because the amount of money involved exceeded its formal authority. The limitation of the Viscount's judicial authority could already have been an established fact before the Venetian take-over (although this remains to be clarified), but under the rule of Venice it assumed a new significance, since the Viscounts, as well as the members of the jury comprising the court, were Cypriots, whereas the Captain and other senior magistrates were Venetians.[19]

The hierarchy of power in the colony is likewise very clearly reflected in the developments following the discovery of the treasure. In the village itself, there was no one with sufficient authority to have any significant say in this affair. The village administrator (*civitan e banier*) seems to have been a peasant himself, for he testified that he encountered the "treasure company" when returning from his field. Both the lord of the village, who must have been a Latin, and the lessee, a Greek to judge from his name, seem to have been absent from the village. This was a typical pattern in Cyprus, where the aristocrats and burghers owning or leasing rural estates resided in the towns, mostly in Nicosia.[20] There was also no question of passing the case to the village court, which most probably did not exist any more at that stage, certainly not with regard to the free

---

[18] For Famagusta, where the court became integrated with the Syrians' court in the fifteenth century, see Jean Richard, "La cour des Syriens de Famagouste d'après un texte de 1448", *Byzantinische Forschungen* 12 (1987) 383-98, reprinted in his: *Croisades et Etats latins d'Orient* (London: Variorum 1992), art. XVII.

[19] Arbel, "Η Κύπρος", pp. 460-6.

[20] Ibid., p. 491.

tenants.[21] The district administrator (*bailo* of Karpass) at Komi, also a Cypriot, had likewise no real power to take any decision in such cases. Without even trying to pass judgment, he immediately sent word to Famagusta, the real centre of power, invested in the Captain's magistracy. None of the persons involved appears to have contested this hierarchy of power, and the Captain himself, as well as the *provveditore*, also submitted the case to the Senate's authority, since they could not reach agreement as to who was entitled to pass a judgment in the colony.

* * *

We should now return to the second chapter of our story, and follow the developments of this affair outside Cyprus. Piero Navagero finished his term of office as Captain of Famagusta in July 1559, just a few days after writing his report concerning the treasure of Ayios Symeon (he was soon to return to Cyprus as governor-general, or *luogotenente*).[22] Leaving behind 517 ducats that he deposited in the colony's treasury, he took along with him to Venice the remaining 1206 ducats. As it happened, however, the ship he was sailing on, the *Veniera*, encountered the Ottoman fleet on its way home. To appease the Ottoman commander, Navagero had to part with 200 gold ducats out of the sum that he was carrying with him. Luckily, the remaining 1006 ducats arrived safely in Venice and were duly deposited in the mint, pending government decision.

The case was apparently not considered to be very urgent. It was discussed in the Venetian *Collegio* only towards the end of January 1560 (n.s.) and put to the vote before the Senate as late as 28 March 1560. Referring to the treasure that had been "miraculously discovered" following the apparition of St Symeon to "Zorlin tu Glimini", the Senate declared that it would be in harmony with the piety of the Venetian state to act in this matter in a way that would honour God and express the devotion of the Venetians to His Saints, so that matters appertaining to God would remain entirely His, without any diminution. Con-

[21] Ibid., pp. 464, 516.
[22] Ibid., pp. 534-5.

sequently, it was decided that the money brought to Venice, together with 200 ducats taken from the public treasury to compensate for the sum given to the Ottoman commander, was to be returned to Cyprus and added there to the 517 ducats left in the colony by Navagero. The entire hoard, as originally discovered, was thus to be reconstituted. Subsequently, 300 ducats out of the reconstituted sum were to be given to Zorzin tu Glimin. In case he was no longer alive and had no successors, the sum was to be reintegrated with the rest of the money, which was to be earmarked for the reconstruction of the church of Ayios Symeon, for lighting the same church and for the continuation of religious services there, under the responsibility of the colony's governors.[23]

The Senate's decision is most exceptional in the wider context of Venice's colonial policy. As could be expected in any colonial system, the direction in which money and other resources moved between Venice and its overseas territories was normally the other way round. Even when faced with an urgent necessity to invest in any colony's building projects, defence or public works, Venetian governing bodies always preferred to cover the expenses from the income of the colony itself. In the present case, not only was the pattern reversed, but this extraordinary decision was approved by an overwhelming majority of 182 supporters, against just two senators who opposed the motion, and two others who preferred to abstain.

How can one explain this unusual behaviour on the part of the Venetian senators? The place of religion in Venetian politics is a complex issue. Though always keen to protect the autonomy of the Venetian Church vis-à-vis Rome, Venice also jealously protected its image of a most pious Republic. Foreign observers were impressed by the great number of churches and monasteries in the city, and the concentration of many relics in Venice was intended to enhance its image as a saintly city. The myth and rituals around the figure of Saint Mark were central components of Venice's political symbolism. Venetians had served as popes and cardinals and were deeply involved in the leadership of the

[23] ASV, Senato Mar, Reg. 35, ff. 30-30v (28 March 1560).

Roman Church.[24] The involvement of the State in religious affairs in Venice is further evidence of the importance attributed to religion by the leaders of the patriciate, particularly during those years of the militant Counter-Reformation, which also saw the publication of the Index, and the last session of the Council of Trent.

However, Venice was also a foremost commercial power, and its capital a truly cosmopolitan metropolis. In the mid-sixteenth century, one could always encounter in its *piazza*, *campi* and narrow streets a great variety of characters: alongside the Venetians themselves, many of whom were of foreign extraction, there were numerous subjects from Venice's Italian territories, as well as Greeks, Jews, Armenians, Slavs, Germans (including Protestants), and even some Muslims. These groups played a central role, as traders, seamen and mediators, in Venice's system of international trade, and in its function as "the hinge of Europe".[25] In the difficult period of growing intolerance that characterized the age of the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation, Venice was a haven of relative toleration, where no religious wars were being waged, and where people who would have been persecuted elsewhere could live in relative safety. The Venetian colonies in the eastern Mediterranean were part of this world.

This relatively tolerant policy developed from what may seem as a contradictory situation: on the one hand, Venice invested great efforts in maintaining and supporting its highly sophisticated system of international trade, in which the Ottoman empire constituted a major partner; but on the other hand, the same Ottoman empire was the main threat to Venice's presence in the eastern Mediterranean, particularly to its hold of its remotest colony – the island of Cyprus. The Republic therefore conducted a very cautious policy, trying to avoid war as much as possible, but at the same time taking precautions to defend its territories for the eventuality of such a war.

---

[24] By 1565 there were seven Venetians in the Sacred College: William Bouwsma, *Venice and the defense of Republican Liberty* (Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press 1968), p. 187.

[25] The term was coined by William McNeill in his: *Venice, the Hinge of Europe, 1081-1797* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1974).

Cyprus clearly represents the Venetian dilemma. Not only was the island a very important component of the Venetian system of commercial navigation in the eastern Mediterranean, but it was also the biggest and richest of Venice's overseas colonies, and a source of essential products, such as grain, cotton and salt. Yet the island was much closer to Ottoman lands than to Venice, its population was overwhelmingly Greek Orthodox, rural and rather miserable. In view of the Ottoman threat, Venice tried to alleviate the burden placed on the Cypriot peasants, but apparently not sufficiently. The survival of serfdom, growing demographic pressure, problems of food supply, religious tensions and Ottoman meddling in Cypriot affairs, would produce serious troubles in the colony in 1563. In 1558, shortly before the affair of Ayios Symeon, the Republic had organized a peasant militia on the island, and in 1559-60 it was making efforts to ensure the collaboration of the free peasants (*francomati*) who were supposed to serve in this corps.[26] It is most likely that in debating the fate of the treasure of Ayios Symeon, the Venetian Senators took into consideration these wider aspects of Mediterranean and Cypriot realities of the late 1550s and early 1560s.

* * *

To conclude, an affair originating in an obscure Cypriot village has enabled us to follow a few moments in the history of colonial relations in Venetian-ruled Cyprus. The first chapter, whose main protagonists were the villagers of Ayios Symeon, remains puzzling for anyone unwilling to believe in the reality of saintly apparitions, though it can very well serve to expose both the deep-rooted belief in supernatural phenomena and the reality behind the formal institutional framework of that large Venetian colony. The second chapter allowed us to place this plot in the wider context of the Venetian world. The Venetian senators, though somewhat extraneous to the forms of piety of the Greek Orthodox Cypriot peasants, must have been influenced by the growing wave of religiosity characterizing the Catholic world during those years. In our specific case, this tendency har-

[26] Arbel, "Η Κύπρος", p. 480.

monized with political interests which aimed to demonstrate to its Greek subjects Venice's benevolence and respect for their religious traditions, in view of the threat of the Counter-Reformation, growing pressures inside the colony and the external pressure exerted by the Ottomans. The miraculous event could therefore be used to enhance the image of the holy Republic, in whose empire saints chose to appear in visions, thus enabling Greeks and Catholics alike to express their Christian piety.

On 19 September 1560, the governors of Cyprus reported that after having received the Senate's decision, they proceeded to the reconstitution of the entire sum and carried out the Senate's instructions.[27] However, ten years later began the Ottoman invasion that ended with the annexation of Cyprus to the Turkish empire. Unfortunately for Saint Symeon, the village bearing his name not only became part of a Muslim empire, but his church was not destined to function for long. When Louis de Mas Latrie visited the village in 1878, it was already inhabited exclusively by Turks.[28]

Tel Aviv University

[27] ASV, Senato, Dispacci da Cipro, filza 2.

[28] Louis de Mas Latrie, *L'Ile de Chypre, sa situation présente et ses souvenirs du Moyen Age* (Paris: Firmin-Didot 1879), p. 203.

Odysseus Elytis on poetic expression: *Carte blanche*

David Connolly

...I am neither a critic nor a prose-writer
Odysseus Elytis

Though more than twenty years have passed since Theofanis G. Stavrou, writing in his "Notes on the *Open book* of Odysseus Elytis", stated that: "Odysseus Elytis' national and international reputation as a poet has, until recently, obscured the fact that he is also an accomplished prose writer and a sensitive critic..." (Stavrou 1975: 701), it is doubtful whether anything has changed either in Greece or abroad. Stavrou was referring to Elytis's prose works prior to 1974 when these works were published collectively in a single volume comprising some 516 pages and entitled *Ανοιχτά χαρτιά* (translated into English as the "Open book" or "Open papers", though hereafter referred to as "Cards on the table"[1]). His observation is even more striking today, following the publication in 1992 of a second volume of collected essays and critical writings comprising 428 pages and entitled *Εν λευκώ* [translated into English as "Carte blanche"]. Since then, two further prose works have appeared, *Ο κήπος με τις ανταπάτες* [The garden of delusions] (1995) and *2 x 7 E* [2 x 7 Epsilons] (1996), bringing the corpus of his prose works to a total of over 1,000 pages.

Nevertheless, despite the volume of his prose writings, very little critical attention has been given to them.[2] In the standard bibliography of Elytis's works by Dimitris Daskalopoulos, there are only four entries listed relating to reviews of *Cards on the table* and three for *Carte blanche*. This has to be seen in comparison with the numerous entries listed for each of his

---

[1] See my "Introduction" to *Carte blanche* (Elytis 1999: 2).

[2] A recent exception is the work by Koutrianou (1999a; 1999b).

collections of poetry. As an essayist, Elytis has in fact largely been ignored by critics and scholars, who perhaps consider his prose writings as simply exercises in style that bring to prose a sense of the lyricism and expressive boldness that characterise his poetry. It is true that they are clearly poetical texts, yet their philosophical and critical nature cannot be denied. They develop theoretical and critical arguments in their own original way, conveying ideas using techniques similar to those in poetry, while revealing at the same time an acute and sensitive critical mind.[3]

The lack of scholarly attention may also owe something to Elytis's own reservations as to his ability as a prose writer and critic, which he expressed quite openly at the beginning of *Cards on the table* (see Elytis 1974: 13). Despite his reservations, however, the writings contained in *Cards on the table* and *Carte blanche* are of particular importance for any aspiring interpreters of his work, in that they offer invaluable help in better understanding his poetics and, consequently, his poetry. As Vayenas (1993) notes: "Elytis is 'autobiographical' even in his most objective essays (see, for example, his admirable essay "Romanos the Melodist"), which are invaluable precisely for this reason, that they help us to better understand his own poetic expression...". My discussion of his essays, particularly those in *Carte blanche*, has as its aim to contribute to a better understanding of Elytis's views concerning poetic expression in general and, consequently, of his own poetics. More specifically, I will examine Elytis's views concerning prismatic poetry, which he develops mainly in his essay entitled "Ρωμανός ο Μελωδός" [Romanos the Melodist], though also in earlier and later writings, particularly those collected in *Carte blanche*.

In an essay of his entitled "Μουσική και ποίηση" [Music and poetry], published in 1964 (but not included in either *Cards on the table* or *Carte blanche*), Elytis says with reference to the *Axion esti* that "as a poetic work, it has the peculiarity of being 'prismatic', of presenting, that is, numerous facets" (see Elytis 1964: 339). As far as I know, this is the first time that Elytis uses the term "prismatic" and, moreover, to describe one of his own poetic works. He offers an explanation of the term by simply

[3] For a fuller discussion, see Pascalis 1993: 98.

saying that the work "presents numerous facets". It is only much later, in his essay "Romanos the Melodist" (written in 1975, but first published in 1986), that he again uses the term, distinguishing and contrasting two forms of poetic expression that he terms "prismatic" (πρισματική) and "plane" (επίπεδη).[4] What is of chief interest in this contrast, as Nikos Dimou (1986: 424) notes, is "its importance for understanding Elytis's poetics and for the way in which he perceives the poetry of others".

Though Elytis's views concerning prismatic and plane poetic expression are outlined for the first time in "Romanos the Melodist" (see Elytis 1992: 33-56), nevertheless he expresses similar views relating to poetic expression in earlier[5] as well as later essays so that they may, therefore, be regarded as a constant feature of his poetic outlook. If then, we wish to get an overall picture concerning Elytis's views on poetic expression, as these are outlined in "Romanos the Melodist", we have to read this essay in conjunction with his earlier and, more so, with his later writings on poetic expression, which are collected in *Carte blanche*. I will limit myself in the discussion which follows to these later writings: namely to the essays, "Αναφορά στον Ανδρέα Εμπειρίκο" [Report to Andreas Embiricos] (written in 1977 and first published in 1979), "Η μέθοδος του 'άρα'" [The method of "therefore"] (written in 1976 and first published in 1986), "Λόγος στην Ακαδημία της Στοκχόλμης" [Address to the Swedish Academy] (written in 1979 and first published in 1991) and "Από το 'Σημειωματάριο ενός λυρικού'. Για μια κωδικοποίηση της ποιητικής εκφραστικής (δοκιμαστική δειγματοληψία)" [Notebook of a lyric poet. Towards a codification of poetic expression (tentative sample)] (first published in 1992 in *Carte blanche*) as it is in these essays that he further develops and qualifies the views outlined in "Romanos the Melodist".

---

[4] To be precise, Elytis never uses the terms "prismatic poetry" or "plane poetry", but talks of the "prismatic form of discourse" and of "plane expression" (see Elytis 1992: 50).

[5] See, for example, "Η αληθινή φυσιογνωμία και η λυρική τόλμη του Ανδρέα Κάλβου" [The true physiognomy and the lyrical boldness of Andreas Kalvos], written in 1941/42 (in Elytis 1974: 81), "Τα κορίτσια" [The girls], written in 1944/72 (in Elytis 1974: 150), and "Το χρονικό μιας δεκαετίας" [The chronicle of a decade] (in Elytis 1974: 353-4).

In "Romanos the Melodist", the terms "prismatic" and "plane" as characteristics of poetic expression are novel, as is the classification of Greek poetry that is put forward. The features of these two types of poetic expression may be summarised – using Elytis's own words as much as possible – as follows. In the prismatic form of poetic expression, words are never on the same plane but *undulate*. The poetic text is organised around certain "nuclei" which stand out like peaks within the poem and which, in retrospect, can be seen to hold the poem together. According to Elytis, they are to the poetic organism what red corpuscles are to the human organism. These "nuclei" are not necessarily images, but are rather phrasal units with a self-generating radiance, in which the combination of the word's image and sound coincides with the cognitive meaning to such a degree that it is impossible to decide whether the poetic effect comes from *what* the poet says or the *way* he says it. The repetition of this feature gives a prismatic form to the poetic expression. Poems containing this characteristic feature affect the reader not only as a whole, but also in their fragmented parts, precisely because of these peaks, these concentrated and laconic crystallisations of the poetic spirit. They are utterances, Elytis maintains, in which the metal of the language and the images produced are fused and in which the formulation of a truth gives rise to another perception of the world, apprehended through the imagination. The test for this type of poetry is to imagine that 90 per cent of the poetic text has been lost and to examine whether the remaining fragments still function as poetry, as, for example, is the case with Sappho's poetry. Prismatic poetry, according to Elytis, is that particular feature which characterises the true Greek poetic tradition, and is a feature of Homer, Pindar, Sappho and the ancient lyric poets, Romanos, Kalvos and, by inference, Elytis himself.

Plane poetry, on the other hand, is characterised by a flat, linear form of expression. It made its appearance in the Greek tradition, according to Elytis, either as a reaction to the excess of the prismatic tradition or simply through the influence of foreign, particularly Anglo-Saxon, models. It is narrative in style and has a poetic value not in its parts but only when taken as a whole. If such poetry is fragmented, all that remains, says Elytis, are "plain statements" (σκέτες κουβέντες). As an example, Elytis quotes verses by Cavafy, who, together with Seferis, is

referred to as an exponent of this plane, linear poetic form. The two isolated verses by Cavafy that he cites as examples are: "από το παράθυρο φαίνονταν το σοκάκι" [the street could be seen from the window] and "Βαρέθηκεν εφημερίδες να διαβάζει" [he grew tired of reading newspapers]. This "test", according to Elytis, sets one thinking (βάζει σε πολλές σκέψεις). Elytis does not reject this poetry but considers it as being outside the true Greek tradition.[6] Without explicitly saying so, Elytis makes it clear that he favours the tradition of prismatic expression, his description of which, as Nikos Dimou (1986: 420) remarks, "corresponds entirely to the features of his own poetry. In this contrast [between prismatic and plane poetry], we find the clearest expression of his own poetics."

It is interesting to compare what Elytis says in "Romanos the Melodist" with what he says in a later essay "Notebook of a lyric poet. Towards a codification of poetic expression (tentative sample)" and contained in *Carte blanche* (Elytis 1992: 231-44). In this "Notebook", Elytis lists types of poetic expression that he divides into fourteen categories.[7] As examples of these types of poetic expression, he cites verses from Aeschrion, Apollinaire, Archilochus, Baudelaire, Bertrand Aloysius, Gatsos, Engonopoulos, T.S. Eliot,[8] Eluard, Góngora, Hölderlin, Jouve, Cavafy, Calas, Kalvos, Karyotakis, Lautréamont, Lorca, Mallarmé, Nerval, Novalis, Palamas, Papatsonis, Reverdy, Rilke, Rimbaud, Romanos, Sarandaris, Seferis, Sikelianos, Solomos, Dylan Thomas, Ungaretti, Valéry, Whitman and Yates.

---

[6] Elytis asserts that such poetry can be translated almost as easily as prose in contrast to the insurmountable translation problems in prismatic poetry. This is in keeping with many other statements by him as to the virtual untranslatability of poets in this tradition, such as Solomos (see Elytis 1974: 29), and of his own poetry in particular (see Elytis 1992: 329).

[7] These categories are: περιγραφή ευθεία, περιγραφή πλαγία, συγκινησιακός αρμός, στοχασμός απλός, στοχασμός λυρικός, αναπαρθενευτική σύνταξη, πλέγματα γλωσσικής γοητείας, παρομοίωση πρώτου βαθμού, παρομοίωση δευτέρου βαθμού, παρομοίωση τρίτου βαθμού, εικόνα πρώτου βαθμού, εικόνα δευτέρου βαθμού, εικόνα τρίτου βαθμού, οργανικοί τίτλοι.

[8] The only verse attributed to T.S. Eliot is, in actual fact, by W.B. Yeats.

We might quite reasonably assume that the verses he cites in his lyric poet's "Notebook" are taken from poets with whom Elytis feels some lyrical affinity, even though he does not go so far as to characterise them as "prismatic" poets. We are not surprised, for example, to find verses by Romanos, Solomos and Kalvos, who Elytis places firmly within the prismatic poetic tradition in various other essays. Nor are we surprised to find verses by, for example, Dylan Thomas, about whom Elytis says: "...I feel a great affinity with Dylan Thomas, particularly regarding lyrical expression and iconic imagination" (see Elytis 1981b) or by Hölderlin,[9] who is referred to by Elytis as the poet who, together with Solomos, observes him "with a watchful eye" (see Elytis 1992: 408). Similarly, we would expect to find verses by Rimbaud, who Elytis asserts was "undoubtedly the most gifted poet ever seen in European literature" (see Elytis 1976: 10). What is surprising, however, is that we also find verses by Cavafy and Seferis as examples of lyric expression after his explicit reference to their poetry in "Romanos the Melodist" as examples of the plane form of poetic expression. It is also of interest that in an earlier essay ("The girls", 1944-72), Elytis once again cites verses by various poets in order to clarify his views concerning poetic expression. Among the verses by poets that one would expect (Rimbaud, Lautréamont, Lorca, Eluard, Apollinaire, Ungaretti, Engonopoulos, Embiricos, Gatsos), there

---

[9] In his essay on "Friedrich Hölderlin – Odysseus Elytis", Daskarolis (1991: 885) notes that "Hölderlin doesn't simply *write* poetry, he *is* poetry. His every word appears cut off from everyday vocabulary; it is reborn in a primordial clarity. Each phrase is a drop of freshness. Each word is charged with the inseparable force of its meaning. [...] Isolated verses, just as much as long elegies, piece by piece compose a scintillating work that extends in perpetuity and has access to eternity" (which is a good description of what Elytis is trying to achieve through his poetry). Daskarolis cites several verses by Hölderlin as examples: *Nah ist / und schwer zu fassen der Gott. / Wo aber Gefahr ist, wachst / des Rettende auch* (from "Patmos") and *Denn schwer ist zu tragen das Unglück, aber schwerer das Glück* (from "Der Rhein"). And discussing Elytis's description of prismatic poetry, Daskarolis tests the prismatic nature of Hölderlin's "Der Rhein" by isolating a verse (*Ein Rätsel ist reinentsprungenes*) and examining whether it still functions as poetry. In his view, the test proves positive.

are also two by Seferis (see Elytis 1974: 148-9). I think what this shows is that, when talking of prismatic and plane forms of poetic expression, Elytis does not consider that these two forms are mutually exclusive, that we are dealing, that is, with two different *kinds* of poetry, but rather that they represent two different degrees of lyrical expression.

The contrast between Kalvos and Cavafy in their form of lyrical expression, which we find in "Romanos the Melodist", had aready been made in his essay "The true physiognomy and lyrical boldness of Andreas Kalvos", written as early as 1942 (see Elytis 1974: 81). In this earlier essay, at least, Elytis does not seem to regard the prismatic and plane modes of poetic expression as being mutually exclusive, but more as a question of degree. "We can imagine," he says, "the field of lyrical creation as a notional expanse, with two extreme points and a central area; or as a sphere with two poles and a circumferential zone in the middle" (ibid.: 81). Using this schematic representation in the sphere of Greek poetry, he places Kalvos and Cavafy at opposite ends and places the folk songs, Solomos, Palamas and Sikelianos at unspecified points between the two. He then does the same for European poetry, placing Rimbaud and Lautréamont at one end and Pound and Eliot at the other, with Baudelaire, Verlaine, Mallarmé and Valéry somewhere between the two extremes. In this text, Eliot and Pound are placed at the same end as Cavafy in terms of their mode of poetic expression and are contrasted with the mode of expression employed by Kalvos (while, in "Romanos the Melodist", Pound and Eliot are not specifically referred to but are implied under the general reference to "Anglo-Saxon poetry"). Elytis admits that such a view of lyrical expression is purely schematic, but that he simply wishes to reveal the difference and relationship between these poets in terms of the way imagination functions in these types of poetry.[10]

---

[10] A similar schematic representation of Greek poetry is put forward by Elytis in his address to the Swedish Academy on receiving the Nobel Prize for Literature (see Elytis 1992: 327-8). Here, however, Solomos takes the place of Kalvos at the one extreme, while Cavafy is again compared to Eliot in terms of their mode of poetic expression.

The list of poets with whom Elytis aligns himself – Sappho, Romanos, Solomos and Kalvos from the Greek poetic tradition and Hölderlin, Rimbaud and Mallarmé from the European – is instructive in the analysis of his poetics, as it is indicative of how he sees poetic expression. When asked in an interview about poets who might have influenced him or with whom he feels some kind of affinity, Elytis answers:

> ...In the matter of expression, I came under various influences, particularly in my first steps. The iconicity, for example, and the juxtapositional syntax of Eluard gave me support. As did the ellipticalness of Ungaretti and the intellectual clarity of Yorgos Sarandaris. Later, Lorca and his popular myth-making. [...] Personally speaking, my major teachers [...] were Hölderlin, Mallarmé, Rimbaud and Solomos.
>
> (Elytis 1981: 243-4)

As to Sappho, he refers to her as "a distant cousin"; each of them, he says, was working "with the same concepts... not to say the same words" (Elytis 1992: 216). In talking of Sappho's poetry, Elytis describes it in a way that clearly recalls his description of prismatic expression in poetry:

> A better example of the power of poetic discourse doesn't exist. Mutilated stanzas, half-lines, fragmented words, a nothing; yet from that nothing comes a miracle [...]. The magnetism unloosed by the words is so great, you could say, that they become detached from the axis of their servile usage.
>
> (ibid.: 217)

His views concerning a particular poetic mode of expression are, of course, linked with his views concerning poetry's deeper function. Poetry, for Elytis, is not just an art; it also constitutes a mission. Poetry, he says, "rises up at the point where rationalism lays down its arms for poetry to take them up and advance into the forbidden zone..." (1992: 321). In his essay entitled "The method of 'therefore'" (1992: 165-83), Elytis maintains that we live in a world governed by calculation and expectation of some ready answer of the type "plus, minus, divided by, times – therefore" (ibid.: 165). Yet, where is the "therefore" in a poetic phrase (he asks)? And it is perhaps not without significance

that, here too, in terms of poetry's deeper function, he takes issue with the Western conception of poetry, just as he does with Anglo-Saxon poetry in terms of poetic expression. He sees poetry as having come about "to correct God's mistakes; or, if not, then to show how mistakenly we perceive His gift" (ibid.: 116) and asserts that the pile of materials that constitute this world could, with a different method of assembly, dictated by our sentiments, produce a more inhabitable dwelling. Yet, in trying through poetry to reassemble the elements of the world, to make a Heaven out of a Hell, "we came up," he says, "against an unbreachable wall: the Western perception of art, that because of its inability to move on a mythical level, has come to confine itself to observation and analysis, transferring the area of a poem from a nucleus of mysterious radiances to a simple melancholic confessional" (ibid.: 116).[11]

Again it can be seen that Elytis is aware that the deeper function of poetry (as he understands it) can also be achieved in other ways. In his essay "The method of 'therefore'", first published in 1986, the same year as his essay "Romanos the Melodist", he says with reference to Eliot's *The Four Quartets*:

> ...the poet arouses and reveals our very own sentiments in a state of suspension, transmuted into crystals whose brilliance revolves and determines like clockwork the elements of the world around us with such plausibility, that you don't have time to consider that most probably everything was premeditated. And I'm speaking of only one particular, extreme case. You can turn to another one, to the T.S. Eliot of *The Four Quartets*, for example, in order to be convinced that there are as many ways to give

[11] Again, on the level of function, just as with its mode of expression, Elytis contrasts two types of poetry, stating in an earlier essay (see Elytis 1974: 147): "So for many years, poets have made themselves comical through their persistent endeavour to reveal things that even the most stupid reader knows. Of course pearls are white, leaves green in spring. What else could they be? So honey is sweet? Fine, thanks for the information. The true poet does not stoop to use more words than he needs, to paint a scene, to remind. He makes the invisible visible, the notional a sensation, the non-real real. In place of a simple series of words, he puts another, appropriate not for recalling things already known, but for inspiring unknown visions."

