ΚΑΜΠΟΣ

Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek

No. 12 2004

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 Io Manolessou
Design by Mark Owen

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)

Contents

Erotokritos and the history of the novel*

Roderick Beaton
King's College London

Erotokritos has long been recognised as the