> existence to the second, real world, transcending the current one, as there are fingerprints.
>
> (1992: 173)

It is also interesting to note here that although Elytis places Eliot and Pound at the other extreme of poetic expression, nevertheless he elsewhere cites both Eliot's *Four Quartets* and Pound's *Cantos* among a list of works that, in his opinion, are works for all eternity.[12]

Behind this contrast between the prismatic and plane modes of poetic expression, I think that what Elytis wishes to emphasise is the difference between what we might term a "poetry of language", in which words are enlisted in an incantatory way in order to open the doors of perception to another reality, and a "poetry of ideas", in which ideas and sentiments are expressed using poetic diction. In his "Report to Andreas Embiricos", he says that:

> the heralds of ideas in poetry aim at a truth which, as a rule, contradicts them the next day, just as the concept of beauty contradicts the lovers of beauty the day after the next day. "Beauty" and "truth" are able to last and remain unchanged only through magic, which is the art of transformation. (1992: 137)

He goes on to explain that to transfuse accepted knowledge into verses is at best an achievement; to reveal, however, a hitherto unknown feeling is a miracle. As an example of what he means, he cites and comments on two verses by Embiricos:

> "Κρυφή μου ελπίδα στα βουνά, καλημερίζω την ηχώ σου" [My secret hope in the mountains, I bid good day to your echo], says the poet, and at the same time we feel the sound striking us in the breast. "Ο άνεμος όταν φυσά, οι καλαμιές γεμίζουν αυλητρίδες"

---

[12] This list includes: *The Epic of Gilgamesh, The Odyssey, The Pythian Odes, The Metamorphoses, The Song of Songs,* the "Kontakia", *The Divine Comedy, The Marriage of Heaven and Hell,* "Der Rhein" and "Patmos", *Hymnen an die Nacht, Erotokritos, Les Illuminations, The Free Besieged, Les Fleurs du mal, Leaves of Grass, The Duino Elegies,* "L'Après-midi d'un faune", "Le Cimetière marin", *Lament for Ignacio Sánchez Mejías, The Cantos, The Four Quartets* (see Elytis 1992: 183).

> [When the wind blows, the reeds fill with flute girls]; it also fills our hearing and, you might say, our eyes too, because the second vision comes into operation, which, in its turn, carries out the work of our other senses.
>
> (ibid.: 138)

This contrast between a "poetry of language" and a "poetry of ideas" is particularly well expressed by Ioulita Iliopoulou, who writes:

> A little this way or that and poetry doesn't exist; only thought, sometimes wise, sometimes commonplace, but still thought, or even more commonly, confession. No amount of noise is the same as a note of music. And a written statement of words cut asymmetrically in various lengths of line does not constitute poetry. Why should it? Certain poets know, however, that "One single word is sufficient to become a spark to an incombustible thought."
>
> (1994: 15)

Just as, according to Elytis, the poetic nuclei in prismatic poetry are like blood corpuscles to the human organism, so too the basic cell of prismatic poetry is the spark that flies out when two words are appropriately placed. "Two words are sufficient [...]," writes Elytis, "where all the factors – linguistic, iconic, cognitive and phonic – co-function in the fusion of an integral poetic unit" (1992: 48) and, elsewhere, he says:

> The poet *points*. And the visibility increases, intensifies, becomes more refined, shines the more each element finds its exact place in a whole that makes its levels converge and result in a single, lasting radiance.
>
> (1992: 181).

This is the goal of (prismatic) poetry for Elytis, yet the spark created by two words appropriately placed is not an end in itself; the ultimate aim of this poetry is to change the way we see the world, as he explains when he says: "... not that this element – surprise – constitutes actual poetry [...]; what I mean is that the revelation, thanks to this, of another way of seeing things most certainly constitutes poetry..."(1992: 143). And in talking of poetry's mission, he remarks: "For over thirty centuries, man has

striven to place one word next to another in such a way that his thought is obliged to take new, untried turns" (1992: 113-14).

In conclusion, we can say, firstly, that Elytis's views on poetic expression and the contrast he makes between the prismatic and plane modes of poetic expression in "Romanos the Melodist" should be examined in connection with his earlier and, above all, with his later writings collected in *Carte blanche*. Secondly, such an examination reveals that the two forms of poetic expression contrasted in "Romanos the Melodist" are not mutually exclusive, but rather represent the two extremes of a single axis of poetic expression. Their difference, therefore, is more one of degree than essence. Thirdly, Elytis's concern with different modes of poetic expression is inseparably linked to his understanding of the deeper function of poetry, which is not simply to express ideas and sentiments using a poetic diction, but, by means of language, to bring about a new vision of the world, given that poetry is, for Elytis, "the art of transformation". And finally, an examination of his views concerning poetic expression and function, as these are outlined in his later essays collected in *Carte blanche*, helps us, I believe, to achieve a better understanding of his own poetic work.

References

Daskalopoulos, Dimitris (1993). *Βιβλιογραφία Οδυσσέα Ελύτη (1971-1992)*. Athens: Etaireia Syngrafeon

Daskarolis, Thodoris (1991). "Friedrich Hölderlin – Οδυσσέας Ελύτης", *Η Λέξη* 106 (November-December), 885-93

Dimou, Nikos (1986). "'Πρισματική' και 'επίπεδη' ποίηση", *Χάρτης* 21, 22, 23 (November), 420-8

Elytis, Odysseas (1964). "Ποίηση και μουσική", *Επιθεώρηση Τέχνης* 20, 337-40

Elytis, Odysseas (1974). *Ανοιχτά χαρτιά*. Athens: Asterias

Elytis, Odysseas (1976). *Δεύτερη γραφή*. Athens: Ikaros

Elytis, Odysseas (1981a). "Μια συνομιλία του Οδυσσέα Ελύτη με τον Αντώνη Φωστιέρη και το Θανάση Νιάρχο", *Η Λέξη* 3 (March-April), 241-6

Elytis, Odysseas (1981b). "Συνέντευξη του Ελύτη στα 'Νέα' από το Λονδίνο. Του ανταποκριτή μας Γ. Γεμενάκη. Μετά την Αγγλία... πίσω στα χειρόγραφά μου. Ανακηρύχθηκε 'Διδάκτορας της Φιλολογίας' ", *Τα Νέα* (27 November)

Elytis, Odysseas (1992). *Εν λευκώ*. Athens: Ikaros

Elytis, Odysseus (1999). *Carte blanche. Selected writings*. Translated by David Connolly, Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers

Iliopoulou, Ioulita (1994). "Όσοι ποιητές". *Η Καθημερινή* (25 September), 15

Koutrianou, Elena (1999a). "Τα *Ανοιχτά χαρτιά* και τα κλειστά περιοδικά. Για τη μεθοδολογία προσέγγισης του δοκιμιακού έργου του Οδυσσέα Ελύτη", *Ο Πολίτης* 62 (March), 59-62

Koutrianou, Elena (1999b). "Odysseas Elytis on Poetry: The synthetic and the analytical view of the poem", *Comparaison/ Σύγκριση* 10 (November), 96-123

Pascalis, Stratis (1993). "Η μαγεία του 'Εν λευκω'", *Εντευκτήριον* 23-24 (Summer-Autumn), 98-100

Stavrou, Theofanis G. (1975). "Selections from the *Open book*", *Books Abroad* 49: 4 (Autumn), 651-7

Vayenas, Nassos (1993). "Η κεντρικότητα του επιμέρους", *Το Βήμα* (7 March), B7, 49.

Selected prose works by Elytis in English translation
(in chronological order of publication):

"Picasso's equivalences". Translated from the original French by Ivar and Astrid Ivask, *Books Abroad* 49: 4 (Autumn 1975), 649-51

"Selections from the *Open book*". Translated by Theofanis G. Stavrou, *Books Abroad* 49: 4 (Autumn 1975), 651-7 [a short but representative selection of paragraphs from *Ανοιχτά χαρτιά*]

"Draft for an Introduction to the Aegean world". Translated by David Connolly, *The Aegean*, Athens: Melissa 1992, pp. 27-30

Open papers. Selected essays. Translated by Olga Broumas and T. Begley. Washington: Copper Canyon Press 1995 [a selection of essays from *Ανοιχτά χαρτιά*, including "First things first", "The girls", "Chronicle of a decade", "For good measure" and "T.T.T."]

"One-finger melodies for Nikos Gatsos". Translated by David Connolly, *The Charioteer* 36 (1995-6), 193-201

"Elytis in his own words". Introduction to Odysseus Elytis, *The Oxopetra Elegies*. Translated by David Connolly. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers 1996, pp. 1-6 [a translation of his *Address to the Swedish Academy*]

"Open papers" in: *The collected poems of Odysseus Elytis*. Translated by Jeffrey Carson and Nikos Sarris. Introduction and notes by Jeffrey Carson. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press 1997, pp. 557-67 [a short selection of paragraphs from *Ανοιχτά χαρτιά*]

"Nobel Address" in: *The collected poems of Odysseus Elytis*. Translated by Jeffrey Carson and Nikos Sarris. Introduction and notes by Jeffrey Carson. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press 1997, pp. 575-9 [cf. "Elytis in his own words" above]

"The garden with the self-deceptions". Translated from the Greek by Olga Broumas, *Eros, eros, eros*. Selected and last poems

by Odysseas Elytis. Washington: Copper Canyon Press 1998, pp. 121-42

Carte blanche. Selected writings. Translated by David Connolly. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers 1999 [contains translations of the more important essays in *Εν λευκώ*]

"Introducing the Aegean", Translated from the Greek by John Chioles. *Mondo Greco* 1 (Spring 1999), 7-11 [cf. "Draft for an Introduction to the Aegean world" above]

St Cross College, Oxford

Sculpture and stones in the poetry of Seferis and Ritsos

Liana Giannakopoulou

This paper concentrates on selected poems by Seferis and Ritsos in which sculptural imagery and references to stones are prominent. Both poets frequently use the symbol of the statue in their work. This is more obvious in the case of Seferis; however, although the importance of the statues has been acknowledged by various scholars, there has been no systematic attempt to discuss their function or symbolism in his poetry.[1] Ritsos's voluminous work makes it more difficult for a single symbol to dominate, but a careful reading shows how important the statues and other relics from antiquity become in his work after the 1950s. The poems discussed here are not an exhaustive list of course, but my aim is to provide, together with some detailed close readings, an analysis of the dialogue between these two poets and, particularly, Ritsos's response to the way ancient Greek tradition is perceived in the work of Seferis.

Statues are a dominant but also a negative symbol in Seferis's poetry. With the exception of "Ερωτικός Λόγος", in which the symbol appears for the first time, and the Cyprus collection, which marks a radically different approach to statues, what we are left with in poems such as *Μυθιστόρημα* (*Mythistorema*) and *"Κίχλη"* are mutilated corpses haunting an already desolate landscape, threatening nightmares which persecute the viewers, masses of inorganic matter implying attrition and death. This is particularly true of *Mythistorema* and the first part of my paper will concentrate on a discussion of the symbol of the statue in specific poems of that "book", as Seferis used to call it.

---

[1] For a detailed discussion of this matter see A. Giannakopoulou, *Ancient Greek sculpture in Modern Greek poetry (1860-1960)* (unpublished doctoral dissertation, King's College London, 2000). The Seferis section of this paper is an important part of Chapter IV of the thesis.

What is different in *Mythistorema*, compared to the previous poems, is the transition from the individual to the collective sphere. Consequently, the symbolism of the statues, which, so far, was more personal and more abstract, now centres on the issue of tradition and the modern poet's relation to it. The statues are transplanted into a realistic landscape which acquires a special dramatic intensity from the recurrent encounters between statues and humans.[2]

I shall argue that these encounters in fact dramatize the modern Greek's confrontation with the past, which no longer leads to spontaneous communication, as it did in the case of Sikelianos. The wars, and particularly the Asia Minor Disaster, put an end to the unconstrained drawing from the well of tradition (compare the imagery of *Mythistorema* 2). The statues are no longer perceived as whole or restored, and their fragmented condition reflects the nature of actual, modern experience. They confirm, and indeed become the symbol of, a lost wholeness, the fall from an original unity and totality.[3] As such, they become a heavy burden for the modern artist intent on deciphering their meaning, as part of his attempt to restore the troubled relationship with the past.

Interestingly, though, *Mythistorema* is more haunted than actually peopled with statues. Indeed, the word άγαλμα itself occurs only three times (5: 16, 20: 9, 21: 2), though other words related to sculpture, such as μάρμαρο (6: 8-9, 15: 21, 23: 3) or κολώνα (6: 9), also appear. More pervasive, and indeed more suggestive of the adverse effects of war, is a sense of amputation, dismemberment or fragmentation conveyed by references to statues but seeming to extend also to human beings. The references to stones seem to supplement the overriding impression of ruin and desolation. As we can see in poem 18, for example, stones define a landscape which is dry and arid. In poem 10, this landscape is described in greater detail: it is a suffocating enclosure,

---

[2] For the affinities between the dramatic character of *Mythistorema* and that of Eliot's *The Waste Land*, see Edmund Keeley, "T. S. Eliot and the poetry of George Seferis", *Comparative Literature* 8.3 (1956) 214-26 (pp. 219-20).

[3] Linda Nochlin, *The Body in Pieces. The fragment as a metaphor of modernity* (London: Thames and Hudson 1994), pp. 7-8.

without water again, a landlocked country whose inhabitants have lost contact with nature and are alienated from the fundamental functions of life: birth, love, marriage and death. In poem 22, finally, the context in which stones appear again reflects a negative experience: the speakers have lost their roots, they have also lost their memory, and struggle to recover something from a life that seems to proceed *in absentia*.

The statues themselves have nothing in common with the ideal and radiant statue of "Ερωτικός Λόγος". We are faced instead with what appears to be a second population of αγάλματα, sexless, clearly fragmented, and standing on the ground. Their sole characteristic – and an important one – is their mysterious smile, aptly described by Karyotakis as "παραπλανητικό", an attribute confirmed, as we shall see, in *Mythistorema* 21.[4] This smile, which tempts us to identify these statues with the archaic *kouroi*, conveys indeed a feeling of exclusion and hostility. In the poem "[Ανδρομέδα]" for example, the "μαύρη γαλήνη" of the dead is associated with "τα χαμόγελα, που δεν προχωρούν, των αγαλμάτων", both signs of despair, of a vanished life fossilized on the surface of the stone and unable to bring solace to the suffering maiden. But this same smile and the absence of bodily characteristics also bring to mind the statues of the Herms showing the way to travellers (like those of *Mythistorema*). However, Hermes was also the god who took the souls to the Underworld but whose statues, as I will argue here, fail to do so. Rather, they create an atmosphere of disorientation, exclusion and despair vividly described in poem 21:

> Εμείς που ξεκινήσαμε για το προσκύνημα τούτο
> κοιτάξαμε τα σπασμένα αγάλματα
> ξεχαστήκαμε και είπαμε πως δε χάνεται η ζωή τόσο εύκολα
> πως έχει ο θάνατος δρόμους ανεξερεύνητους
> και μια δική του δικαιοσύνη·
>
> πως όταν εμείς ορθοί στα πόδια μας πεθαίνουμε
> μέσα στην πέτρα αδερφωμένοι
> ενωμένοι με τη σκληρότητα και την αδυναμία,

[4] "Ο κήπος της αχαριστίας" in: Κ.Γ. Καρυωτάκης, *Ποιήματα και πεζά*, ed. G.P. Savidis (Athens: Ermis 1991), p. 143.

οι παλαιοί νεκροί ξεφύγαν απ' τον κύκλο και αναστήθηκαν
και χαμογελάνε μέσα σε μια παράξενη ησυχία.[5]

We who set out on this pilgrimage
looked at the broken statues
became distracted and said that life is not so easily lost
that death has unexplored paths
and its own particular justice;

that while we, still upright on our feet, are dying,
affiliated in stone
united in hardness and weakness,
the ancient dead have escaped the circle and risen again
and smile in a strange silence.

(tr. Keeley and Sherrard)[6]

The confrontation of humans and statues in this poem is built on a set of oppositions which seem to define the boundaries between them. In the first section, although the statues are broken, they seem to indicate the presence of another life beyond death, where a kind of justice different from human justice applies. The representation of the dead in the form of statues seems indeed to convey some kind of immortality ("ξεφύγαν απ' τον κύκλο και αναστήθηκαν") since statues appear as the traces of a world to which humans aspire. Their smile and their silence seem to prove precisely these points. One might even think here that the silence and inertia of the statues become resting points, giving the viewers relief and a feeling of stability in the ever-changing world they experience during their journey through life. Indeed, the statues may represent, through their solid, permanent forms, the fixed values of tradition in contrast to "the fluid, changeable character of the modern".[7] But the second part

---

[5] Giorgos Seferis, *Ποιήματα*, 16th ed. (Athens: Ikaros 1989), p. 68.

[6] George Seferis, *Complete poems*, translated, edited and introduced by Edmund Keeley and Philip Sherrard (London: Anvil 1995), p. 25.

[7] Alex Potts, "Male phantasy and modern sculpture", *The Oxford Art Journal* 15.2 (1992) 38-47 (p. 44). In this thought-provoking article, the author discusses the attitudes of Baudelaire and Rilke (among others) towards sculpture. These attitudes reveal, as he says, "an argument char-

of the poem belies such expectations. Looking at the statues has a strangely petrifying effect on the living, who die in a way that strongly suggests that they are becoming statues themselves. This at least is what one understands from images such as "ορθοί στα πόδια μας πεθαίνουμε", as well as the fact that they are united with hardness and weakness or infirmity (the latter alluding to the fact that the statues are broken). The vestiges of the past fail to bring solace to the modern viewers, but rather reflect and confirm their unfortunate condition.

This way of handling the symbol of the statue makes a stark contrast with the very etymology of the word άγαλμα. Barbara Hughes Fowler has given an interesting interpretation of this word with reference to archaic sculpture, and particularly to the *kouroi* and *korai*, in the context of Pindar's poetry.[8] She argues that Pindar may have been aware, when using the word, of its etymological relation with the words αγάλλω, αγλαός and even γελάω. The verb αγάλλω means to honour or to glorify but also to decorate. So the poet's odes resemble statues in that they both bring lasting glory to the victors (the shining ones, αγλαοί – cf. I. 6.62, O. 8.5) as sculptural monuments do, but also because they literally decorate the place in which they are sung (cf. "χώρας άγαλμα" in N. 3.13). What is more, the gleam of the statue as a work of art is associated with the smile it carries on its face, for this too is another way of shining. The distinguished work of art – statue or ode – may bring a smile of pleasure to the face of the one who experiences it; but it also has its own smile – the mysterious archaic smile of the *kouroi* – which betrays, as H. Payne points out, "a look expressive of nothing so much as the plain fact of its own existence"; or, as Fowler explains, "The smile seems to reflect the statue's joy at having been released, a living figure, from the inanimate stone."[9]

---

acteristic of the period about the nature of the modern, and the fate of sculpture within it as the art of a more ancient order of things".

[8] Barbara Hughes Fowler, "The centaur's smile: Pindar and the archaic aesthetic", in: W.G. Moon (ed.), *Ancient Greek art and iconography* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press 1983), pp. 159-70 (pp. 166-8).

[9] Ibid., p. 167. The Payne quotation is cited on the same page.

In Seferis, on the other hand, these values are inverted. The statue is no longer associated with artistic fulfilment, nor with the pleasure of contemplation a work of art offers. The άγαλμα is rather what the word "statue" reveals through its Latin root, a static, inert object which, as we have seen, petrifies the viewer. Looking at the eyes of the statues means that you are turned to stone without actually listening to the voices of the dead who are the bringers of wisdom – note in this context the use of the word ησυχία in this poem in contrast to γαλήνη, the word with which *Mythistorema* ends. One could argue indeed that the statues as they appear, not only here, but also in all of Seferis's poems prior to the Cyprus collection, dramatize Seferis's pre-occupation with the (lost) continuity of Greek tradition and the ensuing difficulties in the assimilation of this tradition by the moderns. And the use of the phrase "παλαιοί νεκροί" to refer to the statues points in that direction. The embarrassment humans feel when encountering the vestiges of the past, as well as the feeling of threat and danger that emanates from otherwise inert and fragmented stones, indicates a lack of familiarity with the past, a shattered memory and consequently the impossibility of communication which leads to fragmentation.

The fact that the statues in *Mythistorema* 21 evoke *kouroi* supports this interpretation. For *kouroi* were widely used in archaic Greece as grave markers; and in Greek tragedy tomb statues (also named είδωλα or κολοσσοί) are an integral part of the ritual of the *nekyia*. Interestingly, the tragedies from which Seferis draws most of his mottoes or quotations are those most preoccupied with the relation between the dead and the living. And it is this dialogue which becomes the central quest of Seferis's own poetry. It is in terms of this communion that Seferis perceives and defines the function of memory in its creative aspect both retrospectively and prospectively. In other words, memory refers both to the artist's own dialogue with the dead and to the wish of the poet to ensure such a dialogue with future generations through the body of his own work.

The use of the word προσκύνημα, in the first line of *Mythistorema* 21, indicates that we may be dealing here with such a *nekyia*, but in this case the goal of the ritual has not been achieved. And the image of petrification Seferis uses to convey this may be compared with the effect of the souls of the dead in

Book 11 of the *Odyssey* – and with other instances of *nekyia* in classical literature. The souls of the dead are associated with sculpture in that they can turn to stone the living who approach them without rituals.[10] According to Vernant, Gorgo's head has become a vigilant watchman who prevents the living from approaching the Underworld, just as Cerberus prevents the dead from leaving it. The use of the verb ξεχαστήκαμε in this context acquires a tragic dimension, since it implies that the statues can be deceptive: with their beauty and stillness they can give the impression of a positive force, whereas in fact they have the power of Medusa's head which imprisons the gaze, charms its victims, and turns them into stone, destroys, that is, their creative powers.

Seferis's attitude can usefully be contrasted with that of Sikelianos. For the older poet the encounter with ancient relics led to their almost instantaneous restoration in his imagination and in his poetry, revealing a spontaneous communication with the past. Sikelianos's confidence is reflected both in his interpretation of the archaic smile (unlike Seferis he understands it as a reconciliation of life and death) and in his use of the *kouros* as a symbol of integrity and wholeness, a projection of his own body which he takes as the only means through which tradition can be restored. In the case of Seferis, however, the encounter with the works of the past (often forced, as we shall see in the following poem) is a source of anxiety; the smile of the *kouros* is no longer here an expression of the artist's satisfaction but becomes (after Karyotakis) παραπλανητικό and προδοτικά αδιάφορο, reflecting his predicament in the face of tradition. This is also reflected in the image of the fragmented body, everywhere present in Seferis's poetry, constituting an inversion of Sikelianos's values.

---

[10] The association of statue and soul is not an arbitrary one, but is confirmed by studies on archaic Greek religion and cult. Vernant explains how the colossus – a term referring to a pillar as much as to a statue – is used in tombs not as an image of the dead but as an indication of the locality to which the soul is bound and in which the living can communicate with it once the proper rituals have taken place; Jean-Pierre Vernant, *Mortals and Immortals*, ed. Froma I. Zeitlin (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1991), p. 121.

The ambivalent presence of past relics in the contemporary landscape is a problem encountered not only by Seferis but also by other artists who faced an equally rich tradition in their own country and concentrated on its relation to their work. A comparable case would be that of Giorgio de Chirico, with whose work Seferis was familiar.[11] The painter shares with the poet the same anxiety concerning past relics that can be assimilated only with difficulty, or not at all, in modern life. So, whereas the paintings of de Chirico's metaphysical period include fragments from classical antiquity that co-exist in relative harmony with various elements of modern civilization in the transcendent world of the painting, in certain works between 1919 and 1927 the memories of the past become rather spectral, lose their vitality and express a desperate appeal to the glory of the ancients.[12] Once again, the First World War was responsible for this change of attitude towards classical antiquity, as was de Chirico's own predicament, after his creative years of 1911-18. In those later paintings the relics of the past are no longer a source of solace. As Loizidi points out, "η μνήμη του παρελθόντος αρχίζει να κυριεύει πλέον σαν έμμονη ιδέα ένα χώρο που έχει χάσει την πηγαιότητα και το ευρηματικό σφρίγος του."[13] As we shall see in the case of *Mythistorema* 3, the same weight of memory, in the form of the fragment of a head, haunts the artist and, at this stage, mutilates him:

Μέμνησο λουτρών οίς ενοσφίσθης

Ξύπνησα με το μαρμάρινο τούτο κεφάλι στα χέρια
που μου εξαντλεί τους αγκώνες και δεν ξέρω πού
να τ' ακουμπήσω.
Έπεφτε στο όνειρο καθώς έβγαινα από το όνειρο
έτσι ενώθηκε η ζωή μας και θα είναι πολύ δύσκολο
να ξεχωρίσει.

---

[11] Seferis must have known de Chirico's work from at least 1933, to judge from relevant entries in his diaries. See *Μέρες Β΄ (1931-1934)* (Athens: Ikaros 1975), pp. 136 and 137.

[12] See Niki Loizidi, *Ο Τζιόρτζιο ντε Κίρικο και η σουρεαλιστική επανάσταση* (Athens: Nefeli 1987), p. 194.

[13] Ibid., p. 192.

Κοιτάζω τα μάτια· μήτε ανοιχτά μήτε κλειστά
μιλώ στο στόμα που όλο γυρεύει να μιλήσει
κρατώ τα μάγουλα που ξεπέρασαν το δέρμα.
Δεν έχω άλλη δύναμη·

τα χέρια μου χάνουνται και με πλησιάζουν
ακρωτηριασμένα.[14]

Remember the baths where you were murdered

I woke with this marble head in my hands;
it exhausts my elbows and I don't know where to put it
down.
It was falling into the dream as I was coming out of the
dream
so our life became one and it will be very difficult for it
to separate again.

I look at the eyes: neither open nor closed
I speak to the mouth which keeps trying to speak
I hold the cheeks which have broken through the skin.
That's all I'm able to do.

My hands disappear and come towards me
mutilated.[15]

The importance of memory in this poem is stated already in the epigraph, taken from Aeschylus's *Choephori* (491). It is Orestes who speaks these lines, in front of the tomb of Agamemnon. With him is Electra, and together brother and sister attempt to call on the spirit of their father to give them the strength to perform the act of vengeance. The fragmentary words Seferis has chosen to quote are an important key to the understanding of the poem. The imperative μέμνησο gives us a possible explanation for the image of the marble head: the head is indeed the *locus* of memory, and the ritual performed by Orestes and Electra aims at precisely revitalizing the memory of the lost

[14] Seferis, *Ποιήματα*, p. 45.
[15] Seferis, *Complete poems*, p. 5.

father.[16] The verb ενοσφίσθης reminds us of Agamemnon's *μασχαλισμός* by Clytemnestra, but it also underlines the feeling of fragmentation and separation which dominates the poem.

The representation of memory as a statue or a fragment which emerges suddenly from the subconscious with the assistance of a dream is a Freudian one, and Seferis was interested in the function of dreams and their interpretation.[17] For Freud, as indeed for the ancient Greeks, memory was considered as an active constituent of the present, in that it lives, that "stones speak", as Freud put it.[18] Remembering, then, meant the possibility for man to perceive reality in more global terms than usually understood. It was equivalent to seeing all of what we call different dimensions of time as one, to understanding the past as a dynamic presence in the present, the world of the dead as sharing the world of the living. This is an opinion Seferis would probably have shared, except that for him it was not obvious that stones actually speak. Although for Seferis too communication with the past meant communication with the dead, it is precisely this relation he is trying to define in those poems in which the *nekyia* – at least until the Cyprus collection – plays

---

[16] The imagery of the head may also have been inspired by Heinrich Heine's *Die Götter im Exil* (a Greek translation by D. Olympiou is published as *Οι εξόριστοι θεοί*. Athens: Kalvos 1982). In this work the author investigates survivals of ancient myths in his country's legends. Among them is the story of the knight who fell in love with a statue of Aphrodite, and had a dream of actually spending one night with her only to wake up the following morning with the statue's head in his arms. The story alludes, among other things, to the distorting effects of a sterile veneration of the past. It may also indicate that the marble head of Seferis's poem could be a head of Aphrodite. This is also supported by the fact that the search for memory is always associated with love in Seferis's work, as we have already seen in "Ερωτικός Λόγος" and (from a negative point of view) *Η Στέρνα*. Of course, Aphrodite, memory and love will ultimately come together in "Έγκωμη".

[17] We know from the catalogue of Seferis's library compiled by Giannadakis that, as early as 1925, Seferis had carefully read some of Freud's writings in the French translation of Hélène Legros, *Le rêve et son interprétation* (Paris: Gallimard 1925). And Seferis devotes a whole late essay to a discussion of Artemidorus's book on the explanation of dreams.

[18] Peter Gay, *Freud. A life for our time* (New York: Norton 1988), p. 172.

an important part. And as we have seen above, the statues, as symbols of the dead, are also associated with it.

But it is to an equivocal rather than a happy reactivation of memory that Seferis alludes in *Mythistorema* 3. This ambivalent situation is successfully explored through the use of the ancient myth, but also through the poet's significant omission from his epigraph of the last word of the original verse: πάτερ. Orestes is the only means for Agamemnon to take his revenge, the only means the father has to recover something of his lost power. Nevertheless, the very return of the father through his son threatens the latter: after the act of vengeance is fulfilled, Orestes goes mad and is haunted by the Erinyes (compare the imagery in the second section of *"Κίχλη"*). So the missing πάτερ alludes through its very absence to the imminent but also inauspicious presence of the father.[19]

The fact that memory is symbolized in *Mythistorema* 3 by the marble head, a fragment of ancient sculpture, makes it explicit that this father figure is for Seferis ancient tradition, whose menacing authority had dominated the cultural life of Greece ever since the birth of the modern Greek state in the modern world.[20] The adjective μαρμάρινος which Seferis uses here to describe the marble head, is, from this point of view, significant. For Seferis, as for Palamas, the learned provenance of the word (as opposed to μαρμαρένιος) associates it with classical antiquity perceived as a burden, as an unassimilated influence, with tradition as a source of embarrassment and mutilation rather than creative influence. This is indeed confirmed in

---

[19] A detailed parallel between this poem and Aeschylus's *Choephori*, in the context of the burden of the past, is given by Charles Segal, "Orpheus, Agamemnon, and the anxiety of influence: mythic intertexts in Seferis, *Mythistorema* 3", *Classical and Modern Literature* 9.4 (1989) 291-8 (pp. 293-5).

[20] In Vasileiadis's "Ο Παρθενών" (I.25-27) we see that the relation of the moderns to the ancients was indeed perceived in terms of a father-son relationship: "όπου και δούλος ωσεί μεθύων,/ το των προγόνων το μεγαλείον/ βλέπει κ' εμπνέεται ο υιός." What is more, the correspondence of Seferis and Theotokas attests to their feelings of inferiority in relation to the heroic (demoticist, μεγαλοϊδεάτικη) generation of their real fathers. See *Γιώργος Θεοτοκάς και Γιώργος Σεφέρης. Αλληλογραφία (1930-1966)*, ed. G.P. Savidis (Athens: Ermis 1975), pp. 16-17.

the poem, where the speaker is explicit about his relationship with the marble head: it is both random and beyond his control. This piece of sculpture has emerged from a dream. It is clearly a symbol of the artist's subconscious, which, for Seferis as for other modernists, is rooted in the collective subconscious. It has entered the artist's life without his own consent, as line 4 shows. What is more, the forced relationship with it is explicitly stated in line 2: the head is unbearable, the speaker wants to get rid of it, but he does not know how. He has to come to terms with it, just as the travellers of poem 21 have to come to terms with the relics they encounter.

This is indeed confirmed in the lines that follow. The speaker actively engages in communicating with this fragmented head by looking at it, speaking to it and touching it, and although the marble itself seems eager to transmit some sort of message, the whole effort does not yield any results.[21] It seems that, if the modern artist sees his work as the only means through which the voice of the fathers can be heard, Seferis is not as confident as Sikelianos about the impact of the ancient heritage on his own artistic integrity. One could read *Mythistorema* 3, as a possible Greek counterpart to Keats's sonnet "On seeing the Elgin Marbles". Although Keats is stumbling under the weight of a heritage which is all the more overwhelming for not being his own, both poets seem frustrated because they feel that their artistic potency is threatened by the presence of the ancient relics. Seferis takes this struggle a step further by revealing its unfavourable outcome for the modern artist.

The imagery of *Mythistorema* 3 is indeed violent, and we have been prepared for this already with the verb ενοσφίσθης of

---

[21] Interestingly enough, this exhaustive as well as fruitless attempt to appropriate something of the past's legacy in the surviving relics will continue to preoccupy Seferis in relation to ancient statuary, and he will describe it, much later, in his essay "Δελφοί" (1961), with a near-quotation from his own poem: "ένα κεφάλι Σφίγγας με τα μάτια μήτε ανοιχτά μήτε κλειστά. Το χαμόγελο, που λεν αρχαϊκό – αλλά δεν φτάνει – ενός Ηρακλή ή ενός Θησέα. Κάτι τέτοια αποσπάσματα από μια ζωή που ήταν κάποτε ολόκληρη, συγκλονιστικά κομμάτια, πολύ κοντά μας, δικά μας μια στιγμή, κι έπειτα μυστηριώδη και απροσπέλαστα." See *Δοκιμές*, Β΄, 5th ed. (Athens: Ikaros 1984), p. 142.

the epigraph. All hope of communication having failed, the relics of the past are not only useless but harmful, almost aggressive: they burden the artist without imbuing his imagination and creativity with positive forces.[22] *Mythistorema* 3 ends, characteristically, with the speaker's mutilation. The fact that he holds the marble head in his hands and that the hands return to him chopped off implies that it is in the hands that the poet feels the pressure of the past as represented by the statues, because for the poet as for the craftsman – an association that Seferis favoured – the hands are the means through which he realizes his art.[23] In this context the poem may be considered an adaptation by Seferis – with a Freudian colouring – of the myth of Medusa, to reflect his own preoccupations. The severed head which has still the power to turn the viewer into stone symbolizes for Freud the fear of castration.[24] In the case of

---

[22] In "Ο βασιλιάς της Ασίνης" and especially in section 4 (lines 40-54) the poet's failure to conjure back to life a dead word, and with it a dead world, is also conveyed through sculptural imagery (though it is less violent). Like a modern Niobe, the poet is turned to stone on realising the vanity of his efforts, as Seferis's own words indicate: "εικόνα μορφής που μαρμάρωσε με την απόφαση μιας πίκρας παντοτινής" (line 53).

[23] The poet's lonely struggle with tradition and the dangers lurking in this perilous occupation are conveniently summarized by Seferis himself in 1946, in his essay "Κ.Π. Καβάφης, Θ.Σ. Έλιοτ· παράλληλοι". What is interesting is that he is again using the imagery of *Mythistorema* 3: "Ο Καβάφης ανήκει σε μιαν άλλη παράδοση. Μια παράδοση κολοσσιαία και πιο αλαζονική από την άλλη, την καταφρονεμένη, που ο Σολωμός, σε μια ορισμένη στιγμή, μόνος προσπάθησε να ξαναπιάσει, με τα δυο του χέρια, που λύγισαν." See *Δοκιμές*, Α΄, p. 345.

[24] Charles Segal also mentions the latent fear of castration which is associated in Seferis with artistic creation, but he does not refer to the myth of Medusa. According to him, the severed head may be associated with the head of Orpheus. He argues that: "In the ancient myth the continuing voice of Orpheus' head expresses the notion that the artist's power, for good or ill, cannot be destroyed with his death." The treatment of the myth by Boccaccio in particular inaugurates its modern phase "when he [Boccaccio] takes up Ovid's story of how Apollo rescues the head from the threatening serpent (*Metamorphoses* 11.56-60) and turns the tale into an allegory of the posthumous fame of the artist. The serpent is time; Apollo is fame. The artist's work defeats all-devouring time and lives on after his death. But Seferis's poem takes the point of view of the living

Seferis, this fear is explicitly related to the artist's creative competence which is threatened, according to *Mythistorema* 3, not so much by the overwhelming presence of the forefathers but by the artist's realization of his impotence in bringing something of the forefathers' message to the modern world. As Maronitis has pointed out, this communication with the ancestors is the very definition of memory in Seferis's poetry: "ο ποιητής βλέπει και ακούει προς τα πίσω, ρίχνοντας στο συγκεχυμένο παρόν αυτόν τον διδακτικό ίσκιο του παρελθόντος."[25] It is this didactic shade that Seferis wants to recapture in his work and to transmit it, in turn, to future generations. But this effortless communication seems at this point to be beyond reach; the voice of the past and the voice of the present exist in different spheres separated by what appears to be an unbridgeable gulf.

In *Mythistorema* 3, then, memory or tradition functions more like an unwanted and embarrassing weight which disables the modern artist rather than being a source of inspiration. The question arises, of course, why Seferis should choose ancient statues in order to convey these feelings. I think that the answer goes beyond the commonly accepted view of statues as being among the few things that have survived from classical antiquity. As becomes clear if we examine "Ερωτικός Λόγος" and, especially, *Η Στέρνα,* the "Apollonian" ideal of the eternal being reflected in the statue's inertia and detachment from life does not satisfy Seferis. He is more interested in the "Dionysian" expression of movement and passion rooted in a deeper sense of life as a condition of constant change and becoming which is its essence and truth.

But the statue is not susceptible of the progress which Seferis – and Palamas before him – found in the Greek language. The statue is a form which is dead in the sense that it transcends time passively without, as it were, responding to time's challenges in

---

poet. And here the immortality of the earlier, dead poets is not a consolation, but also something to struggle against." See "Orpheus", pp. 297-8. However, as I argue, it is not so much the immortality of the earlier poet that threatens the speaker here but rather the modern artist's failure to decode the message that the ancestor is trying to transmit.

[25] D.N. Maronitis, "Διδακτικός Σεφέρης", in his: *Διαλέξεις* (Athens: Stigmi 1992), pp. 49-64 (p. 55).

the way that language (and, for an unusually long time, the Greek language) does. The Andromedan image of fixity, reflected both in the girl's being chained to the rock and in the smiles of the statues which "δεν προχωρούν", may well imply this lack of desired change, or progress. Moreover, the statues' perceived detachment, as well as the fact that they have been burdened by a multitude of interpretations, keeps the viewer at a distance, unable as he is to decipher their meaning. And whereas statues bear the marks of time only in that they show signs of wear, words have the power to adapt to new forms and meanings. Keeping the core of their sense unaltered, they have the power to renew themselves and have reached our own time rich from what they have collected on their journey. They bear the living marks of those who have used them over the centuries. Language, then, and particularly the language of poetry, is a repository of living memories rather than a deserted landscape of fossilized corpses; it thus encourages the desired dialogue between the dead and the living.

* * *

Let us now turn to the poetry of Ritsos in order to attempt a comparison between what has been discussed above and the way sculpture and stones appear in certain poems chosen from the period between 1957 and 1969. Two reasons justify this choice: on the one hand, the poems written during this period are widely considered to be among his best and include some very interesting and original aspects of sculpture not encountered in his poetry so far; on the other, various scholars have already talked about a growing and more explicit response by Ritsos to the poetry of Seferis, which culminates when Seferis is awarded the Nobel prize in 1963. The dialogue between the two poets has been discussed in the context of mythological poems, and especially in their use of Homeric motifs.[26] Here I will concentrate on Ritsos's use of stones and statues and I will venture to draw some conclusions which justify the differences.

---

[26] D. Ricks, "Ρίτσος-Όμηρος: ένας ποιητικός διάλογος", *Δωδώνη* 22 (1993) 49-65.

The way through which stones and statues enter the landscape of Ritsos's poetry is defined first of all by the experience of exile. As a communist, Ritsos became a political prisoner, and between 1949 and 1953 was exiled on the deserted islands of Makronnisos and Ai-Stratis. Consequently, his Waste Land is a literal one and not, as in the case of Seferis, the metaphorical rendering of a poetic landscape. The other factor which defines his perception of statues and stones is the poet's extensive travelling in Greece (between 1954 and 1966), and his acquaintance, after his marriage in 1954, with Samos. As Prevelakis has pointed out, the island's countryside and above all its archaeological sites have exerted a strong influence on Ritsos;[27] they have helped him see the burdensome classical past through different eyes, and must have defined his rather different perception of tradition in that context.

Let us look at the first poem, characteristically entitled "Πέτρες":

Έρχονται, φεύγουν οι μέρες, χωρίς σπουδή, χωρίς απρόοπτα.
Οι πέτρες μουσκεύουν στο φως και στη μνήμη.
Ένας βάζει μια πέτρα για προσκέφαλο.
Άλλος, πριν κολυμπήσει, αφήνει τα ρούχα του κάτω από μια πέτρα
μην του τα πάρει ο αέρας. Άλλος έχει μια πέτρα για σκαμνί του
ή για σημάδι στο χωράφι του, στο κοιμητήρι, στο μαντρί, στο δάσος.

Αργά, μετά το λιόγερμα, γυρίζοντας σπίτι σου,
όποια πέτρα απ' τ' ακρογιάλι αν ακουμπήσεις στο τραπέζι σου
είναι ένα αγαλμάτιο — μια μικρή Νίκη ή το σκυλί της Άρτεμης,
κι αυτή, όπου ένας έφηβος το μεσημέρι ακούμπησε τα βρεγμένα του πόδια,
είναι ένας Πάτροκλος με σκιερά, κλεισμένα ματόκλαδα.
(*Μαρτυρίες Α*, 1957-63)[28]

STONES

Days come and go without haste, without surprises.
Stones become drenched with light and memory.

---

[27] P. Prevelakis, *Ο ποιητής Γιάννης Ρίτσος* (Athens: Estia 1992), p. 368.
[28] Giannis Ritsos, *Ποιήματα*, Θ΄ (Athens: Kedros 1989-90), p. 191.

Someone sets a stone for a pillow.
Another, before swimming, leaves his clothes under a stone
so that the wind won't take them. Another uses a stone for a stool
or as a boundary mark on his farm, the cemetery, the sheepfold,
the forest.

Late, after sunset, when you've returned home,
whatever stone from the seashore you place on your table
becomes a statuette – a small Nike or the hound of Artemis,
and this stone, on which a young man at noon leaned his feet,
is a Patroclos, with shadowed, closed eyelashes.

(tr. K. Friar)[29]

The function of the stones in this poem is the complete opposite of what we saw in Seferis. In *Mythistorema* stones have negative connotations, confirming that the landscape of the poem has lost its vitality and its creativity. What Seferis sees in them is inorganic matter reflecting the surrounding aridity, alienation, a disturbance of the biological cycle of life and death (10: 7-11). In "Πέτρες", on the contrary, Ritsos seems to celebrate the transformation of inorganic matter into quasi-organic beings.

The poem is separated into two parts: in the first, stones are presented as functional objects in a predominantly rural setting. They are man's everyday companions and define what appear to be humble, almost insignificant details of everyday life.[30] Importantly, they also function as σήματα, tomb markers, indicating the boundaries between the world of dead and the world of the living. Only that here (unlike *Mythistorema* 21) there seems to be no discord between them. What is more, in a strikingly un-Seferian manner, stones are described as being bathed in light and in memory. Now, this is an important word to highlight: for what makes Seferis's *Mythistorema* a waste land is above all "the decision to forget", Lethe or oblivion, and often this is

---

[29] Yannis Ritsos, *Selected poems 1938-1988*, edited and translated by Kimon Friar and Kostas Myrsiades (Brockport, NY: BOA 1989), p. 125.

[30] This is an important aspect of Ritsos's poetics as revealed in many poems and especially "Οι άσημες λεπτομέρειες" and "Περίπου". For a discussion see D.N. Maronitis, "Η τιμή του χρυσού και η τιμή της πέτρας", in his: *Πίσω μπρος. Προτάσεις και υποθέσεις για τη νεοελληνική ποίηση και πεζογραφία* (Athens: Stigmi 1986), pp. 151-62.

dramatized through references to the waning of love as a creative power (*Myth.* 10: "Κι οι γάμοι μας, τα δροσερά στεφάνια και τα δάχτυλα / γίνουνται αινίγματα ανεξήγητα για την ψυχή μας. / Πώς γεννηθήκαν πώς δυναμώσανε τα παιδιά μας;"), and to the disappearance of the feeling of touch (cf. *Myth.* 3 and 8: "χωρίς αφή"). In Ritsos, on the other hand, touch is already an important component of the first part of "Πέτρες", since all the activities described presuppose some sort of contact with the stones. But in the second part stones are celebrated as the very essence of memory, the agents which include within the forms or shadows of the past (a Victory, Artemis's hound, the face of Patroclus). Here a mere functional object is elevated into a work of art. Stones become now statuettes, precious objects of an almost fetishistic value. The feeling of touch which becomes prominent with the repetition of the verb ακουμπώ twice in the second part of the poem, confirms not only the activation of memory but also the awakening of love (very much in the tradition of Cavafy): the words έφηβος, μεσημέρι and Πάτροκλος recall Cavafy's erotic poems.[31] The same can be said of the fragmented presentation of the body (Ritsos only mentions the wet feet) and the emphasis put on the eyes, which, again, recreate the sensual atmosphere of poems such as "Γκρίζα", "Μέρες του 1903" and "Στου καφενείου την είσοδο". Finally, although "Πέτρες" was written between 1957 and 1963, it echoes the experiences of the poet's years of exile. In a text published for the first time in 1974, Ritsos talks about stones in a way which is strongly reminiscent of the poem discussed here. It is worth reporting a few lines:

> On the deserted islands of exile [...] those quiet objects acquire a voice (or maybe we acquire a deeper hearing), they speak, they tell us what they once were, what they could be, maybe because of this general need of expression that fights wear and loneliness and [...] which, alone, can secure an individual survival in the crowd. And humans, urged by the same need of expression, found the stones, listened to them, used them (for houses and for statues), and worked with them in harmony. In particular the exiles,

[31] Compare with Patroclus as he appears in "Τυανεύς γλύπτης" and "Τα άλογα του Αχιλλέως" for example. Similarly, compare the emotional value of the words έφηβος and μεσημέρι in poems such as "Ένας θεός των", "Ιασή τάφος", "Ζωγραφισμένα" and "Όταν διεγείρονται".

> isolated, forcibly silent, became friends with the stones. And because in those places painting material was forbidden, stones offered themselves, through their smooth surfaces and sculptural cavities, as the basis on which one could draw or highlight what the stone itself dictated.[32]

It becomes clear that, both in the above quotation and in the poem discussed, stones seem to liberate the creative drive of the artist, his desire for expression and communication and, above all, his wish "to remain", as Cavafy would have put it.

The poems that follow confirm the appropriation of stones and sculpture in the above-discussed manner. Although we can recognise some of the ingredients of Seferis's poetry, Ritsos inverts their value, attaching to them positive attributes. Take for example the poems "Προοπτική" and "Συνέχεια". The point Ritsos is trying to make in them is, I think, obvious: past and present co-exist harmoniously. The past becomes the necessary foundation for the present (compare θεμέλια in "Προοπτική", line 2), and the present almost literally springs out of the seeds of the past, forming its natural extension. This appears to be an organic and certainly unforced relationship. We saw in *Mythistorema* (and poem 22 is a good example) that people have clearly lost their roots and are wandering and searching in vain for some clue that will establish the shattered communication with the past. In the poems by Ritsos, on the other hand, it is the existence of these very roots that is celebrated, using sculptural imagery in a rather different way.

ΠΡΟΟΠΤΙΚΗ

Τα σπίτια μας είναι χτισμένα πάνω σ' άλλα σπίτια ευθύγραμμα, μαρμάρινα,
κι εκείνα πάνω σε άλλα. Τα θεμέλιά τους
κρατιούνται πάνω στα κεφάλια όρθιων αγαλμάτων, δίχως χέρια.
Έτσι, όσο χαμηλά, στον κάμπο, κάτω απ' τις ελιές, κι αν απαγκιάζουν τα καλύβια μας,
μικρά, καπνισμένα, με μια στάμνα μονάχα πλάι στην πόρτα,
θαρρείς πως μένεις στα ψηλά, και σου φέγγει ολοτρόγυρα ο αγέρας

---

[32] Giannis Ritsos, "Πέτρες, κόκκαλα, ρίζες", *Αντί*, Περίοδος Β΄, 23 (1975). My translation.

ή κάποτε θαρρείς πως είσαι έξω απ' τα σπίτια, πως δεν έχεις
κανένα σπίτι, και πορεύεσαι ολόγυμνος,
μονάχος κάτω από 'ναν ουρανό τρομαχτικά γαλάζιο ή άσπρο,
κι ένα άγαλμα, καμιά φορά, ακουμπά ελαφρά το χέρι του στον ώμο σου.

(*Μαρτυρίες Α*, 1957-63)[33]

PERSPECTIVE

Our houses are built on other, straightlined houses, made of marble,
and these on other houses. Their foundations
are supported on the heads of upright armless statues.
And so, no matter how much lower our huts roost in the fields under the olive trees,
small, grimy with smoke, with only a water pitcher by the door,
you imagine you are living high up, that all about you the air shines,
or at times you imagine you are outside the houses, that you have
no house at all, that you are walking naked,
alone, under a sky startlingly azure or white,
and a statue, now and then, leans its hand lightly on your shoulder.

(tr. K. Friar)[34]

As we can see, this poem makes of marble and statues the very foundation of today's world. The imagery related to the statues is comparable to that of *Mythistorema* 21, discussed above, since we find in this poem too fragmented statues which are standing, only that here they are underground. Just as in *Mythistorema* 3, it is the hands which are missing here too, but in spite of that the statues are holding the world on their heads. But in *Mythistorema* 21 the encounter with the statues and stones dramatized a rather perfidious alliance – remember that the phrase "affiliated in stone" had disastrous consequences for the travellers: they become petrified and die, whereas the statues are standing aloof, enclosed in their own ivory tower. In Ritsos's poem, on the other hand, this encounter becomes a humanizing one, since meeting statues does not imply petrification and death.

---

[33] Ritsos, *Ποιήματα*, Θ΄, p. 190.
[34] Ritsos, *Selected poems*, p. 117.

There appears to be a transition from the functional and humble dimension of everyday life (lines 4-5, especially "χαμηλά, στον κάμπο") to an aesthetic perception of it (lines 7-10 and especially "μένεις στα ψηλά"). This uplifting experience, which is certainly due to the presence of the ancient relics, is presented as a process of purification: the humans remain ολόγυμνοι, acquiring in other words statuesque characteristics associated with beauty and the ideal in art; and the landscape shifts from the earth, with the dominant silver-green of its olive groves and the black of the smoke, to the sky, with its pure colours, blue or white.

It is worth comparing at this point the first eight lines of *Mythistorema* 10, because the differences between the two poets are vividly depicted in their handling of a comparable landscape described in these poems:

> Ο τόπος μας είναι κλειστός, όλο βουνά
> που έχουν σκεπή το χαμηλό ουρανό μέρα και νύχτα.
> Δεν έχουμε ποτάμια δεν έχουμε πηγάδια δεν έχουμε πηγές,
> μονάχα λίγες στέρνες, άδειες κι αυτές, που ηχούν και που τις προσκυνούμε.
> Ήχος στεκάμενος κούφιος, ίδιος με τη μοναξιά μας
> ίδιος με την αγάπη μας, ίδιος με τα σώματά μας.
> Μας φαίνεται παράξενο που κάποτε μπορέσαμε να χτίσουμε
> τα σπίτια τα καλύβια και τις στάνες μας.
>
> Our country is closed in, all mountains
> that day and night have the low sky as their roof.
> We have no rivers, we have no wells, we have no springs,
> only a few cisterns – and these empty – that echo, and that we worship.
> A stagnant hollow sound, the same as our loneliness
> the same as our love, the same as our bodies.
> We find it strange that once we were able to build
> our houses, huts and sheep-folds.
>
> (tr. Keeley and Sherrard)[35]

[35] Seferis, *Complete poems*, p. 14.

This is a landlocked country in which the sky is felt as a burden: it reinforces the feeling of enclosure that is born out of the surrounding mountains. This is not the case in the Ritsos poem discussed above. There the humble speakers seem to partake in an impulsive way in the deep historical perspective offered by their tradition, which seems to elevate them above their unfavourable geographical position. Above all, as mentioned above, they acquire an aesthetic perspective as well, for which the landscape and tradition seem to be equally responsible. Indeed, the landscape is transformed into a new home for the speakers (lines 6-9), and, threatening as this transition may be (cf. τρομαχτικά γαλάζιο), the statues are a source of solace and support. Quite unlike Seferis's poems, the last line of "Προοπτική" describes an image of solidarity: statues are not deceitful, but there seems to be a real, impulsive comradeship confirmed by the surrealistic image of the statue touching the human's shoulder.

The poem "Συνέχεια" makes a similar point:

> Αυτά τα χώματα τα ξέρουμε καλά, – το πώς δουλεύονται, τι δίνουν –
> στάρι, σταφύλι, ελιά, καπνό, μπαμπάκι, λεμονάνθι, δάφνη·
> κι η πέτρα δίνει τον ασβέστη για τα σπίτια μας. Πότε πότε, τυχαίνει
> εκεί που σκάβουμε τη γης, για να καταχωνιάσουμε έναν γέροντα,
> να βρίσκουμε ένα πέτρινο γυμνό κορίτσι ή κάποιον άγγελο
> γυμνό κι αυτόν, δίχως φτερούγες. Τότες αγναντεύουμε πιο κάτω
> τη φοινικιά της Αγια-Πελαγίας ν' αγεροπαίζει τα κλαδιά της
> και ξέρουμε πως είναι τα φτερά που λείπουν απ' τους ώμους
> εκείνου του αγγέλου.
>
> (*Επαναλήψεις Α*, Σάμος 28.7.64)[36]

CONTINUITY

> We know this soil well, how it works, what it offers:
> wheat, grapes, olive trees, tobacco, cotton, lemon blossoms, laurel;
> and stone offers lime for our houses. Every now and then,
> while digging up the ground to bury some old man,
> we happen to find a stone girl, naked, or else an angel,
> also naked, without wings. And then, from a distance, we see
> Saint Pelagia's palm tree fluttering its branches

[36] Ritsos, *Ποιήματα*, Γ', p. 20.

and we know that to be the wings missing from that angel's shoulders.

(tr. Keeley)[37]

Historical roots are defined and confirmed through archaeology. Yet, again, we are no longer here in front of the science Seferis condemns in poems such as "Έγκωμη", for example, a learned, mechanical and impassive way of discovering one's roots.[38] In Ritsos, archaeology is represented by the digging of the earth as a spontaneous activity, practised not by the scholars but by the folk, unconsciously, as part of their everyday activities such as the burial of the dead or, in "Ενα άσπρο άλογο", the search for a well:

Λίγο πιο πάνω απ' τ' αμπέλια, ήταν το κίτρινο χωράφι. Εκεί,
κάτω απ' τους τρεις ευκάλυπτους, ένα άλογο κατάλευκο
ατένιζε, μεσ' από την κλειστή λευκότητά του, απόμακρα
κάτι λευκό, αναγκαίο, αόρατο. Στο καμένο απ' τον ήλιο χορτάρι
η σκιά του αλόγου ήταν γαλάζια, τόσο που οι φωνές των τρυγητών
έπαιρναν μια γαλάζια απόχρωση με χρυσά στίγματα.
Τον άλλο χρόνο, καλοκαίρι πάλι, στο ίδιο σημείο,
σκάβοντας για ν' ανοίξουνε πηγάδι βρήκαν τρία αγάλματα
το ίδιο λευκά σαν κείνο το άλογο που εξαφανίστηκε μια νύχτα.

(*Επαναλήψεις Α*, Σάμος 6.8.63)[39]

A WHITE HORSE

Uphill, beyond the vines was a yellow field. There,
under the three eucalyptus trees, a horse, snow white,
was staring remotely, from within its inscrutable whiteness,
at something white, essential, invisible. On the sun-scorched grass

---

[37] Yannis Ritsos, *Repetitions, Testimonies, Parentheses*, trans. Edmund Keeley (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1991), p. 7.

[38] "Η ανατομία μιας ξοδεμένης δύναμης κάτω από το μάτι/ του αρχαιολόγου του ναρκοδότη ή του χειρούργου" (lines 12-3); or again: "είχανε παζευτεί πολλοί, μερμήγκια,/ και τη χτυπούσαν με κοντάρια και δεν τη λαβώναν" (lines 39-40). Compare also with what Seferis writes in his essay "Δελφοί" (1961): "Έχουμε δουλέψει σαν τα μυρμήγκια και σαν τις μέλισσες πάνω σ' αυτά τ' απομεινάρια. Πόσο την έχουμε προσεγγίσει την ψυχή που τα έπλασε;" *Δοκιμές*, Β΄, pp.136-52 (p. 143).

[39] Ritsos, *Ποιήματα*, Γ΄, p. 12.

the horse's shadow was azure, so much so that the voices of the harvesters
took on a tint of azure with golden speckles.
The following year, in the summer again, at the same spot,
digging for a well, they found three statues
as white as that horse which disappeared one night.
(my translation)

In this latter example, especially, the use of the word πηγάδι is crucial because it operates, I think, on two levels. On a first level, it refers literally to a practice very popular in Greece, particularly in the countryside. Unlike Seferis, once again, where the aridity and desolation of the earth was suggested through the dryness of wells and rivers, the landscape here is a fertile one cultivated by the peasants who seem to live in harmony with it. On another level, of course, the meaning of the digging becomes rather symbolic. For it is not water that the people discover, but three statues. In a predominantly surrealistic ambience, the horse seems to be an apparition from a transcendent world, or again some sort of στοιχειό (the magic number three reinforces the connection of this poem with folk tales) that permeates the place. The peasants are part of that spellbound landscape, although, as it appears from the poem, they are unaware of it. The point here is that there is an unmediated communication between the people and the relics of the past which helps them draw spontaneously from the well of tradition. They seem to experience effortlessly what Seferis (and before him Palamas) struggled hard to achieve: the bridging of the gap between past and present.

The folk element seems indeed to play a crucial role in Ritsos's handling of the theme of tradition as symbolized by the statues. In all the poems discussed, the protagonists are "the people", who live in rural areas, cultivate the land and keep it fertile. Note here again how the Seferian values are inverted: the people in Ritsos preserve the features of the ancient, archaic and above all "organic" societies the travellers of *Mythistorema* 10 are longing for. In Ritsos's poems life is not the unsolved mystery of a learned élite, which is nevertheless cut off from its revitalizing roots. Simplicity and naivety reflect the character of the people, who can still see with the eyes of their soul and

for whom life is still natural and unaffected. Even that heavy burden of *Mythistorema*, the classical tradition symbolized by the statues, has become in Ritsos a positive presence, as we have seen.

This is above all alluded to in line 3 of "Συνέχεια". The word stone also means marble, and the practice of making lime out of marble described here reminds one of pre-Revolutionary Greece, when the relics of the past were used as building materials.[40] Interestingly, Seferis expressed his approval of such procedures in his diaries. For him, they represented very vividly what he understood by unconstrained and constructive use of the past and tradition. It included the idea of building up something new out of the old. See, for example, what he noted in late November 1936, when he visited the Kerameikos Museum, in which a small equestrian statue attracted his attention:

> Από τη μεριά που το βλέπω, το πλευρό του είναι κομμένο ίσια κάθετα, θα 'λεγες επίτηδες. Ο φύλακας μου λέει πως βρέθηκε στα θεμέλια των Μακρών Τειχών. Το είχαν χρησιμοποιήσει σαν ένα κοινό αγκωνάρι. Μια τέτοια πράξη μ' αρέσει. Είναι τόσο αντίθετη με τη μανία που έχουμε να συντηρούμε τα πιο ασήμαντα πράγματα.[41]
>
> From the point where I stand, its flank is cut vertically, as if on purpose. The museum attendant tells me that it was found in the foundations of the Long Walls. They had used it as an ordinary corner-stone. I like this. It is so unlike our craze for preserving the most insignificant things.
>
> (my translation)

Ritsos's folk have preserved these features. They share many characteristics of the people as encountered in Politis's *Παραδόσεις*, in which the landscape is sometimes under the benevolent spell of a statue or some other marble monument (cf.

---

[40] For examples see Angeliki Kokkou, *Η μέριμνα για τις αρχαιότητες στην Ελλάδα και τα πρώτα μουσεία* (Athens: Ermis 1977), pp. 23-5.
[41] Seferis, *Μέρες Γ΄ (1934-1940)* (Athens: Ikaros 1977), p. 148.

"Ένα άσπρο άλογο").[42] This dimension is confirmed in the poem "Συνέχεια": the very words which describe the discovered statues, κορίτσι and άγγελος, echo the words of General Makrygiannis "μια γυναίκα κι ένα βασιλόπουλο", for whom Greeks should fight;[43] they also recall the terms used by the λαός in Politis's *Παραδόσεις* to refer to ancient statues.[44] They reveal both the naivety of the speakers – perceived as a quality here – and, devoid as they are of ideological constraints and the burden of a nationalistic discourse on ancestors, their ability to experience the unity of tradition, the undisturbed continuity between past and present. This continuity is confirmed in "Συνέχεια" in the domain of the natural environment which assimilates and recreates what has been lost through the centuries: the leaves of the palm-tree are the wings that transform the ancient statue into an angel. It is also confirmed in the domain of religion, if one considers the confusion around the iconographical identity of the statue: what used to be the statue of a youth is perceived in the modern set of values as an angel. Such a naïve confusion is not unique. At the beginning of the twentieth century, one of Ritsos's "fathers", Kostis Palamas, attempts a similar representation of the survival of the ancient world into the modern. The grave stele of Dexileos, in the ancient cemetery of Kerameikos, is interpreted by a mother and her child as a depiction of Saint Dimitrios.[45]

* * *

---

[42] See in N.G. Politis, *Μελέται περί του βίου και της γλώσσης του ελληνικού λαού. Παραδόσεις* (Athens: Sakellariou 1904), ch. 7 "Αρχαία κτίρια και μάρμαρα" and ch. 21 "Στοιχειά και στοιχειωμένοι τόποι".

[43] Reported by Seferis in "Ένας Έλληνας – ο Μακρυγιάννης", *Δοκιμές*, Α΄, 5th ed. (Athens: Ikaros 1992), pp. 228-63 (p. 240).

[44] The Karyatids, for example, are referred to as "οι κόραις του Κάστρου" in tale no. 136. See Politis, *Παραδόσεις*, p. 72.

[45] "– Ποιος είναι αυτός, παιδάκι μου; – Μαννούλα, ο Άη Δημήτρης. – / Κ' είσουν εσύ, Δεξίλεε, λεβέντη καβαλλάρη,/ αμάραντο ασπρολούλουδο της αθηναίας Τέχνης!" This is voice 53 from "Εκατό φωνές" in *Η ασάλευτη ζωή* (1904). See *Άπαντα*, III (Athens: Biris n.d.), p. 160.

To conclude: statues and stones in the poetry of Seferis and Ritsos dramatize the relation of the modern Greek to the ancient tradition. In the case of Seferis it is a negative one, because the experience of war, and particularly the Asia Minor Disaster, no longer allows unconstrained and effortless communication with the past. What is more, another alienating factor associated exclusively with Seferis's experience of Greece, is the blind veneration of the ancestors which created a national rhetoric that subverted the aesthetic values of the statues and prevented the modern poets from finding their own voice. What caused a radical change in Seferis's attitude towards sculpture is his visits to Ephesus and Cyprus, after which he will use the symbol of the statue in a positive way, comparable to what we have seen in the poetry of Ritsos. Cyprus offered Seferis a different outlook on ancient Greek tradition which turned the (poetic) landscape into a fertile one, human society into an organic entity, and gave the statues the aesthetic qualities required by their etymology. This shift is achieved among other things thanks to Seferis's acquaintance with the people of Cyprus. It is not accidental that the popular wisdom of Makrygiannis is heard along with the voices of Aeschylus or Heraclitus. Similarly, it is not accidental that for the first time in his poetry Seferis defines his art as craftsmanship, comparing it to the old local folk practice of decorating a κολόκα.[46]

The wound of the Helladic experience which accompanies Seferis from *Mythistorema* up to *Ημερολόγιο Καταστρώματος Γ΄* (*Logbook III*) does not seem to have affected Ritsos. One important reason for that must have been his ideological orientation. As Beaton notes, while other poets of the Generation of the '30s struggled to cope with the chaos that followed Asia Minor by attempting to build a new conceptual order which would replace the Great Idea, those committed to the Left already possessed such a framework against which to interpret the world around them.[47] Ritsos's pessimism of the early years is related to the drama of a fallen bourgeoisie to which he himself belonged and

---

[46] In the poem "Λεπτομέρειες στην Κύπρο" (1955). See Seferis, *Ποιήματα* (Athens: Ikaros 1989), p. 235.

[47] R. Beaton, *An Introduction to Modern Greek Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1994), p. 131.

was not connected at all with "the burden of the past". It is not surprising, then, that we do not find many references to statues in the years before the early '50s.

As I have argued in this paper, it is Ritsos's own experience of the Greek landscape – either in exile or during his travels – as well as his response to Seferis, that brings on stage statues, stones, and, in other poems, ancient temples and archaeological sites. The island of Samos must have exerted on him an influence comparable to that of Cyprus on Seferis. Its landscape offered a different perspective on the Greek tradition (cf. "Προοπτική"), defined mainly by the beauty of nature, the friendliness and simplicity of its people, and the abundance of archaeological relics. And I believe that the affinity with the people is something Ritsos, as a Marxist poet, feels that he possesses almost by definition. In any case, Greek tradition in the poems discussed is devoid of the nationalistic propaganda of the years of exile (especially Makronissos) or of the learned outlook of a scholar working in the library.

It is worth noting that it is precisely the ideological exploitation of the ancestors that will mark a shift in Ritsos's handling of sculpture after 1967. Sculptural imagery, and above all the symbol of the statue, will be used again then, only to underline the nightmarish experience of dictatorship and the growing existential preoccupations of the poet.

King's College London

National bibliography before the nation: constructing Greekness out of early Greek printing

Michael Jeffreys

One of the less significant but not negligible necessities for a modern nation state is a national bibliography. Sydney University Library, my bibliographic home for 25 years, for some reason made a speciality of national bibliographies, with long lines of volumes on its third floor, memories of which I can use for comparative purposes. National bibliographies tend to come in two dimensions: a yearly-based "Books published" and/or "Books in print" on the one hand, and other tomes to cover, in one way or another, the early period before the beginning of the yearly reports. The size of the yearly volume, I remember, usually reflects with reasonable accuracy the size of that country's production of books. On the other hand, coverage of the earlier period varies enormously. Such catalogues often show attempts to use the past as cultural support for nineteenth- or twentieth-century nation-building, and so the size of the volume often reflects the degree to which national identity is contested in the particular case.

The definition of the books belonging to the bibliography of a particular European country is also normally double.[1] First

[1] This is a brief treatment of a large subject, since it is not the central issue here. Words from the titles of the British Museum's (now British Library's) short-title catalogues of early books raise many relevant issues: "Catalogue of books printed in Italy and of Italian books printed in other countries..." STC Italian, BM (1958); "Catalogue of books printed in the German-speaking countries and of German books printed in other countries..." STC German, BM (1962); "Catalogue of books printed in the Netherlands and Belgium and of Dutch and Flemish books printed in other countries..." STC Dutch, BM (1965): the geographical part of this title had sometimes been replaced by "the Low Countries"; "Catalogue of books

there comes the list of books published within the boundaries of the country, which may be defined quite widely. Nearly every European country presents problems. France usually includes Francophone Belgium, Switzerland and North America. Portugal, Spain and Britain also have to decide whether to include or exclude their American dimensions. Entities like Italy and Germany, which had no unified national state in the early days of printing, can base themselves on the linguistic geography of the period to supplement present national borders, usually negotiating them at the widest possible: for example, the recent publication by Hans Eideneier and colleagues of Greek books surviving in German-speaking lands includes Alsace, German-speaking Switzerland, Austria and much of the Czech Republic and Poland, reflecting a regular practice of bibliography on German subjects (Eideneier, Moennig and Winterwerb 2000).

The second of the two elements of the national bibliography is books in the national language produced outside the borders, however defined: books in French produced outside France, or in Dutch produced outside the Netherlands (particularly, of course, Flemish books in Belgium). The first British listing for the early period, Pollard and Redgrave (1986-), follows this pattern. The second, that of Wing (1994-), makes a point of including books produced in British America – not surprisingly, since it began as an American production and has continued so. Switzerland is an extreme case, and Swiss bibliography tends either to be fragmented, divided by canton, or swallowed up into the bibliographies of France, Germany and Italy. Great caution is used in attempts to separate the Swiss sections of these bibliographies from the rest. In problematic cases like Belgium and Switzerland, a different approach involving an easier modern geographical formulation – books preserved in Belgian and Swiss libraries – is often preferred, though the range of books covered is necessarily much wider.

---

printed in France and of French books printed in other countries..." STC French, BM (1966); "Catalogue of books printed in Spain and of Spanish books printed elsewhere in Europe..." STC Spanish, BM (1989). Local formulations in each country usually follow the same tactics without this exemplary brevity.

Thus national bibliographies regularly provide a donkey of books published within the borders together with a tail of books published in the right language(s) elsewhere. The details of inclusion and exclusion are often revealing about the self-projection of the countries involved, and may contribute to an index of national myths. Note that I do not remember any of the national bibliographies of Western Europe which I have consulted including books by nationals published in "foreign" languages, for example books by English authors originally composed in French or translated into German, unless they qualify as having been published in England.[2]

Greece is a nation whose self-presentation is based far more on the importance of its language and culture than on military strength or political influence. Those ignorant of the facts would expect an imposing national bibliography from early times. The reality, of course, is very disappointing. I will say nothing of the patchy attempts in the twentieth century at a yearly Modern Greek dossier of books published.[3] I note with admiration the first volume of Philippos Iliou's beautiful and splendidly comprehensive bibliography of the nineteenth century (Iliou 1997), and wish him well on the long publishing Odyssey required to complete it. By the time the coverage of Iliou's volume begins in 1801, the shape of Greek bibliography – principles for inclusion and exclusion of books – is comparatively uncontroversial. The subject of this article is the preceding centuries, especially the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth. Let us set, then, 1700 as the cut-off date, and use the double categorisation I have sketched for other European countries: the donkey of books published within the borders and the tail of books in Greek published elsewhere. What Greek books do we find?

If one searches for books published within the present boundaries of Greece before 1700, the result is likely to be zero. But I mentioned a tendency in other cases to negotiate those borders widely, so we may extend the concept of Greece in the Tourkokratia to include Constantinople. This will not make much

---

[2] I naturally exclude from this judgement cases like the bibliography of Ireland, where the use of the national language has minority status within its own borders.

[3] Culminating in *Greek National Bibliography* (1989-).

difference. We can find a book or two in Greek but not Greek script, published in Jewish circles in the Ottoman capital (Hesseling 1897), and one or two books produced by Nikodimos Metaxas for the ill-fated press of Kyrillos Loukaris: four or five other books produced by that press with a Constantinople by-line were plainly printed in London in advance, before the press reached the Eastern Mediterranean (Layton 1967; Roberts 1967). If we stretch negotiations to the limit for the conceptual boundaries of Early Modern Greece, we might just reach the Phanariot-ruled Danubian principalities of Romania, where we may add a score or so of books published just before 1700, many found in large numbers now in Greek monastic libraries.[4] There is no way of including in Greece Vienna or the real centre of Greek printing, Venice. What is more, in these cities the publication of Greek books, however significant for Greek studies, was only a small part of a much larger production in local languages and others.

The donkey of early Greek printing is thus made up of a few uncertain hairs from Constantinople and Romania. But you should see the tail! Nearly every European country and America published books during this period in Greek, making this one of the richest and most persistent subject groupings in early printing. Viewed from a nationalist point of view, the material is very heterogeneous: some of it has associations with Greeks at the moment of printing – books written, edited or printed by Greeks, in a framework of Greek commercial activity, with an obvious audience in Greek-speaking lands. At the other end of the continuum, the Greek language of the work may be related only to the ancient dimension of Greek culture, for example an edition of Homer made in a Latin framework by a Scot for a Northern European audience, or it may be conditioned by the status of Greek as a *lingua sacra*, like the Greek versions of the foundation documents of the Dutch Reformed Church and of English Presbyterianism.[5] Only Jewish culture has a more complex list of bibliographical categories. There the existence of Yiddish alongside Hebrew and the institutionalisation of the ghetto within many different modern language communities have led to

[4] Papadopoulos 1984: nos. 161, 170, 378, 972, 1150, 1269, 1502, 2261, 3040, 3672, 3826, 4236, 4367, 4441, 4443, 4445, 4556, 5450 and 5514.

[5] See Papadopoulos 1984: no. 5665, and Harmar 1659.

total fragmentation of early bibliography, demanding quite different structures.

The rest of this article will examine early Greek printing from the point of view of the inclusions and exclusions made by bibliographers, placing these decisions as far as possible within their historical frameworks, and connecting them with Greek national myths, both those current from time to time within Greece, and those projected on to Greece from outside. I shall end with a proposal as to how this issue might be handled in the future.

Before we begin, let us think of some of the possible historical frameworks which could come into play. In this way you will see the simple interpretations I give to the phrase "national myth", and bear them in mind as we examine the categories of books. At the crudest, I mean the almost complete elision of the Turkish period from rational discussion, which results from the use of undefined terms like σκλαβιά or ζυγός to describe the situation of the Greeks under Ottoman rule. A slightly more subtle version of the same condemnation was prominent in the ways in which I was taught to think about early modern Greece: the conquest of Byzantium, by this narrative, was the extinguishing of a great light, leaving other smaller lights in the western colonies in Greek lands, which were put out in turn at their capture by the Turks – Rhodes, Cyprus, then Crete – leaving a light of lesser wattage to move to the Ionian Islands and shine out again eventually with Solomos. The western observer, it is no surprise, sees light in situations in which westerners have influence or are participants. Demoticism, which has emphasised the secular and the poetic, or at least metrical, tradition, has produced parallel results. A similar thought underlies the frequent Greek phrase "δώσαμε τα φώτα στην Ευρώπη". Turkish-ruled Greece, almost by definition, was left in darkness.

Myths in the bibliographical sphere operate at a rather more subtle level. Assumptions are made on the basis of the increasing proportion in the Greek bibliography of the Tourkokratia of material referring to Ancient Greece, as opposed to Greek liturgical and general religious texts for contemporary use. An opposition is set up between Orthodox texts (defined, explicitly or not, as backward-looking and introverted) and

outward- and forward-looking books with subjects connected with the classics. Greek progress from the darkness of the early Tourkokratia to the comparative light before 1821 can be measured, according to this narrative, by comparing the numbers of these two categories of books. The larger the number of religious books, as opposed to books on classical subjects, produced in a particular decade, the further Greek culture has to go to reach the light.[6] This argument is not always accompanied by an attempt to estimate how far the meanings of the two opposing categories had been the same in 1500 as they were to be in 1800. Two assumptions are too easily made: first that Orthodox books at the beginning of the period are of no significance for the non-Orthodox; second, that there was no market then at all in Greek lands for classical books. The first of these assumptions is clearly wrong, the second needs to be proven. Perhaps scholarship is still too credulous in accepting the arguments expressed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries about the worthlessness of the post-Byzantine culture of the Tourkokratia which was being swept away by the largely western imposition of Ancient Greek models and the patterns of thought of the Enlightenment.

From the myths we must turn to the bibliographers. The first motive for the collection of a Hellenic bibliography was patriotic. The most important of the mid-nineteenth century bibliographers, Andreas Papadopoulos-Vretos, shall speak here for several others. His work, as often with that of bibliographers, had a complex publishing history, as more and more volumes were found just after he had sent his previous lists to the printers. In its most developed form, his book is entitled "Modern Greek Literature, or Catalogue of the books published by Greeks from the fall of the Byzantine Empire up to the establishment of the Kingdom of Greece, in the spoken language or in Ancient Greek" (Papadopoulos-Vretos 1854-7). In its dedication to King Otto,[7] he recommends his book as an original attempt to show

---

[6] This statistical form of argument seems to have been devised by Philippos Iliou around 1970: see Iliou 1973: 27-45. It has since been used by several scholars quite effectively to analyse changes in the eighteenth century, but I believe that others who have extended the method back to the beginning of the Tourkokratia are yet to make their point.

[7] Papadopoulos-Vretos 1854-7: vol. 1, immediately after the title page.

incontrovertibly that even in the time when the Greek race was under the Turkish yoke, after the fall of its empire, it was always able to produce men (sic) who were educated and inheritors of the wisdom of their great forebears. The work was in two volumes, the first containing religious texts, the second secular works, described as scientific and philological.

Papadopoulos-Vretos and others working in the same tradition were only interested in works in Greek. He also boldly disregarded the language question then dominating most such projects in Greece by claiming in his title that he was collecting Greek books regardless of the level of Greek used. But from the first, Greek bibliography was less concerned with the books it studied and more with the character and ethnicity of those who produced them. The Greekness of the books was less important than the Greekness of those who denied the pressures of history and wrote and published them in the darkness of the Tourkokratia. This distinction may seem academic but it was to prove crucial.

The next bibliographer is the most important personality of our story. Émile Legrand[8] was a French academic and book-collector who took up the work of Papadopoulos-Vretos and in the last decades of the nineteenth century (and the first of the twentieth, involving some publication by colleagues after his death in 1903) brought out eleven large volumes of what he called the *Bibliographie Hellénique*, together with two volumes of the *Bibliographie Ionienne*, which had some overlap with the volumes of the main series, but included some books relevant only to the Ionian Islands.[9] He was a demoticist with a belief in the *Megali Idea*, and moved in the same circles as Ioannis Psicharis.[10] One of his main contributions was to include in his publications the scattered printings of early Modern Greek, a category which had been almost absent from previous collections because of the extreme rarity of copies. He was thus able to produce for Psicharis firm evidence that printed works in

---

[8] The best introduction to his work for these purposes is Iliou 1973: 9-45.

[9] Legrand 15-16 (1885); Legrand 15-16 (1903-1906); Legrand 17 (1894-1903); Legrand–Pernot (1910); Legrand 18 (1894-1903).

[10] See the latter's notice of his death in Psichari 1904.

demotic had circulated widely in Greek lands since the early sixteenth century, a significant plank in the demoticist platform.

Legrand began by searching the Bibliothèque Nationale and the other great libraries of Paris like the Mazarin, the Arsénal and those connected with the University. Another source was the book sales, particularly in Paris, in which the great collections of the nineteenth century were being put together – like those of Ioannis Gennadios which were to end up in Athens, and of Ingram Bywater, now in the Bodleian at Oxford. Legrand's publications never lost their connection with book-collecting, including regular (and sometimes extravagant) claims about the rarity of the books he was describing, backed up by statements of the price and physical condition of copies he had seen sold, some of which he bought himself. Legrand was able to catalogue far more books from these sources than those included by Papadopoulos-Vretos. When he had exhausted the resources of Paris, he developed a network of correspondents, particularly among his fellow European collectors, and in Constantinople, Mt Athos and Moscow. Often in the later volumes he is describing books he had not seen, so it is necessary to check the quality of his informants before accepting his information at face value (see Iliou 1973: 17-22).

On questions of inclusion and exclusion, Legrand began from the position of Papadopoulos-Vretos: the title of his first two volumes was "Hellenic Bibliography, or description with commentary of works published in Greek by Greeks in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries".[11] But his researches were turning up many books not in Greek which demanded inclusion. The recording of Greek energy and activity during the Tourkokratia, even when not expressed in Greek, remained a major purpose of his work. Thus from the third volume onwards there was an interesting slippage in the title, with the inclusion of a second "or": "Hellenic Bibliography, or description with commentary of works published in Greek *or* by Greeks in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries".[12] The Greek linguistic criterion has been removed, greatly widening the range of the bibliography. Between the second and third volumes on the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, he had published the five volumes on the

[11] Legrand 15-16 (1885).
[12] Legrand 15-16 (1903-1906).

seventeenth century, where the criterion in the title has been further simplified to "published by Greeks".[13] The actual scope of his collection is best summed up by Thomas Papadopoulos, the current continuator of Legrand's project, in an English summary at the end of the introduction to his two-volume catalogue:

> 1. Works published anywhere in the world and in any language revealing that a certain Greek born in Greece or simply of Greek descent, having lived after the discovery of printing, contributed in any way whatsoever to the publication of those works.
>
> 2. Works published anywhere and in any language intended for the Greek reading public, in order to satisfy its cultural needs or religious ceremonies.[14]

We are a long way here from the standard donkey and tail approach of Western European bibliography. Rather than centring our interest on the book, to see where it was printed and in what language, we are being asked to identify the nationality of the authors, publishers or printing professionals involved in its production, and of the intended audience. The opportunities for special pleading become very wide.

Legrand's early volumes go through the material he found in Greek in the Paris collections, in chronological order. Later, as we have seen, he widened his scope geographically and linguistically, and went through the same chronological sequence once, and in some cases twice, again. Thus as well as the problematical rules for what he was to include, the volumes, inevitably, are haphazardly arranged and infuriating to use as a catalogue. His indices, which cover all aspects of his analysis without concentrating on the lemmata of individual books, do not help a great deal.[15] There are distinct signs that Legrand himself found it hard to control this mass of data. The greatest strength of his books, which will never go out of date, is the multifarious information and documentary evidence he gives about the volumes he includes and the professionals involved in their creation –

---

[13] Legrand 17 (1894-1903).

[14] Papadopoulos 1984: λδ΄.

[15] See the criticisms of Papadopoulos 1984: θ΄-ια΄.

still providing one of the best introductions to the environment of early printing in general and Greek printing in particular.

The series of eleven books was so huge and so authoritative that it became an institution. Bibliographical articles took the form of additions to Legrand, or first-hand accounts of books which he had only seen at second hand via one of his correspondents. The focus of Greek bibliographical narrative, as it were, was firmly set around 1900. It came to be assumed that every reader of these articles had available a full set of Legrand's volumes, and some of these contributions do not make full sense unless one has. Several publications were made of the early holdings of libraries, identifying each book only by a reference to Legrand – except for those not found there which were triumphantly described in full at the end.[16] Many of the great and the good of Modern Greek studies made a contribution to this long series.[17] Legrand's mastery of the textual evidence for early Greek printing, which was unchallenged, appears to have acted as a validation of his criteria for the choice of books for the *Bibliographie Hellénique*, which certainly ought to have been reconsidered.

The situation I have described continued, with little essential change, till 1984 and the publication of the first volume of Papadopoulos's work. Let us take up position in 1984 and review the effects of this process on the development of Greek bibliography and its result, the expanding category of *Ελληνική Βιβλιογραφία*. Many of the additions made to it during this time were uncontroversial, mere filling in of the gaps in the publication, for example, of the major liturgical books, volumes which Legrand had not included because he had not found copies. One interesting case, mainly restricted to liturgical books, was that of volumes which had been left in a printer's warehouse unsold and were provided with a new title page, to give the impression that they were hot off the press. The original date of printing was usually left untouched in the colophon at the end of the book. Such hybrid volumes are now generally accepted as separate bibliographical lemmata (Iliou 1973: 25-6).

---

[16] See, for example, Ploumidis 1971; Kordosis 1979.

[17] See, for example, Dimaras 1977; Manousakas 1958.

However, some additions were more difficult to justify. I will restrict myself to one or two categories. Evro Layton, the Cypriot-American bibliographer, discovered that US libraries were strong in collections of *alphabeta graeca*, basically the first stage of the humanist learning of Greek, a group of short biblical and other texts which also served as an advertisement of the Greek dimension of the activities of the printing establishment that put them out. A Hebrew section was often included. For the US libraries they were an inexpensive way of acquiring examples of early printing. Now one of the works contained in some, but not all, of the *alphabeta* is a treatise on Greek letter-forms by Ianos Laskaris. Evro Layton used this as an argument to include the whole genre in the *Greek Bibliography* (see Layton 1979: 94-105). Papadopoulos was more conservative, especially with volumes which do not contain Laskaris's work, but faced the problem that there is no established way to reassess books once assigned to the bibliography. He therefore reluctantly accepts Layton's judgement and then adds more than a dozen *alphabeta* of his own, enthusiastically listing them in the long catalogue of additions to Legrand offered in his own name, which makes up the second of the two volumes of his work.[18]

There are other problems with books designed for higher levels of learning Greek. The numerous editions of works ascribed to Manuel Chrysoloras, Theodoros Gazes and Konstantinos Laskaris were among the first secular works included in the mid-nineteenth century in the second volume of the bibliography of Papadopoulos-Vretos. But these too are collections of heterogeneous works by different authors, many often basically in Latin, as it was unwise to use only Greek for books teaching the early stages of that language. There is a similar and equally popular collection of works serving as an introduction to Greek ascribed to the Catholic cleric Urbano of Belluno. This preserves a short poem by Markos Mousouros, which had appeared in

[18] Papadopoulos 1984: 26, n. 1; 1986: nos. 38, 73, 80, 118, 212, 230, 261, 492, 930, 934, 942-4, 951, 957, 959, 1025-7. Papadopoulos's footnotes often question why Legrand had included various books in the *Bibliographie*, but he never, to my knowledge, excludes them. In other cases he does include books described by Legrand but carelessly left out of the numeration which implies bibliographical acceptance.

Legrand in the form of a separate booklet. Papadopoulos in this case adds to the bibliography one edition of Urbanus's work, opening the door to two dozen others, whose inclusion can hardly be opposed, though the justification is slender (Papadopoulos 1977: 147-8). I hope that you are beginning to see the difficulties of the system. Papadopoulos is forced to make compromise after compromise in facing three-quarters of a century of additions to Legrand, made on the basis of Legrand's criteria, which were never really made explicit and were subject to obvious slippage, interpreted by generations of scholars naturally concerned to maximise their own contributions to the bibliography. One should add that Papadopoulos's volumes also show the regular confusion involved in the publication of bibliographical work-in-progress.[19]

I propose now to go through the major categories of books included, wholly or partially, in Papadopoulos's catalogue, to examine current attitudes to them. The order of examination will move roughly from the more central categories towards the more marginal, though I do not insist on the detail of this sequence.

We may begin with early works of Modern Greek literature. These were first systematised, as I said, by Legrand, and have since been accepted without question in the bibliography. Discoveries are still being made, including the oldest printed Greek vernacular work, Bergadis's *Apokopos* of 1509, found by Evro Layton (Layton 1990), and a whole group of late seventeenth-century editions found by Ulrich Moennig in a library in Halle (Moennig 1994). It is plain that this kind of book was normally read and thrown away. There remain numerous surprising gaps between editions recorded, suggesting that many reprintings have disappeared without trace. The books are often very thin, and one may hope for further discoveries, particularly of volumes attached to other more substantial works.

Liturgical and para-liturgical works are probably represented in the bibliography in a more complete way, and of course

---

[19] I still remember with some shame announcing to David Holton the discovery of a new edition of the Alexander romance in an Oxford library, only to be told that it already appears among the Επιπροσθήκαι of Papadopoulos's second volume – the fourth alphabetical listing one needs to search to check the existence of an edition in his catalogue.

meet unquestioning acceptance there. The larger volumes have probably all been listed, though cases of the rebadging of unsold volumes with new title pages, as described above, are still appearing. Smaller liturgical volumes like the *Psalter*, the *Oktoechos* and the *Liturgy of the Anagnostes* were used as aids to reading in church schools, and so were published in greater numbers and in more frequent editions. At times they seem to have been reprinted almost yearly: there certainly remain some gaps to be filled. In this connection, recent research has found a surprising number of Greek liturgical works in Western Europe, together with evidence that they have been in the libraries where they now are since a date shortly after their publication.[20] Oxford and Cambridge are particularly rich in such copies. You may be surprised to learn that the UK will be a more important source for the writing of the history of the seventeenth-century Greek liturgical book than Mt Athos or any more conventional Orthodox site.

Throughout the early history of Greek printing the medium was used for practical treatises on a variety of different subjects – mathematics, science, military science, economics and a number of others. Most of the writers of this material had Greek as their first language, and they were probably aiming largely at a Greek audience. But this was also an international genre: these books form a part of the evidence that Greek was used, even in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as a kind of *lingua franca* of South-Eastern Europe.[21]

With classical literature we come to the first examples of the exclusion of works in Greek from the bibliography. Some high-profile cases concern incunabula using Greek, especially those connected with the Aldine firm in Venice. These were dealt with by Legrand early in his research, when his categories were still quite strict. Several of the Aldine incunabula are firmly connected to named Greek editors, and so are accepted.

---

[20] See the internet site Ελληνόγλωσσα παλαιότυπα/Early printing in Greek, 1469-1700 (URL http://babel.mml.ox.ac.uk/neograeca/). Look especially under liturgical books for the period 1615-1635.

[21] The use of Greek as a language for the dissemination of the ideas of the Enlightenment to Balkan intellectuals whose first language was not Greek is a minor theme of several of the collected studies in Kitromilides 1994.

Some others are not so connected, and are excluded, despite the fact that no specific non-Greek editor has been found, and the *a priori* assumption that at this date Aldus's Greek colleagues are more likely to have helped in the editing of difficult Greek material than the non-Greeks. There is no better testimony to the authority of Legrand than the continuing exclusion from the bibliography of the Aldine first edition of Aristotle, one of the greatest intellectual achievements of the fifteenth century.[22] At the other end of the continuum, many editions of Cicero have been included (and more need to be added, according to the rules). Theodoros Gazes's translation of a few Ciceronian treatises into Greek is an interesting sign of the cultural situation in the fifteenth and the first decades of the sixteenth century, when Greek showed some signs of rivalling Latin as an international scholarly language in the West. It was widely reprinted in sixteenth-century Latin editions of Cicero's work, large and small – which thus qualify for Papadopoulos's catalogue.[23] In general the classical editions which are found in the bibliography tend to be somewhat second-rate, like the multitudinous productions of the Portos family, Frangeskos and Aimilios. It is also worth commenting that there are significant numbers of the standard early editions of classical authors now in Greek libraries, some of which may have been there for centuries. One thinks particularly of the libraries of the Orthodox patriarchates, but other, smaller libraries often throw up interesting examples. There is a danger of circular argument in the assumption that there was no audience at all for such books in Greek lands.

Relevant Western European religious texts fall into two categories. The first is the propaganda of the Catholic Church of the Counter-Reformation in its active campaign in the Eastern Mediterranean. This appears at every level of linguistic and

---

[22] Note, for example, that Urceo Codro, criticising the edition from Bologna, lists some errors in the *Historia Animalium* and expresses amazement that the Greeks in Aldus's circle had not noticed them. See Wilson 1992: 127-8.

[23] See Papadopoulos 1984: nos. 1734-1752, which is certainly not a complete list. One of the texts has now received two modern editions: Salanitro 1987 and Megas 1993.

intellectual sophistication.[24] Many of the texts are composed by Greeks and all are clearly intended for Greek reception, so here Legrand's rules worked positively to ensure the inclusion of books which might under other circumstances have been excluded for reasons of doctrinal politics. The other category, already mentioned, is the printing of a Greek and usually a Hebrew form of the basic texts of all new religious formulations. Papadopoulos accepts the two editions of Luther's *Small Catechism* included by Legrand and one added subsequently. He gives a list of 11 others, but refuses to add them formally to the bibliography till definitions have improved.[25] As for Calvin's *Στοιχείωσις της χριστιανών πίστεως*, he points out that Legrand included only one edition because he had special reasons to think that it was printed for a Greek audience. Even so, Papadopoulos adds other editions he has come across, apparently abdicating responsibility for finding any more.[26]

A final category must be mentioned merely to be dismissed from present concerns. At least 30% of the books in Papadopoulos's catalogue are translations and original compositions by Greek migrants to Western Europe in Latin or the vernacular languages of their new or temporary homelands. Having observed a similar phenomenon at close hand in Australia, I feel a great deal of sympathy with these migrants and their products. However, this is a different subject from printing in Greek.

Since this article is being published in Cambridge, I wish to use a Cambridge book as an example to sum up much that I think is wrong in Greek bibliography. This is an edition of the ancient scholia to Sophocles made in 1668 by the University printer, John

---

[24] The scholarly work of Leon Allatios is well known. At the lower end of the scale is a work written by the French cleric Paul de Lagny, who had long served as a Catholic propagandist in Greek-speaking lands. The linguistic and intellectual level of the volume may be judged from a note on the back of the title page explaining the genesis of the book: "Χριστιανοί μου παρακαλείτε τον Θεόν δια τον Βασιλέα της Φράνσας, ο οποίος εννοιάζεται την σωτηρίαν των ψυχών σας, αγκαλά και να είστε ξεμακρεμένοι από του λόγου του: επειδή και όρισεν να τυπωθή το παρόν βιβλίον δια την ερημείαν [sic] την εδικήν σας, και δια να σας μοιραθή χάρισμα" (de Lagny 1668).

[25] See Papadopoulos 1984: nos. 3663-3665; 1986: no. 1004.

[26] See Papadopoulos 1984: nos. 1489-1493, p. 110 n. 1.

Field, appearing as Ιωάννης Φιέλδος.[27] He is already represented in the bibliography by a Greek edition of the book of Common Prayer, but I have never seen the Sophocles scholia connected with a Greek bibliography. There is no word in this volume in any language but Greek, the date of publication is given in the Greek system, and the whole layout follows the traditions of Greek printing and begs for inclusion within them. Using the donkey and tail system, I regard this as a Greek book, just as its equivalent in other languages would be welcomed in other European bibliographies, as part of the tail of books in the national language produced abroad. In the official Greek bibliography it is excluded for ethnic reasons, because the race of the editor is much more important than the nature of the book.

It is time for conclusions. You will have understood that I am not happy with the way that the Hellenic bibliography is constructed. Its origins were dominated by the myth of the Tourkokratia as darkness and σκλαβιά. Against this background, bibliographers set out to demonstrate that there were Greek intellectuals and printing professionals actively cultivating the light throughout the period. In the early history of the Greek state, recourse to such thoughts may be treated with sympathy. In the era of Legrand, the special circumstance of the *Megali Idea* can be taken as some limited justification for bibliographers to examine the author rather than the book, the political environment rather than the cultural product. But the overwhelming size of Legrand's oeuvre has prolonged these anomalous definitions far too long. It is also time to question the assumption that Greeks had no interest at all in classical literature in the early Tourkokratia, and, even more, to correct the erroneous belief that the only market for Orthodox liturgical and para-liturgical books was in Orthodox lands. The truth is more complex than the simplistic myths I described.

My chief annoyance with the story according to Legrand and Papadopoulos is that the picture they paint is only half of the truth, and the less interesting half at that. If one looks at the general holdings of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century libraries in Western Europe, one gets a very different and much more positive picture. In the bibliography of Legrand and Papadopoulos,

[27] Sophocles, Ancient scholia (1668).

the books share the fate of Greek populations who formed an underprivileged and sometimes oppressed minority in the Ottoman Empire, and of Greek migrants in the West, who after a bright post-Byzantine beginning, were slowly absorbed into the countries where they had settled. But in the wider picture, Greek letters are sweeping across Europe in a spectacular way. The triumph of Greek classics in western garb is only part of the picture. For a time, as I have said, there are signs that Greek might take its place alongside Latin as a viable international language. Even when that proves impossible, some of Europe's greatest men in several walks of life find it necessary or advantageous – use whatever adjective fits the situation – to write Greek. Greek influences other European languages, especially Latin, where all of Cicero's ελληνικούρες are brought out over and over again. Greek words, often in Greek script, invade hundreds, perhaps thousands of non-Greek book-titles. Letters of the Greek alphabet, especially the favourite omega, make a typographical invasion of English, French and German words in other titles.[28] All this one would not suspect from looking at the Academy of Athens' official Greek Bibliography. Its concentration on people rather than books has given a restricted version of the truth. Heaven forfend that I should ever complain that any section of Greek society shows an insufficient appreciation of the greatness of Greek culture – but I am close to it in this case.

As for the Hellenic bibliography, I suppose that too much ink has already been spilt to allow us to forget the idea – which might be the best solution. The bibliographic situation of Greece is really difficult and quite different from that of the Western European states which may be used as comparators. But on the other hand, I do not think that things are quite so desperate as in Jewish bibliography. My own solution to the problem (as to many others) is electronic. I believe in the internet. I am building up a website of pictures and transcriptions of early Greek printings, starting from those included by Papadopoulos but unlikely to end there. My eventual goal is to recommend different Greek bibliographies for different purposes. I would like to think that this

[28] For an unusually rich set of such cases, I can recommend the catalogue of the Library of St George's Chapel, Windsor Castle: Callard 1976.

could influence the theory and methodology of the developing Greek national bibliography.

I would expect the catalogue of the Greek National Library, eventually available from an official website in Athens, to embrace the idea of a national bibliography from the time of the beginning of printing. If people insist on putting the website into national bibliography mode, I can imagine several buttons appearing. One would have a Greek flag on it, and would give the disappointing list of books published in Greek lands, however widely defined. Another button would show Makrygiannis, and give access to the early modern Greek books published in Venice. Others would show Hagia Sophia (revealing a large and important Orthodox collection), St Peter's, and a yet-to-be-determined Protestant symbol, the significance of which is obvious. The Parthenon would be used for classical books. Via that button users could access a huge list of all books containing substantial passages of Ancient Greek, with subdivisions for Patristic and Byzantine Greek, all divided into two categories: the first would have a stricter definition, but wide enough to include, as well as those classical books already listed by Papadopoulos, many others like the Aldine Aristotle and the work of Ιωάννης Φιέλδος of Cambridge. However, the edition of Homer made by a Scot for Northern Europeans would come in the second and wider category. The lines of division between the two categories will need careful wording. I suggest that they should ensure that books in the first group show in one of many different ways a recognition of the continuing existence of Greek language and culture after the end of the classical world, and indeed of Byzantium – for example, use of the conventions of Greek printing and publication, or of the Greek language to comment on, introduce, or dedicate the text of the volume. This definition would give particular weight to Greek written by non-Greeks during the age of printing (cf. the same chronological stipulation reported by Papadopoulos above about the activities of those identified as Greek). Overall, I hope that the National bibliography will decide to include within a decade or two all books, wherever produced, with substantial passages in Greek script. This outer definition of the Greek book is in line with that obtaining in other countries, and ultimately is the only criterion which is completely defensible. One might also suggest that

Greek claims on past inheritances involve bibliographical obligations as well as cultural enjoyment.

Users could draw out a whole series of interlocking and at times mutually exclusive national bibliographies, corresponding to their different and changing bibliographical needs and varying interpretations of national myths. Only thus will the complexities of the bibliographical problem be cut through with a solution appropriate for a state enjoying an immensely rich yet chronologically fragmented cultural endowment which, for historical reasons, reached publication in print almost entirely in areas over which it can have no political and little linguistic and cultural claim.

References and abbreviations

Callard, John (1976). *A catalogue of printed books (pre-1751) in the Library of St George's Chapel, Windsor Castle*. Windsor [Historical Monographs relating to St George's Chapel, Windsor Castle, 15]

Dimaras, K.Th. (1977). "Supplement à la Bibliographie Ionienne", *Δελτίον της Ιονίου Ακαδημίας* 1, 215-313

Eideneier, Hans, Moennig, Ulrich and Winterwerb, Helma (2000). *Neograeca in Germania. Bestände frühneugriechischer und liturgischer Drücke des 16.-18. Jahrhunderts in Bibliotheken des Deutschprachigen Raums*. Athens: Kentro neoellinikon erevnon, EIE [Τετράδια Εργασίας, 23]

Greek National Bibliography (1989-) = *Ελληνική Εθνική Βιβλιογραφία*. Athens: Ethniki Vivliothiki tis Ellados

Harmar, John (1659). *The Catechism of the Christian religion*. Londinii: Typi Ioannis Macock

Hesseling, D.C. (1897). *Les cinq livres de la Loi (le Pentateuque). Traduction en néo-grec, publiée en caractères hébraïques à Constantinople en 1547*. Leiden: van Doesburgh/Leipzig: Harrassowitz

Iliou, Philippos (1973). *Προσθήκες στην Ελληνική βιβλιογραφία Α: Τα βιβλιογραφικά κατάλοιπα του E. Legrand και του H. Pernot (1515-1799).* Athens: Diogenis

Iliou, Philippos (1997). *Ελληνική βιβλιογραφία του 19ου αιώνα.* Τόμος Πρώτος: 1801-1818. Athens: ELIA

Kitromilides, Paschalis (1994). *Enlightenment, Nationalism, Orthodoxy: Studies in the culture and political thought of south-eastern Europe.* London: Variorum

Kordosis, Michael (1979). "Ελληνικά παλαιότυπα της Μονής Παντοκράτορα Αγίου Όρους", *Κληρονομία* 11, 403-41

de Lagny (1668). Λάγνιος, Παύλος. *Εγχειρίδιον Ορθόδοξον των Ρωμαίων.* Εν Παρίζι: Ανθώνιος Βιτρέ

Layton, Evro (1967). "Nikodemos Metaxas, the first Greek printer in the Eastern world", *Harvard Library Bulletin* 15, 140-68

Layton, Evro (1979). "Greek bibliography: additions and corrections (c. 1471-1829)", *Θησαυρίσματα* 16, 89-112

Layton, Evro (1990). "Zacharias and Nikolaos Kallierges and the first edition of the *Apokopos* of Bergadis", *Θησαυρίσματα* 20, 206-17

Legrand 15-16 (1885). Legrand, Émile. *Bibliographie Hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés en grec par des grecs au XVe et XVIe siècles.* Vols. I-II. Paris: Ernest Leroux

Legrand 15-16 (1903-6). Legrand, Émile. *Bibliographie Hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés en grec ou par des grecs au XVe et XVIe siècles.* Vols. III-IV. Paris: Alphonse Picard

Legrand 17 (1894-1903). *Bibliographie Hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des grecs au XVIIe siècle.* Vols. I-V, Paris: Alphonse Picard

Legrand–Pernot (1910). *Bibliographie Ionienne. Description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des grecs des Sept-îles ou concernant les îles du quinzième siècle à l'année 1900.* Vols. I-II. Paris: E. Leroux

Legrand 18 (1894-1903). *Bibliographie Hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des grecs au XVIIIe siècle. Oeuvre posthume complétée par Louis Petit et Hubert Pernot.* Vols. I-II. Paris: Garnier

Manousakas, Manousos I. (1958). "Προσθήκαι και συμπληρώσεις εις την Ελληνικήν Βιβλιογραφίαν του E. Legrand (συμβολή πρώτη)", *Επετηρίς του Μεσαιωνικού Αρχείου* 7, 34-83

Megas, Anastasios Ch. (1993). *Μάρκου Τούλλιου Κικερώνος, Κάτων ο πρεσβύτερος Περί Γήρως. Μετάφραση από τα Λατινικά.* Thessaloniki: University Studio Press

Moennig, Ulrich (1994). "Zwei Bände mit Neograeca der Hallenser Waisenhausbibliothek", *Θησαυρίσματα* 24, 274-81

Papadopoulos, Thomas (1977). "Προσθήκες στην Ελληνική βιβλιογραφία. Συμβολή πρώτη", *Ο Ερανιστής* 14, 138-84

Papadopoulos, Thomas (1984-6). *Ελληνική Βιβλιογραφία (1466 ci. – 1800).* Τόμ. 1: Αλφαβητική και χρονική ανακατάταξις. Τόμ. 2: Προσθήκαι–συμπληρώσεις–διορθώσεις. Athens: Grafeion dimosievmaton tis Akadimias Athinon

Papadopoulos-Vretos, Andreas (1854-7). *Νεοελληνική Φιλολογία, ήτοι Κατάλογος των από πτώσεως της Βυζαντινής Αυτοκρατορίας μέχρι εγκαθιδρύσεως της εν Ελλάδι βασιλείας τυπωθέντων βιβλίων παρ' Ελλήνων εις την ομιλουμένην, ή εις την αρχαίαν ελληνικήν γλώσσαν.* 2 τόμοι. Athens

Ploumidis, G.S. (1971). "Τα παλαιά ελληνικά βιβλία της Μαρκιανής Βιβλιοθήκης Βενετίας, με προσθήκη αγνώστων εκδόσεων", *Ο Ερανιστής* 10, 221-73

Pollard and Redgrave (1986-: second edition). Pollard, A.W. and Redgrave, G.R. *A short-title catalogue of books printed in*

England, Scotland and Ireland, and of English books printed abroad. 3 vols. London: The Bibliographical Society

Psichari, Jean (1904). "Émile Legrand" [death notice], *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 13, 311-12

Roberts, R.J. (1967). "The Greek Press at Constantinople in 1627 and its antecedents", *The Library* 22, 13-43

Salanitro, Giovanni (1987). *M. Tullii Ciceronis liber de senectute in graecum translatus*. Leipzig: Teubner

Sophocles, Ancient scholia (1668) = *Σχόλια παλαιά των πάνυ δοκίμων, μετά και των του Τρικλινίου εις Σοφοκλέους επτά τραγωδίας*. Εν τη Κανταβριγία. Εξετυπώθη παρ' Ιωάννου Φιέλδου, του της Ακαδημίας τυπογράφου, Έτει από της Θεογονίας αχξη

STC Dutch, BM (1965) = *Short-title catalogue of books printed in the Netherlands and Belgium and of Dutch and Flemish books printed in other countries from 1470 to 1600 now in the British Museum*. London: Trustees of the British Museum

STC French, BM (1966) = *Short-title catalogue of books printed in France and of French books printed in other countries from 1470 to 1600 in the British Museum*. 2nd ed. London: Trustees of the British Museum

STC German, BM (1962) = *Short-title catalogue of books printed in the German-speaking countries and German books printed in other countries, from 1455 to 1600 now in the British Museum*. London: Trustees of the British Museum

STC Italian, BM (1958) = *Short-title catalogue of books printed in Italy and of Italian books printed in other countries from 1465 to 1600 now in the British Museum*. London: Trustees of the British Museum

STC Spanish, BM (1989) = *Short-title catalogue of books printed in Spain and of Spanish books printed elsewhere in Europe before*

1601 now in the British Museum. 2nd ed. London: Trustees of the British Museum

Wilson, N.G. (1992). *From Byzantium to Italy. Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance*. London: Duckworth

Wing (1994-). Wing, Donald. *Short-title catalogue of books printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America, and of English books printed in other countries 1641-1700*. 3 vols. 2nd ed. New York: The Modern Language Association of America

King's College London

Greek Cypriot refugees after twenty-five years: the case of Argaki

Peter Loizos

The essay which follows was written as a new concluding chapter for a Greek edition of my monograph *The heart grown bitter: a chronicle of Cypriot war refugees* (Loizos 1981). This book examined the experiences of the villagers of Argaki, before, during and immediately after the Turkish invasion of 1974. As the Greek edition, entitled *Χρονικό της Κυπριακής προσφυγιάς*, did not appear until 2001 (Loizos 2001), there was a clear case for including in it some account of how the people of Argaki had fared since 1975.[1] Indeed, the proposed translation of the monograph helped me decide to go to Cyprus, in 1999 and 2000, to do some systematic qualitative research. The essence of this was some fifty open-ended, informal conversational interviews, in which I pursued questions which had arisen after some years of reflecting on other regional displacements (Loizos 1999; 2000).

Briefly, Argaki village in NW Cyprus was a mixed village of 1,500 Greek Cypriots and 70 Turkish Cypriots when I first visited it in 1966. My father had migrated from it in 1930. I wrote my doctoral thesis about how the politics of Cyprus's first decade of independence impacted on the villagers. This thesis was written up as *The Greek Gift: politics in a Cypriot village*. But as I was correcting the proofs, in August 1974, the Argaki Greeks became refugees, as Turkey consolidated its military hold on the North of the island. So in the spring and autumn of 1975 I returned to Cyprus to witness to the distress of the people who had recently been so prosperous, and so hospitable to me. The book, which tried to make sense of this turmoil, took twice as long to write as the doctoral monograph.

---

[1] This essay is a postscript to the English-language text of 1981, but has not previously been published in English.

In subsequent years I made a number of brief visits to Cyprus, to attend conferences, to make a documentary film about a particular refugee family,[2] or for holidays. Although these trips often led to some notes being jotted down, I did not for many years do serious field research. This was finally remedied in the two visits which led to this essay.

Throughout this period there has been the recurrent mirage of a solution to the Cyprus Problem. At the time of writing (August 2002) this still eludes the island and the region. A great deal has changed since the upheavals of the 1960s and 1974, but here, as in my previous writings, I have tried to foreground the fortunes and the experiences of Argaki's Greek Cypriots, rather than focus on the national and international developments, about which others write more expertly than I can do. As an author, I no longer have Argaki to myself, since in 2000 a book was published in Greek written by Christodoulos Pipis, *Argaki: 1800-1974*, a work of 649 pages, full of factual information about village families, and celebrating the activities of the EOKA militia group formed in the village.

* * *

The story of the next twenty-five years has to be dramatic, but my purpose here is not to dramatise further, but to report and analyse soberly. The main themes of the following pages can be stated briefly: for a variety of reasons, the Greek Cypriot refugees in general, and the Argaki villagers in particular, did not allow themselves, and were not encouraged, to be idle, apathetic, a burden, a liability. Assisted by a determined government, by unexpected windfalls, and by international aid, many of the refugees re-invented themselves economically as productive citizens; a few, undoubtedly, fell upon stony ground, gave in to despair, were laid low by illness, of body and mind. A few older people stepped back and understandably allowed their mature children to shoulder the burdens of family provision. But many, perhaps most, made extraordinary efforts to provide for themselves and their dependents.

---

[2] The film was entitled *Sophie's people: eventful lives* (1985).

So, the various styles of coping with dislocation and destitution can be seen as a triumph of human creative energy over negative circumstances, a transcendence. But also, and this is the second equally important theme, I see a whole cohort of Argaki people as deeply, irreversibly, emotionally marked by having been forced out of their villages, and living through these years with a powerful sense of injustice, and dissatisfaction. Because the possibility of a return has never been ruled out by the rhetoric of national politics, the Hope of Return remains a troubling and painful possibility. Even had such a hope been ruled out early on (as happened in 1923 with the Treaty of Lausanne), the sense of injustice would have remained powerful. The third theme of importance is that their children seem less deeply affected, and capable of making an important distinction between their parents' unsatisfactory lives and their own.

Emergency planning: refugees as a resource

At Independence in 1960, UNDP persuaded President Makarios to set up a Planning Bureau, as a super-ministry to co-ordinate other ministries. Under its guidance the performance of the Greek Cypriot-controlled sector of the island's economy, in spite of major political disruption in the first fifteen years, was respectable but hardly dramatic. Government debt was kept low. Some diversification was encouraged, to break out of colonial autarky, because the island had relied principally on mining, agriculture, a tiny manufacturing sector, and a little tourism for foreign earnings. After 1964, the situation for the Turkish Cypriots was very different, because they were operating an enclave/siege economy, under the pressure of an embargo on many materials, put in place by the Greek Cypriots.

In August 1974 the Greek Cypriot South had suddenly to cope with around 180,000 refugees, in most cases quite destitute. The situation was that roughly one in every four Greek Cypriots in the South was a refugee.[3] When Greece had been confronted by a similar problem in 1922, there were hunger and disease deaths

[3] In international law the Greek Cypriots are "internally displaced persons", as "refugee" is used for people forced to move from one *state* to another. But I shall call them "refugees" for simplicity, and because that is the term most commonly used by them and most other people in Cyprus.

running at 6,000 a month for at least two years, and massive suffering for many years. How and why was this scenario avoided in Cyprus 50 years later?

The answer is that the political leaders and civil servants met the crisis head-on, and took appropriate and effective measures. The Planning Bureau was a key player in this drama, and its Emergency Plans were the script. Roger Zetter has made a special study of government measures to deal with the refugees, destitute people needing housing, feeding, clothing, educating, and employment (Zetter 1982; 1991; 1992; 1998). I draw freely and gratefully on his work in the first section of this essay, and also on that of Paul Strong (1999). The planners saw beyond the immediate need for humanitarian relief, and treated the refugees, their problems and their potential as a development opportunity, rather than an economic burden. The state, on behalf of Greek Cypriots as a whole, invested heavily in the refugees' future, and the refugees were able to meet them more than halfway.

This was possible because of ethnic solidarity: the refugees were regarded by the wider society of non-displaced Greek Cypriots as victims of injustice, who had legitimate claims for succour. And there was some property – houses and land, which Turkish Cypriots were leaving behind as they set out for the North of Cyprus. However, there was by no means enough Turkish Cypriot property to meet new needs. At the very least, four times as many Greeks were coming into the South as Turks were going North.

The Planning Bureau produced the 1975 Emergency Action Plan. This had the following components: proposals for new industrial enterprise zones, and for export credits to boost production; proposals for infra-structural construction; proposals for welfare benefits in health, education and housing for the refugees; small-business loans, loans to farmers, and proposals to re-employ civil servants and refugees otherwise unprovided for. There was to be a major public housing programme, which was to employ refugee labour and skills, put money into refugee pockets, and roofs over the heads of many of them, all at the same time. There had been virtually no public housing in Cyprus prior to 1974: Cypriots had been building new or renovated houses on marriage, in the plains villages and in the cities on plots of land

separated from the plots and houses of immediate neighbours (Loizos 1975).

The Planning Bureau decided to locate major public housing sites on the edges of the island's main towns, close to the new industrial enterprise zones, even though most of the refugees were rural people from farming villages. This meant people lived near employment opportunities. These houses are typically much smaller than most villagers were building for themselves before 1974, and they are not detached, but joined-together rows or blocks of houses. Because the official position of the Greek Cypriot political leadership was that all the refugees had to have the right of return to their original properties, this public housing was designated "temporary", and although it was not luxurious, and some estates look dilapidated today, this was unlike the insubstantial pre-fabricated housing which was put up on bomb-damaged sites in the UK after 1945, but of a more permanent construction.

By no means all the refugees ended up in such purpose-built housing. Other government-funded schemes were also initiated, in which the state made available building land, and some cash towards owner-supervised constructions, in densities closer to previous cultural preferences. Poorer people with less education, and less well-paid labour market prospects went into the "row" house estates, and many white-collar people, teachers and civil servants sought to avoid the schemes, and to build their own homes. It depended on many factors.

For farmers, the government did three things: first, it wiped the slate clean on their pre-war debts to the Co-operative Savings Societies and Agricultural Banks. This, as we shall see, was special treatment, but carefully considered. Secondly, it allocated them unused land or abandoned Turkish land. Thirdly, it lent them money for planting and subsistence without significant collateral, a break from pre-war practices. In the first year after the war the government issued a general exhortation to plant every square inch of the South which would take a crop, "even on your house roofs". At the time I missed this exhortation and was puzzled, in September 1975, to see a Limassol police sergeant and a Nicosia secondary schoolteacher growing *fasolia* (beans) in urban flower gardens. They were, I now realise, responding patriotically to the government's plea. In fact, the

response was so successful that there was a glut for many crops, prices collapsed, and many refugee farmers lost money. This may have led to a shake-out in the farming sector, which was said by economists to have been under-productive before the war. In 2000 a number of Argaki farmers were still farming intensively, and effectively.

Refugee civil servants were treated differently from the farmers. First, and crucially, the state decided to keep them all on the payroll, although, in agreement with both right-wing and left-wing trade unions, there was a general 25% wage cut throughout the unionised sectors, which included most civil servants and teachers. Some of the guaranteed redeployment made a certain amount of economic sense – refugee children needed teaching, so refugee teachers could be put to work. It is doubtful whether this applied to all civil servants. How, for example, could all the Department of Agriculture's refugee staff be efficiently redeployed when the land under government control had shrunk by more than a third? I have seen no proper analysis of these issues – but analysis must have gone on in the Planning Bureau. There was, of course, the politics of refugee incorporation to be considered, as well as the economics.

However, the civil servants were not indulged in other ways. In cases known to me, for example, pre-war debts had to be honoured: a young schoolteacher from a poor family in Argaki had, in 1973, just completed an impressive house in her natal village, by taking a loan from the teachers' union savings fund. Although she had to abandon this house, and in the end build a second one with a new loan, her pre-war loan for the lost house had to be paid back. "I had to build two houses," she said. I understand this was typical, rather than exceptional. But an Argaki farmer's wife saw the policy rationale immediately. "It's because they still had their salaries," she suggested. Unlike the farmers! The teacher remains bitter to this day, and bitter not only with Turkey, but with her own government. "It was an injustice" is how she sees it.

Businessmen could also be treated tough-mindedly by the Planning Bureau over issues of equity. One major employer known to me (not from Argaki) had run an island-wide bus-line. He had lost a lot of vehicles, buildings and other facilities in 1974, and he had two hundred employees on his payroll. He inevitably

had debts to major banks. Because he still had assets in the South, the government took him to court on a number of occasions in attempts at debt recovery, while he did his best to fight the case and meanwhile delayed as best he could. He said he could see the government's point – they were faced with the possible collapse of the banking system. There are three major banks in Cyprus, two with majority holdings by the Church. And many Cypriots had, before 1974, borrowed from these banks to buy land as savings and speculation. So, a collapse of the banks would have hit nearly everyone, refugees and non-refugees alike.

Because there were all kinds of "grey area" people, who might have claimed refugee exemptions or benefits, the Planning Bureau had to think hard about whom to treat how. In another poignant case known to me, two Nicosia residents, born in adjacent villages, and married to each other, had white-collar jobs in Nicosia. They had inherited substantial landholdings in their villages, and saw to it that the land was planted out with citrus trees. To do this, they had undertaken substantial debts. In 1974 they lost at least 5,000 orange trees, but were not classified as "refugees", nor yet as "farmers". No debt relief, and no expectation of future income. They also remain bitter to this day, but their bitterness is directed more at Turkey than at their own government.

Those who were labourers before the war were helped to find employment by the construction of refugee housing in urban areas, within reach of light industry. The Cyprus Government encouraged (with export credits and start-up loans) the manufacture of shoes and clothing, furniture, and fittings of all kinds, and the export of canned fruits and juices, all aimed at the nearby Gulf and Maghrebian markets. Because of the oil price rises of the early 1970s, oil-rich states were having consumption booms, and Cyprus enjoyed the comparative advantage of being near to these markets. At the same time, there was a major expansion of mass tourism in the South, in which hotel construction featured prominently and which created a new service sector, with jobs for waiters, chambermaids, cooks, bar staff, and many associated trades.

The civil war in Beirut was an ill wind for the Lebanese, but an externality which blew some good to Cyprus. Some wealthy Lebanese decided to sit the war out in the island, in its newly-

constructed tourist hotels. With the collapse of Beirut as a financial centre, Cypriots were able to take on some financial services work. Cyprus is second only to the USA and Canada in the proportion of the population who are graduates. The necessary skills were present as human capital in the 1980s to take advantage of this opportunity. Such is the generally high level of social aspirations among younger Cypriots that in the 1990s the South has imported labour – men from Syria to work in agriculture, and women from Sri Lanka and the Philippines to work as maids, nannies, and care workers for the elderly, and kitchen staff in the tourist sector, while Cypriot women go out to work in white-collar jobs. The collapse of communism in Eastern Europe has sent young women and men to many countries, and Cyprus is no exception. In 1992, foreign labour was 6% of the labour force. It was closer to 10% by 2000.

I must also mention, in the human capital and graduate context, that for some years after 1974 significant numbers of Cypriots went as short-term labour migrants to the Gulf, and to countries such as Bulgaria, to work in construction, transport, and other sectors. Remittances to support parents, grandparents and siblings were important in this period.

So, to summarise the overall macro-economic picture: Cyprus, which at Independence had a low level of state indebtedness, and a predominantly rural and agricultural economy, after 1974 was challenged to absorb a large destitute but skilled population. It did this by neo-Keynsian or Roosevelt New Deal methods of funding appropriate public works – refugee housing, tourist hotels, factories, roads, airports, dams – which led to a construction boom, and enabled increased tourism, with new seasonal employment opportunities.

The level of public indebtedness is now high, but significant economic diversification has taken place. Agriculture is no longer the lead sector for employment and GNP; there has been a boom in export manufactures, and urbanisation has continued to increase due partly to Planning Bureau housing construction decisions. However, after a decade of neo-liberal right-wing governments, the Planning Bureau has been dissolved.

Where Roger Zetter stressed Planning Bureau strategies, Paul Strong, an economic historian, subjected "the Cyprus miracle" (referring to the South alone) to sceptical analysis. He

gives private investment an important additional role: Cyprus, for example, has developed the fourth largest maritime fleet in the world. Tourism took off before the 1974 watershed partly due to state investment, partly due to local enterprise, and partly due to appropriate externalities such as cheap air travel, and rising wealth in Northern Europe. He points out that after 1974 there was a five-year concordat between state, the private sector, and the unions, which dramatically reduced days lost by strikes. But as any good Marxist will tell you, in such an accommodation, someone is being held down. Recent work by Prodromos Panayiotopoulos (1996; 2000) has analysed the ability of businessmen in Cyprus to connect up with diaspora Cypriots in the UK, and organise cheap refugee labour to service the British clothing market. In the late 1970s and early 1980s this was important, but this kind of employment has now shifted away from Cyprus, as Cypriot labour costs have risen, and the Cypriot businessmen are going off the island for their cheap labour. Panayiotopoulos suggests that the sweated labour of refugee women was important here, and that many a small business fortune has been built on this factor.

Women's labour

Before the war, in the village I studied – but the distinction was more general – there was an important status difference between women who did and did not "work for strangers". There is a special word in Greek, ξενοδουλεύω, which means exactly that. Ideally, Greek Cypriot husbands preferred that their wives should not need to work outside the home, or family farm or family shop. Argaki men would boast to me about their wives never having worked for strangers. If a husband and wife needed additional farm labour, it was often exchanged with neighbours without money changing hands, or poorer women were hired and paid by the day. But they were pitied. Roughly half the households in the village in 1968 had women who were not taking paid work, not working for strangers, as they would put it.

Women working in farm employment appear in national economic statistics as "unwaged". As regards pre-war rural Cyprus, in many cases these women would have proved to be working on their own land, or rented land, with their husbands. They neither expected nor needed their husbands to pay them a

wage. For them, the Big Issue was that they are working for the family, and more particularly for the well-being, the education and the future marriages of their children. Having recently stood alongside some of them in the fields they were working, I have a strong sense that the development of feminist classifications of these women as "unwaged", and therefore invisible in the national economy, misses the cultural point. It should also be appreciated that we are not talking about patrilineal patriarchy in Cyprus: Greek Cypriot women are virtually to a woman either the full owners or half-owners of the houses they live in and, before 1974, of significant agricultural land. There can, of course, be embedded domestic authority disagreements, when a husband overrules a wife. But Cypriot women's property rights were and still are a highly significant aspect of their status as women.

For the refugees I know about, 1974 changed the status distinction between women who took paid work and those who did not. Some Argaki farmers managed to continue to work as farmers and, in the cases known to me, their wives assisted them. They were still operating within the pre-1974 value system. But where before the war only the unfortunate "poorer" Argaki girls worked in fruit-packing factories, shops and offices, after 1974 it became common for young women and many married women to take paid employment. Older refugee women, particularly from previously wealthier farming families, who have had to take factory jobs for the last 25 years to see their children through school and university, tell their stories of getting by in this way with involuntary tears in their eyes, because there is a strong sense of having come down a long way in the world. Their daughters can and do see things rather differently – but they are often doing more attractive jobs than their mothers did, and are getting better paid for what they do, a fact they readily appreciate.

1974, then, was probably a watershed for refugee women, and they were catapulted by need into paid work, regardless of their pre-war status. Non-refugee women moved into paid employment on a slower trajectory, but they too moved. That they had to do so is probably consistent with the perception of most Cypriot families that they could not make ends meet, educate and marry off their children, and reach reasonable modern and increasingly

urban consumption standards, without wives working for wages where possible. The change the refugees experienced as a hardship and humiliation forced upon them was soon to become an unremarkable fact of most women's lives. But, as the refugees are quick to tell you, refugee women were *forced* to make the change, and the others were free not to do so.

The micro-picture: Argaki refugees and employment

1) The farmers: some had succeeded in escaping with productive machinery – tractors, trailers, cultivator rigs. These allowed them to work uncultivated land in the South. Some found abandoned Turkish land; some rented land owned by Greeks; some obtained permission to farm government-owned land. In 2000 there were still a number of active farmers from Argaki, who had farmed intensively for the previous 25 years. Truck and bulldozer drivers were easily re-employed if they had brought the machines out of the war zone. If they had not, they still had their skills to sell.

2) The professionals: young doctors, lawyers and other specialists have sought or continued employment, and some have been highly successful, while others have more modest incomes in government service. Some teachers set up private education establishments and worked a major second shift after their state-paid day job was over.

3) Those who needed wages but lacked specialist skills or capital looked in several directions. A number of Argaki wives, some of whom who had never taken paid work before, have worked for many years in home-based activities (lace-making, cooked food production) or in light industry, packing fruit and vegetables. Others have worked in the tourist sector, as domestics. Men have worked as chefs, barmen or drivers. More educated and younger men have worked as salesmen.

4) Self-employment: numbers of Argaki people started a business of one kind or another, particularly taverns, restaurants, coffee-shops, a car rental firm, a bakery. Some combine a modest white-collar job with something else at home, e.g. part-time tailoring, and breeding rabbits. One retired civil servant has been investing in a quarry. One farming family bought a house-plot in Nicosia and later sold it for a handsome profit, which has been re-invested in growing flowers. One young college teacher invested

in a college ably managed by his wife's cousin and has seen the investment flourish. The most favoured form of investment until recently was speculative land purchase, for later building development, but of late Cyprus has acquired a Stock Exchange, a mixed blessing.

The overall picture, then, has been of enterprise and hard work, in a generally enabling economic climate created by what to a layman looks like successful state management, and selective targeted support which takes equity issues into account. Among those equity decisions, there were some which rankled deeply. The government decided that the refugees they would help were those who would have been normally resident in particular places, now under Turkish control, in 1974. If, for example, you had been born in Argaki, and owned land there, but had migrated to Nicosia *before* 1974, you were not entitled to support from the state as a refugee. To people affected in this way, this seemed then and still seems like "rough justice". If you have lost property, and cannot even visit your place of birth, why are you *not* a refugee, they ask? If the rash anthropologist asks "in the same sense as those who lost everything?", he may get grudging agreement. The way such people comfort themselves from the pain of such state-led injustices is to say: "But at least we did not lose someone."

The Hope of Return

Some authors (Al Rasheed 1994 ; Zetter 1998) have written of a Myth of Return, because they are thinking of the ways in which refugees remember their home communities in an idealised way (as labour migrants have often been observed to do) and dream of going back even when the odds are strongly against it. I prefer to write of the Hope of Return. It seems to me that the Hope of Return in the South of Cyprus has to be understood in terms both of refugee aspirations and of the political environment created by the Greek Cypriot leadership since 1974. That has portrayed Turkey's intervention as an out-of-the-blue illegal act, and stands squarely on a human rights platform – that all the refugees must be permitted to return to their homes, and that free movement and unrestricted ownership of property must be restored, the so-called "Three Freedoms". This is not the place to debate this policy, or its effects on popular attitudes. But it has

meant that a Hope of Return, even if it eventually proves chimerical, a mirage, has been strongly articulated and become the dominant official discourse of Greek Cypriot society. No one ever says in public that return is impossible. Greek Cypriots are particularly determined to reject Rauf Denktash's description of the 1974 partition as a "fait accompli". To accept this definition would be seen as a collective humiliation, and to deny it is seen as a collective duty.

This applies particularly in the school system: the Ministry of Education is always headed by a Greek nationalist, and the Church is always consulted about the appointment. In schools, the children of primary refugees have been encouraged to find out from parents and grandparents about their villages of origin, and the state television service runs regular programmes about individual occupied villages, under the heading "I do not forget". In the 1970s the Bank of Cyprus offered prizes for the best pictures by refugee children about the war, flight, and the loss of homes. Thus, what refugees feel and think about their lost homes is given massive reinforcement by state and society, and can only ambiguously be treated as straightforward and uncomplicated. Statements of connectedness, belonging and attachment are given very wide support. I once suggested to a refugee relative who was a schoolteacher that it might be better for the children of refugees *not* to tell them their villages are in the occupied area. She took a deep breath and told me angrily for at least twenty minutes all the reasons why I was in her eyes utterly wrong.

Beyond "refugee generations"

Zetter and other writers on refugees have written of "first and second generation refugees", but I think this needs both refinement and some further attention to the cultural and historical specifics of a given refugee situation. I would suggest five sociological categories of persons for whom the impact and implications of the 1974 displacement must be understood. These categories allow proper account of the most important Greek Cypriot life-goals: to see one's children educated and securely married.

1) Those who by 1974 had accomplished major life-goals, i.e. who had helped all their children marry, and whose children

were secure in jobs and homes in the South, and not in the occupied North. I have no data for this theoretical category, but there must have been small numbers of such people outside my sample. A family resident in Argaki (or some other occupied community) but whose children were all resident in Nicosia, Limassol, Paphos and Larnaca, would have been examples.

2) Those who had married off some of their children, but now saw this provision devalued, because these children had had to flee from those hard-earned homes. In some cases their skilled, adult children took over from them the burdens of re-providing for themselves, their parents and younger siblings. In other cases, men of forty or more had to start all over again a process of economic support to some or all of their children, but knowing that, as soon as they could, these children would start to provide for themselves.

3) Those who after 1974 faced the full burdens of child-provision, whose children were mostly so young as to be still fully dependent. Whatever these people had achieved prior to 1974, they had to start some or all of the process again. In some cases this meant repeating ten or fifteen years of hard work and savings, but from a position of destitution. In other cases, they had recently married and only just produced children, but had lost the family home and, perhaps, productive land or a shop.

4) Those who in 1974 were unmarried young adults, not yet burdened by the duty of provision for children. Some of these were still partly concerned with support for parents and for other family members – siblings, particularly. Many would feel the need to study hard and start earning rapidly, to ease burdens on parents.

5) Those who in 1974 were small children, or as yet unborn. They have certainly grown up hearing that they have connections to a village in the "Occupied Zone".

Among the Argaki refugees, it would be fair to say that those who had lived fifteen or twenty years in the village, or more, and *would have stayed there*, other things being equal, are most passionately interested in the issue of return. They are clear that their lives will remain deeply unsatisfactory if return proves impossible. They speak of their fear of dying without returning to live in the village. Some simply speak of seeing it, but most imply wishing to live in it as before.

It is not the case that, in a simple, linear sense, interest in the village falls away the less the time a person has spent in it. Some who never lived there, being born after 1974, and with no simple personal memories, but only their parents' memories to inform them, seem interested in visiting, in possibly living there, and in their property rights. Others, who left the village at 5 or 10, wish their property rights to be honoured, but have no strong wish to live there, merely a curiosity about it. They are clear that their lives are in Limassol and Nicosia, wherever their young children are, their jobs are, and their homes are. At best, they consider they would have to make a calculation of self-interest if return were suddenly possible. The region would have to be developing; there would have to be appropriate work.

If you ask a three-year-old child today where it is from, it will pipe up "Argaki, Morphou", and be rewarded by parental approval. But how much weight should be placed on this? I had conducted an interview with a woman who was 17 when she left the village, and who had been explaining her complex feelings of identity, which included working – but not living – in the former Turkish quarter of Paphos, and having lived more of her life outside of Argaki than in it. At this point a 14-year-old secondary schoolgirl came into the shop – she had been born when her parents had been refugees for ten years. She was introduced to me by my informant as being "from Argaki" too. "Ask her what she thinks," I was told. As it happened I had the previous day run into her grandfather in another town. Her father is a lawyer, and had grown up in Argaki. I asked her if the word "refugee" describes her? Yes and no, she says. She thinks of herself as a Paphos girl, and an urban person. She is interested in any entitlements she may have, and she is concerned with justice for the refugees more generally. "Perhaps I ought to feel a stronger identification with refugees," she adds, thoughtfully, as she departs. Her connection to 1974 sits lightly on her, it seems, and it is better for her, and for Cyprus, that this is the case.

To conclude this section: there has never been the slightest likelihood that the older Argaki refugees would feel that they could set aside the hope of return, both because of their own feelings of attachment, but also because of the formal negotiation position taken by national political leaders. However, not all

younger people who identify themselves as being of refugee origins feel an intense personal concern about return. But they cannot always tell their parents this – it would look like a denial of earlier parental sacrifices, and indeed, the meaning of their parents' recent lives. In front of their parents, all express interest in return. Away from their parents, they put different emphases on these issues, talk about the needs of their children, and about not wishing to "uproot" them. I have even talked with Argaki people in the city of Melbourne, who miss Argaki and visit Cyprus from time to time, but who point out that with three sons married to Melbourne girls, and their grandchildren happy in Melbourne, their own lives are grounded, we could say earthed, where their descendants are, however much they miss Cyprus, their village, friends and relatives.

Surviving 1974: three reactions

I wish now to report representative summary statements made to me by people looking back on how they have managed their affairs over the last twenty-five years. I will not sketch in the wider social contexts.

The Embittered. Some persons, particularly those who felt their previous achievements, or future wealth and security, were wiped out in 1974, no matter how much they have laboured to see their children well-established, seem to have – speaking metaphorically – wounds which do not heal. Like Philoctetes. They may dwell on the injustice of Turkey's actions, the lack of appreciation by Turkish Cypriots of Greek Cypriot moderates, or they may simply insist that they are fated to die without seeing or enjoying the village again. They may speak of the cynical self-interested behaviour of major powers, the USA and the UK being the most prominent.

The Undefeated. A number of people summed up their refugee lives with some form of the phrase "ταλαιπωρηθήκαμε, αλλά είμαστε καλά": "we have been through the mill, but we are all right." Sometimes they reversed the key words, to give a slightly different emphasis. The "είμαστε καλά" does not mean "we are just fine". 1974 is still seen as a major injustice, and they still insist on their rights to their property in Argaki. But they wish to be judged on their personal achievements, the *transcendence* of

what was imposed on them. This is to drop down a level from the refugee-wide statements of the first group, and it is to stress personal specificities. Some of these people add that they still want justice for Cyprus. I would characterise them as deeply marked by dislocation, but not maimed by it, and troubled, but not obsessed by their losses.

The Empathisers – refugees by identification with parents. This third group of people, who were typically teenagers or younger in 1974, always answer questions about where they are from by replying "Argaki, Morphou", usually adding that they are refugees if explanation is needed. But the adults make important distinctions between their experiences and those of their parents and grandparents. They may have clear memories of the village, or their memories may have a dream-like quality. They may have felt as children that they ought not to "ask for" things which their parents would not be able to provide. But if they have made friends and spent important school years away from the village, and if they have married and built a home they are pleased with, they tend to speak of an option of return to the village as a matter which would require careful assessment, and not as a matter which would be decided by a simple, strong emotional pull from the village as place of primary experience. They may know a lot about the village, and have a positive sense of their fellow-villagers as distinctive and generally rather attractive people.

Some of the more interesting conversations I listened to were between these people and their parents, over what they would do if return became an option. Someone who five minutes earlier had stated clearly all the difficulties and uncertainties that return would present, would then hear their mother saying that conditions in the region might improve rapidly, allowing a transfer of the child's employment to the region, and would then modify the position to make their mother happy. On other occasion, a man in his mid-forties said: "Look, I am a partner in a major firm, here in Limassol, and my house is here, and my life is here. I cannot say this to my parents, but I would not return. It just wouldn't be practical." Another man, aged 10 in 1974, whose employment situation might have allowed return and who had just told a very moving story about growing up with a feeling of strong

memories of dislocation: "My children have grown up *here* [in Limassol]. Am I going to make *them* refugees because their father and mother once lived in Argaki more than 25 years ago?" His wife, however, aged 5 in 1974, said that the word refugee described her ελάχιστα, meaning "hardly at all". She had never felt deprived of anything in childhood, and she has never felt any stigmatisation. Her house is a substantial modern one on the outskirts of Limassol, and her preoccupation is with her children's well-being.

Some of this younger group are still passionately interested in the village, and some say they would go if the opportunity arose. My guess is that if life is less than satisfactory where one is, the appeal of the imagined village community is all the stronger.

Lots of people of all ages talk with feeling about the difficulty of relatives being separated by dispersal, and not knowing all one's relatives, not recognising old schoolmates whom one hasn't encountered for many years. But they would in my view have the same thoughts if they were simply people who had moved to one of the towns through social mobility. If they heard me say this, as I sometimes did, they would remind me that they had not moved voluntarily. Normal migrants have the option of returning periodically to reconnect with village life. Refugees do not.

Trying to conserve community

Cypriot Greek villages and urban neighbourhoods have churches with protective patron saints. The Argaki patron saint is Ayios Ioannis Prodromos (St John the Baptist), and his ritual day in the Orthodox calendar is 7 January. I asked if his day had been observed by Argaki refugees in their refugee context. It turned out that it had been: the Church of Petros and Pavlos in Limassol had been chosen for a special evening service every 7 January for many years. Announcements had been placed in newspapers to tell people, and they had come from Nicosia and Paphos, as well as some villages. The village priest had conducted the service, and afterwards the villagers had gone off to a *kentron* for a meal together. "People felt better after this," I was told. But participation had not included everyone from Argaki. I only heard about this event late in my research, but when I asked a woman

with six children and a low-earning husband if she knew about it, she did not. She had worked as a chambermaid in hotels, and was clearly short of time, energy, and money. Had she known about it, she still might not have been able to take part.

A different kind of community was suggested by an attempt to create a "non-political" club for refugee villagers. However, this did not succeed. Such a club had been started in the village in 1973 and had taken the name "Olympos". However, in July 1974, the Secretary sent a telegram of congratulation in the name of the "Olympos Club" to Nikos Sampson when the Greek Army and EOKA B installed him as "President". It was reportedly the first such telegram to be sent in Cyprus, and many Argaki people were ashamed and disgusted when they heard this. So when, in the refugee condition, moves were made to start a new club to bring the Argaki people together, with the same name, Olympos, most villagers decided to ignore it. But there is a coffee-shop in an old quarter of Limassol run by a man from Argaki. He started it in 1975, and when I visited in 2000 he was still running it, and there were a dozen men from Argaki and neighbouring villages there, playing cards and watching television.

Conclusion

My concern here has been with refugee capacities for rebuilding disrupted lives. There has been emphasis on the range of social factors which distinguish one family's trajectory from that of another, and with different "generations" in terms of pre-war experience, of met or unmet responsibilities, and of the portion of economic life which has had to be "repeated" to see children educated and married off. Another concern has been with how far the original dislocation, with its loss of access to accumulated savings, capital resources, and homes (practical but resonant with social symbolism), is necessarily transferred to those who are more removed, by their youthful condition and the absence of direct dependants, as they grow up.

I am left with new questions arising out of this provisional, qualitative research – fifty serious conversations packed into a few weeks. One of these concerns the health effects of the dislocation, destitution, and subsequent heroic efforts to fulfil social obligations, particularly those to children. Many refugees have

health problems in their late 50s, 60s and onwards. There are cardio-vascular problems, cancers, alcohol and smoking-related conditions. There is also a tremendous concern with improving health. But, of course, all these things can be expected in the non-refugee population at the same age. Such matters were discussed in 1977 by the psychiatrist Takis Evdokas, in a widely publicised study. I think there may be reasons to take these issues further, with a major health survey of carefully matched refugee and non-refugee populations, to see if, in practice, significant numbers of refugees have been dying younger or getting ill earlier, or from different sicknesses, than non-refugees. Many refugees themselves explain incidents of illness and death by the concept of άγχος, the pathological anxiety of having been dislocated. They may well be correct.

Acknowledgements

I am as always grateful to a large number of Argaki people for their hospitality and trust, and particularly in this recent work to Evrou and Ttoulis Polyviou, of Kato Polemidhia, and to Tomas and Argyrou Diakourtis of Astromeritis; to my friends Vassos Argyrou, Paul Sant Cassia, Yiannis Papadakis and Marios Sarris, for their hospitality and many helpful discussions; to Dr Paul Strong for permission to quote unpublished work; to David Turton and the Refugee Studies Program, Queen Elizabeth House, for helping me re-engage with refugee issues; and to Akis Papataxiarchis and Spyros Marchetos for similar encouragement; and to colleagues in the LSE Anthropology Department, Development Studies Institute, Hull University Anthropology and Sociology Department, and at the April 2000 Intercollege Cyprus Sociological Association Conference, Nicosia, for giving me opportunities to present work in progress. Lastly, my thanks to David Holton for an invitation to talk about these matters to his Cambridge seminar, and for editing this text.

References

Al-Rasheed, M. (1994). "The Myth of Return: Iraqi Arab and Assyrian refugees in London", *Journal of Refugee Studies* 7.2/3, 199-219

Evdokas, T. et al. (1976). *A representative research among the 200,000 refugees of Cyprus*. Nicosia: Socio-Psychological Research Group

Loizos, P. (1975). "Changes in property transfer among Greek Cypriot villagers", *Man* 10.4, 503-23 (with an appendix by Christopher Langford)

Loizos, P. (1981). *The heart grown bitter: a chronicle of Cypriot war refugees*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Loizos, P. (1999). "Ottoman half-lives: long-term perspectives on particular forced migrations", *Journal of Refugee Studies* 12.3, 237-63

Loizos, P. (2000). "Are refugees social capitalists?", in: S. Baron, J. Field and T. Schuller, *Social Capital: Critical perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 124-41

Loizos, P. (2001). *Χρονικό της Κυπριακής προσφυγιάς*. Trans. Dr Spyros Marchetos. Athens: Alexandreia

Panayiotopoulos, P. (1996). "Challenging Orthodoxies: Cypriot entrepreneurs in the London garment industry", *New Community* 22[3], 437-60

Panayiotopoulos, P. (2000). "The labour regime under conditions of globalization in the Cypriot garment industry", *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans* 2.1, 75-87

Pipis, Christodoulos (2000). *Αργάκι: 1800-1974*. Nicosia: Cassoulides and Sons

Strong, P. (1999). *The economic consequences of ethno-national conflict in Cyprus: the development of two siege economies after 1963, and 1974*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Economic History, London School of Economics and Political Science [University of London]

Zetter, R. (1982). "Housing policy in Cyprus: a review", *Habitat* 6. 4, 471-86

Zetter, R. (1991). "Labelling refugees: forming and transforming a bureaucratic identity", *Journal of Refugee Studies* 4.1, 39-62

Zetter, R. (1992). "Refugees and forced migrants as development resources: the Greek Cypriot refugees from 1974", *The Cyprus Review* 4.1 (Spring), 7-39

Zetter, R. (1998). "We are strangers here: continuity and transition and the impact of protracted exile on the Greek-Cypriot refugees", in: V. Calotychos (ed.), *Cyprus and its people: Nation, identity and experience in an unimaginable community, 1955-1997*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, pp. 301-29

London School of Economics

"It happened in Athens": the relaunch of Greek film production during World War II*

Maria A. Stassinopoulou

The film *It happened in Athens* (Andrew Marton, 1962) was a Hollywood production about the 1896 Olympics. Its cast included Jayne Mansfield, the decathlete Bob Mathias and the Greek-American actor Nico Minardos. Parts of the film were shot on location and Jayne Mansfield became the talk of the town for a few days – a photograph of her on the steps of the Acropolis has recently risen to new prominence on a book cover (Yalouri 2001). In the early sixties Greece not only offered shooting locations for international productions but was also a European country on the way from post-war poverty to economic development and consumerism. A minor sector of its economy, Greek feature film production, was passing from the modest regularity of the early fifties to an annual production of over one hundred films in 1964 (Sotiropoulou 1995: 38). This development was out of proportion, even if one includes Cyprus and Greek communities abroad in the potential audiences. During the so-called golden era Greek film production would reach its peak (with 196 films produced in 1967), followed in the early seventies by the inevitable crisis, the result (among other reasons) of the late arrival of television. For those few years Greek films were responsible for more than 30% of box office returns (Sotiropoulou 1995: 42) and, it has been assumed, for an even higher percentage in second-run and provincial cinemas.

Twenty years before Hollywood's story of actress Eleni Costa (Mansfield) and the marathon runners of the first modern Olympics, something different – and indeed more significant for

---

* This is a slightly revised version of a lecture given in Cambridge on 8 May 2002. It is part of an ongoing research project on Greek cinema in the twentieth century for a planned monograph on "Greek national cinema" in the Routledge "National Cinema" series.

the history of Greek cinema – had happened in Athens. In late 1942 two film productions were announced and a new attempt at regular feature film-making was initiated after local feature film production had gone through a severe crisis during the previous decade. Between late 1942 and mid-1944 a total of ten film projects were announced: eight began shooting, five reached the cinemas during the Occupation; the others were subsequently re-edited with additional material and shown in 1945 or even later. The difficulty of locating copies, particularly of older films, is especially acute for this period, and this can partly explain (along with the perennial difficulties of archival research in Greece) the rather marginal attention given to the subject. As in all countries which experienced Axis occupation, a further reason for neglecting the topic is probably a reluctance to discuss economic activities during the period. Film-making, an activity requiring, among other things, a scarce raw material, police permits of different types and state intervention through censorship at various stages, must have involved some kind of positioning of the participants vis à vis the Occupation forces, most probably somewhere between the two extremes of collaboration and resistance. While film production in Greece until the sixties did not offer possibilities for significant enrichment – as opposed to distribution and cinema ownership – the subject is still understandably delicate, particularly considering that Modern Greek historiography has not yet sufficiently discussed the different strategies of adaptation and survival among the Greek population (Margaritis 1992), and even less economic collaboration with the occupying forces (Chaidia 1996). The focus of this article is on the position of feature film production between late 1942 and 1944 in the general chronology of Greek film history. Based on the limited published data available and on unpublished material from the Bundesarchiv in Berlin, I propose a provisional narrative of film-making during this short period.

* * *

Cinema-going was already in the late twenties an established form of leisure in Greek towns and cities and most cinemas had adapted to sound by the mid-thirties (Stassinopoulou 2000a and

2000b; Delveroudi 2002). Hollywood was already a major player, but German and French companies and their distributing agents still controlled part of the market in the last inter-war years. In contrast to Greek cinematic culture in general, which expanded impressively during the thirties, the history of Greek feature film-making is a story of hopeful starts and discontinuous take-offs, the most successful one having been the so-called first "flourishing" of Greek cinema in the late twenties and early thirties (Hess 2000). The economic crisis and the introduction of sound interrupted feature film-making in Athens. Feature films for Greek audiences produced after 1933 were shot in Egyptian studios, first in Alexandria and later in Cairo. Film-making in Athens between 1933 and 1939 concentrated on newsreels and documentaries (Soldatos 1994; Stassinopoulou 2000b: 91-3).

Though most film historians tend to attribute the interruption in production to the authoritarian régime of Ioannis Metaxas, the régime was in fact interested in the possibilities of cinema as a propaganda instrument. This interest was demonstrated by new provisions on censorship with tighter control than that of previous parliamentary legislation. The obligatory screening of documentaries and newsreels before feature films was enforced – attempts of former governments do not appear to have been as successful. Unlike the agenda set out for the organisation of the Royal Theatre or the radio, no immediate measures for the strengthening of feature film production were taken. On the other hand, filming of government activities for newsreels was sponsored by the Ministry of Press and Tourism (Soldatos 1994: 121-2).

In 1939 two feature films were produced in Athens after a complete standstill of six years. They reached film theatres in 1940, while a third project would be finished after the war. *Το τραγούδι του χωρισμού* (The separation song) was the first film of the most important producer of the cinema boom of the post-war period, Filopoimin Finos (Triantafyllidis 2000: 48-9; *Νέα Εστία* 14/27, 1940, 646-8). *Νύχτα χωρίς ξημέρωμα* (Night without dawn) was produced by Antonis Papadantonakis; the film reappeared in 1955 re-edited as *Κάλλιο αργά παρά ποτέ* (Better late than never) (Iliadis 1960: 72; Koliodimos 1999: 1426). A third project, *Σιωπηλή σύρραξις* (Silent fight) starring Iro Chanta, was backed by the new company of Rassel and Barouch, Iro Film (Iliadis

1960: 75). It was completed in 1945, under the title *Διπλή θυσία* (Double sacrifice), by the new owner Ilias Inglesis, who had changed the name of the company to Orpheus-Film – the name of his cinema in Kokkinia. Little is known about the production background of these films, even less than the meagre information available about the films of the inter-war period in general, but it is evident that new names appeared, while DAG-Gaziadis and Olympia-Dadiras, the two most active companies of the first "flourishing", which had coincided with the last Venizelos government, did not invest in feature film-making. It was not necessary for film-makers of the years 1939-40 to share the ideology of the régime. Despite proposals to imitate the Turkish initiative of state intervention in feature film production, inspired probably by the German and Italian examples, Greek feature film production remained a private business. Melodrama, because of its narrative flexibility, permits all kinds of identifications for audiences without provoking censorship. A better knowledge of these films, taking account of the context of Egyptian films of the period, would lead to a clearer understanding of the feature film production of the thirties.

With the beginning of the Greek-Italian war on the Albanian front in October 1940, most film-makers formed newsreel crews under the auspices of the Army Geography Service (Γεωγραφική Υπηρεσία Στρατού). According to oral testimony (e.g. interviews with Finos), almost immediately after the German troops had entered Athens the majority of the army film materials were confiscated by soldiers led by the representative of Agfa in Athens, Willy Venzlaff, dressed in SS uniform. That Venzlaff should have been or become a loyal adherent of national socialism is not surprising. Agfa (Actiengesellschaft für Anilinfabrikation) was after all part of the chemicals consortium IG Farben, one of the industries most closely involved in the German state economy and Nazi warfare. Raw film and cameras, one of the sectors Agfa specialized in, were important and expensive products in the process of penetrating the South-East European and Middle East market. According to the Agfa files of the inter-war period, Venzlaff, who had been the first representative of the company since 1931, did not show any particularly active political profile, and film-selling activities in Athens were reduced to a minimum after the economic crisis of

the mid-thirties, with Istanbul becoming a more interesting trading location (Bundesarchiv Berlin, files "IG-Farbenindustrie AG (R 8128), Verkaufsgemeinschaft Agfa, Berlin SO 36, Photo AG Athen 1928-1944"). After the war Venzlaff remained at the Agfa offices in Athens until his retirement.

Greek film histories record without any particular comment the reappearance of Athenian feature films in late 1942. Considering that, with the exception of the short pre-war interlude of 1939-40, films had not been produced on a regular basis in Athens since 1933, the unquestioning attitude of Greek film history, simply registering the relaunch of film production after almost a decade and after the terrible famine of the winter of 1941-2, is, to say the least, surprising. The timing of this new attempt at feature film-making in late 1942 coincides, however, with the general improvement of food availability in Greek cities and particularly in Athens (Thomadakis 1981; Margaritis 1993: 171-3), generating optimism among the population. Christos Christidis wrote in his diary entry of 26 December 1942: "The market is full of merchandise and customers. The theatres and the cinemas are full" (quoted in Margaritis 1993: 172). Antonio Gomes, a Jewish film-agent working for the Skouras companies and travelling through Europe in 1943, surprised his Foreign Office interview partner in Lisbon by stating that survival in Athens was easier than in other cities (Margaritis 1992). The narratives of some of the legendary figures of post-war cinema about how they had managed to hide film rolls from the Greek army, or even to seize German and Italian supplies with the assistance of resistance groups, cannot sufficiently explain film-making at such a time. Probably as a gesture of discretion after the war, discussion of the financial backing, and more importantly, of the attitude of officials, both of the collaborationist government and of the occupying forces, towards the film projects did not take place, at least not openly.

In his recent biography of Maria Callas, Nikos Petsalis-Diomidis describes in a minute case study the great difficulty of avoiding contact with the Occupation forces, at least for performing artists (Petsalis-Diomidis 1998: ch. 20 to 33). This is yet another subject which remained a topic of insider discussion, but not of public debate and certainly not of publications – something which has not changed since Veloudis's remark that

"cooperation" or "collaboration" in the domain of letters remains a taboo subject in Greece (Veloudis 1990: 517-18, notes 3 and 5). In an entry in his diary dated 31 March 1942, Giorgos Theotokas expresses his concern about the involvement of writers in journals and festivities of the Occupation forces (Theotokas [1987]: 351-2). Theotokas was equally disapproving of the appearance of Kostas Varnalis at a banquet held at the Bulgarian Embassy in Athens, as well as of the collaboration of authors with printed media financed and controlled by the Germans and Italians. The diary entry related to the first issue of the Italian propaganda journal *Quadrivio*, published in Greek, which featured an article by a member of the Academy of Athens, Grigorios Xenopoulos, together with articles by Kostas Kairofyllas and Nikolaos Laskaris. In 1943 Theotokas returned to this entry to note in the margin: "Later Kleon Paraschos, Fotis Kontoglou, Alekos Lidorikis, Dim. Bogris, N. Poriotis, Gatopoulos, Mich. Tombros and others. More than we expected (1943)." While the disdain expressed here by Theotokas, a man of strong principles, but also of means, is understandable, it is necessary to point out that during the period of the Occupation the choice for people in the media and cultural sectors was either silence and retreat, meaning also no possibility of making a living, or a direct or indirect declaration of political beliefs.

The influence of the Occupation forces was not only felt in political persecution or censorship but also through financial decisions (see, for example, Bastias 1997: I, 115-17 on the bankruptcy of the "Theatre of Athens", because its main sponsor's contract with the Italian army had been suspended). Already in mid-1942 the leftist resistance movement EAM was promoting cultural activities, including the publication of literary journals (e.g. *Καλλιτεχνικά Νέα*, featuring film articles by Alexis Solomos) and the sponsorship of theatrical activities for the ELAS troops (see, for example, Kotzioulas 1986; bibliography in Myrsiades 2000). As usual in times of political crisis in Greece, the pastoral dramas were brought back, functioning as national pageants. In 1944 both *Golfo* and *The shepherdess's lover* were being played in Athenian theatres and the film *Astero* (DAG Film, 1929) was announced in January 1944 in a new sound version (*Βραδυνή*, 27 and 29 January; Iliadis 1960: 73; for earlier versions

of this phenomenon during the Balkan Wars and World War I see Delveroudi 1988).

My questioning of the standard narrative on Greek film-making during the Occupation began as I was trying to understand Greek film chronology in the context of international film-making. As with other aspects of social and cultural history, Greek bibliography, more often than not, opts for a *Sonderweg* model, preferring to elaborate on individuality and difference rather than to compare similarities. This is also the case with cinema: dissimilarities to other European cinemas are stressed while similarities are neglected. The discussion of the European film industry during the war has not yet found its echo with respect to Greek cinema. Some cameramen and directors did indeed shoot films for EAM and ELAS, but they mainly filmed the ELAS units in action as well as the liberation scenes in 1944 (e.g. Stelios Tatasopoulos; see Petris 1988: 21), while later accompanying the Democratic Army (e.g. Manos Zacharias). The tragic fact that Finos's father, Giannis, was accused of being an active communist and executed by the Germans in the summer of 1944, while Filopoimin himself escaped with four months' imprisonment and the voluntary donation of his assets, is often mentioned (Triantafyllidis 2000: 29). Unfortunately it does not help in understanding the film business between the autumn of 1942 and the summer of 1944. Giorgos Kavoukidis, co-producer of Finos's first production during the Occupation, mentioned in an interview that it had been said that Giannis Finos was supplying resistance fighters with food, but that he himself was not certain that this was true (Triantafyllidis 2000: 208). I do not approach the subject of film-making during the Occupation with the desire of bringing out family secrets from a locked closet. My primary interest lies in the continuities and discontinuities in Greek film-making from the thirties to the fifties; as is the case with France, I believe that personal, film content, and structural continuities before and after the war are strong. Persons already active in the inter-war period continued through the Occupation and until well into the fifties, shaping the themes and the aesthetic agenda of Greek post-war cinema. I suppose that this is what film historian Giannis Soldatos means when he writes in his short chapter on the Occupation: "The Greek cinema takes

the first steps on its later path, by reconstructing its pre-war remnants" (Soldatos 1999: 55).

The Reich was keen to put both film production and distribution under the control of a company called Ufa, Universum Film AG (Kreimeier 1992: 389-98), while at the same time providing the legal infrastructure for state intervention, in those countries which had developed feature film production mainly in the private sector. The most prominent examples were, on the one hand, the foremost European competitor of German cinema, France, where production continued in both occupied and Vichy France and where the foundations for the post-war structures of the French cinema were laid during this period (Garçon 1984: 31-47; Hayward 1993: 43-4; Thompson and Bordwell 1994: 337-9; Williams 1992: 247-53); on the other, a small industry, the Danish cinema, which flourished particularly in the first years of the Occupation (Thompson and Bordwell 1994: 448; Vincendeau 1995: 110) producing some 92 films from 1940 to 1945, compared with 77 between 1930 and 1939. How did the Germans handle the small but active Greek distribution sector and the paralysed production sector on their arrival in Greece? So far I have looked into the German newspaper which appeared in Athens during the Occupation, *Deutsche Nachrichten für Griechenland*, Greek dailies, as well as unpublished archival materials from the post-war correspondence of American and German authorities, trying to track down the property of Universum Film AG, left in the formerly occupied countries. I have not undertaken, for the moment, any research on the Italian side, which also promoted its own cultural activities.

The Occupation forces moved rapidly in order to take control of the Greek economy in the spring and early summer of 1941. While it is true that the main interest was in food supplies and ores, other sectors such as the textile industry also attracted attention, not in order to invest but rather to confiscate materials or products (Etmektsoglou 2000; Mazower 1993: 24-6; Thomadakis 1981). Immediately after the Occupation began, several big cinemas in Athens and Thessaloniki were transformed into Soldaten-Kinos, showing German newsreels, propaganda documentaries and German feature films. Cinema was considered by the Wehrmacht as an important part of organised leisure. We know from diaries of German soldiers posted even in small towns,

and later on islands, that they watched films on a regular basis. Men of 164 Infantry Division dispersed among small garrisons throughout Northern Greece saw up to eight films a month already in the autumn of 1941. In his diary for 1944 a member of the SS registered two to three shows weekly (Mazower 1993: 204). For some rural areas these must have been the first film shows ever, but they were probably not open to the local population. A fair amount of film copies was available in order to provide for all units. The number of copies grew after the German retreat from Africa, as some material supplies were transported via Greece to other fighting fronts. After the withdrawal from Greece numerous film copies were apparently left behind. According to the American agent, Carol Hellmann, authorised by the "Liquidationsausschuß", the controlling institution entrusted with the evaluation and liquidation of Ufa assets after the war, film copies were circulating in Greece and being distributed without any rights being paid to the lawful owner (Bundesarchiv Berlin, Universum Film AG (R109 I), file 2302, Ufa-Liquidationsausschuß. Korrespondenz). The correspondence of Hellmann and other representatives of the "Liquidationsausschuß" with Greek distributors mentions several films of the late thirties and early forties. The Greek correspondents confirmed the existence of copies but were not willing to disclose information on how the copies had reached them and, most importantly, on their number (Bundesarchiv Berlin, Universum Film AG (R109 I), various correspondence files).

The small scale of Greek film production probably did not render it immediately attractive for the economic staff, but considering the importance accorded to propaganda activities it is rather surprising that the only documented take-over relating to cinema dates from October 1941, while all major acquisitions had already been arranged by May 1941. A memorandum written in 1954 in an attempt to reconstruct remaining Ufa assets in Greece describes the contents of a contract signed on 28 October (!) 1941. According to the memorandum, Universum Film AG (Ufa) bought the company of Theofanis Damaskinos, already one of the most powerful distributors in Greece and a pre-war Ufa agent, and founded Hellas Film AG with exclusively German capital. Damaskinos was on the board of

directors of the new company, which was conceived not only as a distributing agency of Ufa productions but also as a producing firm. As was the usual pattern, the Italians also appear to have made a similar move by founding Esperia Film, while Damaskinos himself founded a further distribution company, Hermes Film, which continued to exist after 1944, specialising in German films (Lazaridis 1999: 182). In the fifties and again in his memoirs, screenwriter and producer Giorgos Lazaridis, son of Kostas Lazaridis, whose company Damaskinos had taken over before the war, accused Damaskinos of making illegal profits during the Occupation. Even if that does not necessarily hold true, it is certain that Damaskinos was in a position after the war to participate actively in the new distribution game. Together with his partner Viktor Michailidis he controlled to a large extent film distribution in post-war Greece, competing successfully against the Skouras companies (Stassinopoulou 2000b: 126-7). Filmographies mention neither Hellas AG nor Esperia Film as film producers during the Occupation.

The second move of the Occupation forces in the domain of cinema was to include an important relevant section in the new law on theatre published in March 1942. The interest in a direct involvement in production was thus manifest, the legal framework had been adapted to suit the needs of an authoritarian regime even better than the Metaxas law, and in the autumn of 1942 the inhabitants of Athens were becoming more optimistic after the hardships of the first Occupation winter (Margaritis 1993). Finally, as in all Reich territories and countries occupied by Reich forces, only German films and films produced by German allies could be imported and distributed; productions from France, including the Vichy territory, were also formally allowed in some territories but, at least according to the newspapers, they no longer found their way to Athenian cinemas. By December 1942 only German, Italian and Hungarian films were being shown. Obviously investing capital in a film did not appear to be such a risky business. Finos, together with Kavoukidis and Dadiras (Olympia Film) in cooperation with Pergantis, were the first to make the leap.

The films

The first film project of Finos during the Occupation was the film *Η φωνή της καρδιάς* (The voice of the heart), a melodrama starring the legendary leading man of the Greek theatre Aimilios Veakis. The title was probably a translation of the German melodrama *Die Stimme des Herzens* (Karl Heinz Martin, 1937) starring the German star Marianne Hoppe. The film was co-produced with Giorgos Kavoukidis; in the initial campaign it was advertised as a 1942 Finos-Kavoukidis production (Triantafyllidis 2000: 50), while later the film was considered the first production of the Finos Film company. It was written and directed by Dimitris Ioannopoulos, who had studied in Athens and Berlin and had worked for Ufa in the Neubabelsberg studios in Berlin. Ioannopoulos, the director of the theatre section of Greek Radio since 1938, had directed a state-financed short on the population census of 1940, produced by Finos, which received praise in the media (*Νέα Εστία* 14/28, 1940, 1363; Mitropoulou 1980: 81-3; Goutos and Noulas 1996: 108; Triantafyllidis 2000: 208). Ioannopoulos's Berlin background and his career from 1938 onwards do not necessarily confirm a particular ideology, but they were certainly no obstacle to forming a good relationship with the German authorities. On the other hand, Aimilios Veakis is known to have been sympathetic towards EAM and was forced to sign a declaration of political convictions after the Battle of Athens. The film was premièred in March 1943 in two cinemas of the Anzervos company ("Rex" and "Esperos"), and was an immediate success, resulting in spontaneous gatherings of enthusiastic audiences outside the "Rex" (Mitropoulou 1980: 82; Triantafyllidis 2000: 208). It remained on show for three weeks in three Athenian cinemas selling approximately 103,000 tickets; according to one of the two main investors, the photographer Giorgos Kavoukidis, the costs were covered within these first weeks (Triantafyllidis 2000: 206-8).

Olympia Film, the company of Panagiotis Dadiras, who in 1932 had backed the famous *Ο αγαπητικός της βοσκοπούλας* (The shepherdess's lover), the first Athenian film with post-production sound inscription recorded in the Tobis studios in Berlin, produced in cooperation with Ilias Pergantis the melodrama *Η θύελλα πέρασε* (The storm is over). The film was written and directed by Takis Bakopoulos and featured Periklis

Christoforidis, Frangiskos Manellis, Giannis Apostolidis, Kimon Spathopoulos, Christoforos Nezer, Anthi Miliadi, and the young Efi Palmi. Together with *The voice of the heart* they reached the screen in March 1943. In *Deutsche Nachrichten für Griechenland* the film was promoted as a step towards a truly national Greek cinema, liberated from French and Anglo-Saxon influences. Friedrich Herzog wrote in his film presentation under the title "Athenian milieu" on 24 March 1943:

> The influence of French and Anglo-Saxon films has created in this country a norm in the general perception of filmic vision, which cannot be overturned from one day to another. It rests in the hands of Greek artists to liberate themselves from this influence, in order to be able to help the creative breakthrough of Greek cinema as the expression of Greek life.

The third film to be shown in 1943 was *Μάγια η Τσιγγάνα* (Magia the Gypsy), produced, written and directed by Giannis Christodoulou, who also played the male leading role. Both Finos and Dadiras announced new films in 1944. *Νύχτα αγωνίας* (Night of agony) and *Ραγισμένο βιολί* (Broken violin) were melodramas, which were to be completed after the German withdrawal. Their titles were changed – as were probably the scripts – into *Η βίλλα με τα νούφαρα* (The villa with the water lilies) and *Ραγισμένες καρδιές* (Broken hearts) respectively. The Tonis Film production (Papadantonakis) *Η ανθοπώλις των Αθηνών* (The flower-girl of Athens) began in 1943 but was also completed in 1945 (Iliadis 1960: 73). Another main player of the distribution and cinema-owning business, Anzervos, former distribution agent of the German company Tobis AG, began the production of *Όνειρα που σβήνουν* (Fading dreams), with the owner's son Giorgos Zervos directing and Giorgos Pappas and Vaso Manolidou starring, a film which could not be completed before the end of the war (Iliadis 1960: 73-4). *Το δρομάκι του παραδείσου* (Paradise alley), a Mega-Film production (Iliadis 1960: 74), was announced in late 1943 (*Βραδυνή*, 15.11.1943) and seems to have been premièred in April 1944. The producers Megalokonomos and Drimaropoulos were well-known photographers and newsreel producers of the thirties. The film was written by Alekos Lidorikis (who, as we saw earlier, had aroused Theotokas's in-

dignation by cooperating with the Italian magazine *Quadrivio*), directed by Pier Alberto Pieralisi and photographed by Umberto Perugini(?). Its cast included Christos Efthymiou, Dimitris Myrat and Eleni Chalkousi.

Mavrikios Novak, a former sound technician and newsreel cameraman (his son Iason was the cameraman of *Maya the Gypsy*), produced *Χειροκροτήματα* (Applause) on the life of the famous singer Attik. Shooting began in late 1943 and the film was premièred on 27 April 1944. It was the directing debut of one of the most prominent film directors of the post-war period, Giorgos Tzavellas. It also was the second appearance of probably the most successful *jeune premier* on both screen and stage from the forties to the late fifties, Dimitris Horn, who had started his film career in *The voice of the heart*. Novak had already announced in 1943 plans for a musical film production in the spring of 1944 (*Βραδυνή*, 1.12.1943). In May 1944 a new company (*Βραδυνή*, 1.5.1944) announced the film *Love in the classroom*, based on the theatrical success of playwright Alekos Sakellarios *Το ξύλο βγήκε απ' τον παράδεισο* (Spare the rod), a film finally made in 1959 as a Finos Film production. The Gaziadis brothers, who had led the so-called "flourishing" of the inter-war period, are among the exceptions who do not appear in this new phase of production activities, despite their experience in Germany in the twenties. Even after 1944 they did not appear again as producers, but participated as cameramen in early post-war films.

The Athenian films of the period suffered the same drawbacks as their predecessors of the late twenties and early thirties. They were made with extremely old equipment and backward technical standards in studios not worth the name, while direct sound inscription was still impossible. The only reason that Athens had again become attractive as a location for shooting films was that the previously used Cairo studios were out of reach for film-makers and actors living in Greece. The few Greek actors residing in Egypt continued to appear in Egyptian productions, such as the Kalouta sisters in the comedy *Καπετάν Σκορπιός* (Captain Scorpion, Togo Misrahi, 1943), but touring and shooting had become impossible for Athens-based actors. For the first time there was also no real competition at the box office because of the protectionist system of the Occupation forces. After having seen German and Austrian productions like

Immensee, Der Kongress tanzt and *Barcarole* several times, audiences were now more amenable to accepting a Greek film than they had been before the war. Furthermore, some of the Greek films, like *The voice of the heart*, featured some of the best Greek stage actors (Veakis, Leivaditis, Konstantaras, Tsaganea, Vokovits) and introduced fresh faces such as Kaiti Panou, who starred in several feature films after the war as an *ingénue*. Greek films were for the first time really successful at the box office. The film-makers involved seem to have perceived this turn of fate for Greek feature film as a positive change. In an article published in early June 1944 in the magazine *Radio*, Giorgos Tzavellas wrote:

> The two last films, *The voice of the heart* and *Applause*, which according to the opinion both of the public and the specialists were considered a very good starting point for film production in our country, still do feature serious imperfections. But they have proven that there exist in Greece both technical and artistic elements for cinema. (Aktsoglou 1994: 27)

Both professional journals and the dailies registered the sudden activity in film production in 1943 and 1944 with optimistic articles (Iliadis 1960: 73-4), perhaps slightly prompted by the authorities. Pavlos Palaiologos finished his article in *Ελεύθερον Βήμα* (26.1.1944) with a hopeful note: "But does the stamina for a long-term work exist? And the ability? And the capital? And the infrastructure? It does, say the omens. May it be so."

The German retreat in the autumn and the Battle of Athens in December 1944 and January 1945 disrupted everyday and social life again and the electricity shortage kept cinemas closed for some time. But by mid-1945 movie-going was booming again and there were plenty of films waiting to be shown: all the Allies, and in particular the Americans, were interested in promoting their film industries. Production continued at approximately the same pace as during the Occupation, growing steadily after 1948 and reaching an annual production of ten films in 1950. A look at Greek feature film production from its beginnings in 1914 (with a *Golfo*) to 1950, which symbolically marks the post-war take-off – among other reasons because the film *Ο μεθύστακας* (The drunkard) sold 300,000 tickets in the first-run cinemas of Athens

and Piraeus alone – reveals an irregular pattern of Athenian production until 1942. With an irony comparable to parallel phenomena in other continental film industries, the German and Italian occupation authorities contributed through protectionist measures and active involvement in cultural politics to an encouragement of producers and to the relaunch of Greek feature film production, which was to continue uninterrupted after the war to reach its golden era in the sixties.

References

Aktsoglou, Babis (ed.) (1994). *Γιώργος Τζαβέλλας* [35ο Φεστιβάλ Κινηματογράφου Θεσσαλονίκης]. n.p.

Bastias, Giannis K. (1997). *Ο Κωστής Μπαστιάς στα χρόνια του μεσοπολέμου. Μεσοπόλεμος–Κατοχή–Απελευθέρωση.* Τόμος Α΄. Athens: Ekdotiki Athinon

Chaidia, Eleni (1996). "Ειδικό δικαστήριο Θεσσαλονίκης (1945-1946): Η περίπτωση των οικονομικών δοσιλόγων", *Βαλκανικά Σύμμεικτα* 8, 201-10

Delveroudi, Eliza-Anna (1988). "Η καλλιέργεια του πατριωτικού αισθήματος στη θεατρική παραγωγή των αρχών του 20ού αιώνα", in: Giorgos Mavrogordatos and Christos Chatziiosif (eds.), *Βενιζελισμός και αστικός εκσυγχρονισμός.* Irakleio: Panepistimiakes Ekdoseis Kritis, pp. 306-14

Delveroudi, Eliza-Anna (forthcoming 2002). "Κινηματογράφος 1923-1940", in: Christos Chatziiosif (ed.), *Ιστορία της Ελλάδας του 20ού αιώνα.* Vol. 2. Athens: Vivliorama

Etmektsoglou, Gavriella (2000). "Η οικονομία της Ελλάδας κατά τη διάρκεια της γερμανικής κατοχής", in: *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους.* Τόμος ΙΣΤ΄. Athens: Ekdotiki Athinon

Garçon, François (1984). *De Blum à Pétain: cinéma et société française (1935-1944).* Paris: Cerf

Goutos, Kostas D. and Noulas, Konstantinos D. (1996). *Λεξικό σκηνοθετών του ελληνικού κινηματογράφου*. Athens: Aigokeros

Hayward, Susan (1993). *French national cinema*. London and New York: Routledge

Hess, Franklin (2000). "Sound and the Nation: rethinking the history of early Greek film production", *JMGS* 18.1, 13-36

Iliadis, Frixos (1960). *Ελληνικός κινηματογράφος*. Athens: Fantasia

Koliodimos, Dimitris (1999). *The Greek filmography, 1914 through 1996*. Jefferson, N.C. and London: McFarland

Kotzioulas, Giorgos (1980). *Θέατρο στα βουνά*. Athens: Themelio

Kreimeier, Klaus (1992). *Die Ufa-Story: Geschichte eines Filmkonzerns*. Munich and Vienna: Hanser

Margaritis, Giorgos (1992). "Η περίοδος της κρίσιμης καμπής (1942-1943). Μια μαρτυρία για τη μεταβολή των συνθηκών στην κατεχόμενη Ελλάδα", *Μνήμων* 14, 133-49

Margaritis, Giorgos (1993). *Από την ήττα στην εξέγερση. Ελλάδα: άνοιξη 1941-φθινόπωρο 1942*. Athens: Ekdoseis o Politis

Mazower, Mark (1993). *Inside Hitler's Greece: the experience of Occupation, 1941-1944*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press

Mitropoulou, Aglaia (1980). *Ελληνικός κινηματογράφος*. Athens: Thymeli

Myrsiades, Linda (2000). "Theatrical metaphors in Theodoros Angelopoulos's *The Traveling Players*", *JMGS* 18.1, 135-49

Petris, Tasos N. (1988). *Στέλιος Τατασόπουλος*. Athens: Etaireia Ellinon Skinotheton

Petsalis-Diomidis, Nikos (1998). *Η άγνωστη Κάλλας*. Athens: Kastaniotis

Soldatos, Giannis (ed.) (1994). *Ο ελληνικός κινηματογράφος. Ντοκουμέντα 1. Μεσοπόλεμος*. Athens: Aigokeros

Soldatos, Giannis (1999). *Ιστορία του ελληνικού κινηματογράφου*, Α΄ τόμος (1900-1967). 8th ed. Athens: Aigokeros

Sotiropoulou, Chrysanthi (1995). *Η διασπορά στον ελληνικό κινηματογράφο. Επιδράσεις και επιρροές στη θεματολογική εξέλιξη των ταινιών της περιόδου 1945-1986*. Athens: Themelio

Stassinopoulou, Maria A. (2000a). "Ο κινηματογράφος στον ελληνικό αστικό χώρο και η κινηματογραφική εικονογραφία της ελληνικής πόλης στο μεσοπόλεμο. Ασύμβατες πορείες, διαφορετικές ταχύτητες", *Πρακτικά του Β΄ Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου «Η πόλη στους νεότερους χρόνους. Μεσογειακές και Βαλκανικές όψεις (19ος-20ός αι.)»*. Athens: Etaireia Meletis Neou Ellinismou

Stassinopoulou, Maria A. (2000b). *Reality bites. A feature film history of Greece, 1950-1963*. Universität Wien (Habilitationsschrift)

Theotokas, Giorgos [1987]. *Τετράδια ημερολογίου: 1939-1953*. Εισαγωγή, επιμέλεια: Δημήτρης Τζιόβας. Athens: Estia

Thomadakis, Stavros B. (1981). "Black markets, inflation, and force in the economy of occupied Greece", in: John O. Iatrides (ed.), *Greece in the 1940s: a nation in crisis*. Hanover, N.H. and London: University Press of New England, pp. 61-80

Thompson, Kristin and Bordwell, David (1994). *Film history: an introduction*. New York and London: McGraw-Hill

Triantafyllidis, Iason (2000). *Ταινίες για φίλημα. Ένα αφιέρωμα στον Φιλοποίμενα Φίνο και τις ταινίες του*. Athens: Exantas

Williams, Alan (1992). *Republic of images: a history of French filmmaking*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press

Veloudis, Giorgos (1990). "Η ελληνική λογοτεχνία στην αντίσταση (1940-1944)", in: H. Fleischer and N. Svoronos (eds.), *Ελλάδα 1936-1944. Δικτατορία–Κατοχή–Αντίσταση*. Athens: Morfotiko Institouto Agrotikis Trapezas Ellados, pp. 516-28

Vincendeau, Ginette (ed.) (1995). *Encyclopedia of European cinema*. London: Cassell

Yalouri, Eleana (2001). *The Acropolis: Global fame, local claim*. Oxford and New York: Berg

University of Vienna

The year 2001–2002 at Cambridge

Students

Sally Brook spent her year abroad studying at the University of Thessaloniki. Two first-year students, Gwendolyn Edwards and Jonathan Mather, were awarded Ministry of Culture scholarships to attend the summer school of the Institute for Balkan Studies in Thessaloniki. Timothy Coomar won a scholarship for the University of Athens summer school in Greek language.

Three students were successful in the examinations for the Certificate in Modern Greek. Two of them, Bethany Fox and Polly Low, passed with Distinction. Sarah Martin was awarded a Diploma in Modern Greek with Credit.

Anna Rosenberg successfully completed the MPhil in European Literature; her dissertation was on the poetry of Yannis Ritsos.

A.G. Leventis Foundation Studentship

The Foundation generously agreed to fund a second studentship for a PhD in Modern Greek Studies at Cambridge. (The first studentship was held by Tassos Kaplanis for the years 1999-2002.) The studentship has been awarded to Konstandinos Yiavis, a graduate of the University of Thessaloniki, who subsequently undertook an MPhil in Medieval and Renaissance Literature at Cambridge. He will begin his research, on the late-medieval romance of *Imberios and Margarona*, in October 2002.

We were deeply saddened to learn of the death, on 11 July 2002, of Mr Constantine Leventis, Chairman of the A.G. Leventis Foundation. Mr Leventis's services to classical, Byzantine and modern Greek culture in the UK, and indeed elsewhere, are legion. Under his chairmanship the Foundation supported an incredible range of academic, educational and cultural activities in universities and schools, and within the Greek and Cypriot communities. His personal interest, commitment and encouragement, and – as a Cambridge classics graduate – his wide knowledge of Greek culture, were highly valued by all those who had the good fortune to know him. He will be greatly missed.

Teaching staff
Ms Margarita Tsota continued as Language Assistant in Modern Greek, seconded by the Greek Ministry of Education. Further language teaching was undertaken by Dr Anna Mastrogianni and Tassos Kaplanis. Dr Dimitris Livanios taught courses on modern Greek history, and Ms Efrosini Camatsos gave two lectures on twentieth-century prose fiction. Dr Tina Lendari has been appointed to a temporary lectureship in Modern Greek for the period January to December 2003, when Dr Holton will be on leave.

Visiting speakers
A full programme of special lectures was arranged during the year. The invited speakers and their titles were as follows:
17 October. Professor Benjamin Arbel (Tel Aviv University): *The treasure of Ayios Simeon: a micro-historical analysis of colonial relations in Venetian-ruled Cyprus*
7 November. Professor Michael Jeffreys (King's College London): *National bibliography before the nation: constructing Greekness out of early Greek printing*
14 November. Kostas Skordyles (University of Westminster): *The ethnic dimension of the "Fédération Socialiste Ouvrière de Salonique": revisiting the sources*
28 November. Dr Jocelyn Pye (University of Cambridge): *Intimacy and emancipation in Melpo Axioti's* Δύσκολες νύχτες
30 January. Professor Dimitris Tziovas (University of Birmingham): *Palaiologos's* Ο Πολυπαθής: *Picaresque autobiography as a national allegory*
13 February. Dr David Connolly (St Cross College, Oxford): *Odysseus Elytis on poetic expression:* Carte blanche
20 February. Dr Chris Williams: *Why does music matter? Issues of identity in Cretan music* (lecture-recital)
27 February. Professor Peter Loizos (London School of Economics): *Greek Cypriot refugees and the problems of "generation" in analysing their situations*
13 March. Dr Liana Giannakopoulou (King's College London): *Sculpture and stones in the poetry of Seferis and Ritsos*
1 May. Professor Robert Holland (Institute of Commonwealth Studies, University of London): *Britain, the Great Idea and the Cession of the Ionian Islands, 1858-64*

8 May. Professor Maria A. Stassinopoulou (University of Vienna): *"It happened in Athens": the relaunch of Greek film production during World War II*

Graduate Seminar
The Graduate Seminar met eleven times during the year. Five of the papers were given by invited speakers: Elena Athanassopoulou (University of Warwick), Massimo Cazzulo (Milan), Anastasia Natsina (St Cross College, Oxford), Birgit Olsen (University of Copenhagen) and Elina Tsalicoglou (Wadham College, Oxford). Other papers were presented by the following members of the seminar: Efrosini Camatsos (two papers), David Holton, Tassos Kaplanis, Napoleon Katsos and Anna Rosenberg.

Activities of members of the Modern Greek Section
Dr David Holton gave an invited lecture at the University of Gothenburg in November 2001, and a lecture on Cavafy to sixth-formers at the Hellenic College, London, in March 2002. He was a member of the programme committee for the 2nd European Conference on Modern Greek Studies (Rethymno, May 2002), and chairman of the organising committee for a conference on the manuscripts of late Byzantine and early Modern Greek literature, held in Athens in May 2002. Nearer to home, he helped organise a conference on the History of Archaeology in 19th- and 20th-century Greece, held in the Cambridge Faculty of Classics in April. He has published:
"Modern Greek: towards a standard language or a new diglossia?", in: M.C. Jones and E. Esch (eds.), *Language change: the interplay of internal, external and extra-linguistic factors* (Mouton de Gruyter, 2002).

Dr Dimitris Livanios continued to teach introductory and thematic courses in modern Greek history as Affiliated Lecturer. His Research Fellowship at Pembroke College, Cambridge, ended in January 2002. He is currently at the School of History, Classics and Archaeology of Birkbeck College, University of London, working on an AHRB-funded project on nationalism and religion in the Ottoman and Orthodox world, 1600-1900. As part of this project he organised, with Professor Mark Mazower, an international workshop on the "Social and cultural uses of sacred

spaces in the Orthodox and Ottoman worlds, 16th to 19th centuries", held at Birkbeck College, London, on 8 June 2002. A second workshop, on missionary activity in the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century, is planned for December 2002. He taught two new courses: "After the Ottoman Empire: the making of the modern Near East" and "Greece in the 1940s", for Birkbeck College, London. In June and July 2002 he taught a course on "Nations and Nationalism" for the University of California Summer School of Pembroke College, Cambridge. He has accepted a visiting appointment at Brown University, USA, where he will teach modern Greek history in the Spring Semester 2003. He has published or submitted for publication: "Nationalism in Eastern Europe and the Balkans", *Journal of Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 2. 2 (2002) 165-76. "Christians, Heroes and Barbarians: Serbs and Bulgarians in the modern Greek Historical Imagination, 1602 - 1950", in: Dimitris Tziovas (ed.), *Greece and the Balkans: Identities, perceptions and cultural encounters since the Enlightenment* (Aldershot: Ashgate) (forthcoming).

About the contributors

Benjamin Arbel is Professor of Early Modern History at the School of History, Tel Aviv University. His research interests include: aspects of the Venetian presence in the Eastern Mediterranean (trade, colonies, intercultural contacts etc.); historical aspects of human-animal interaction, particularly during the Renaissance; and Italian Renaissance culture. His principal publications include: "Η Κύπρος υπό Ενετική Κυριαρχία", in: Theodore Papadopoullos (ed.), *Ιστορία της Κύπρου*, Vol. 4, Part A (Nicosia: Makarios III Foundation 1995), pp. 455-536; *Trading Nations. Jews and Venetians in the early modern Eastern Mediterranean* (Leiden & New York: Brill 1995); and *Cyprus, the Franks and Venice, 13th-16th centuries* (Aldershot: Ashgate 2000).

David Connolly has written extensively on the theory and practice of literary translation and has published some fifteen books of translations from major Greek poets and novelists. A naturalised Greek, he has lived in Greece since 1979 and has taught translation at a number of university institutions in Greece. He is currently the Hellenic Foundation Visiting Fellow at St Cross College, Oxford.

Liana Giannakopoulou studied philology and linguistics at the University of Athens. She continued her studies in Paris, obtaining a DEA in formal and theoretical linguistics. In 2000 she completed her doctoral thesis at King's College London on "Ancient Greek sculpture in Modern Greek poetry, 1860-1960". She is currently teaching Modern Greek literature at King's College and has published on Sikelianos and Cavafy. Her research interests include Ritsos, Seferis and Cretan Renaissance drama.

Michael Jeffreys read classics at Peterhouse, Cambridge, and taught in London schools for a decade, whilst gaining a PhD at

Birkbeck College in the popular literature of Byzantium. After fellowships in America and Greece he became lecturer in Modern Greek at Sydney University, where he was later elected Sir Nicholas Laurantus Professor, for a decade the only professor of Modern Greek in a continent of half a million Greeks. He took early retirement in 2000 to follow his wife to Oxford, and now directs the Prosopography of the Byzantine Empire at King's College London, indulging enthusiasms for internet publishing. He has published on Greek literature from Malalas to Ritsos, concentrating on popular verse from the 12th to 16th centuries.

Peter Loizos (formerly Papaloizou) was born in London and took his first degree at St John's College, Cambridge. He was a Knox Fellow at Harvard University and obtained his doctorate at the London School of Economics. His research interests include Cyprus, Greek-Turkish relations, refugee adaptation and health, and ethnographic film. He taught Social Anthropology at the LSE from 1969 to 2002 and is currently teaching at Intercollege, Nicosia.

Maria A. Stassinopoulou is Professor of Modern Greek Studies at the Institut für Byzantinistik und Neogräzistik of the University of Vienna. She studied classics, linguistics and Greek history at the University of Athens, and Byzantine and Modern Greek studies and South-East European history at the University of Vienna, where she was awarded her PhD. Her research interests include early modern and modern social and cultural history, sociolinguistics, and film studies. She has published articles on the Greek Enlightenment, the Greek Diaspora in Austria-Hungary, German/Austrian-Greek cultural relations, Greek cinema, and language and ideology, and is the author of *Weltgeschichte im Denken eines griechischen Aufklärers: Konstantinos Michail Koumas als Historiograph* (Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang 1992).

Index to issues 1-10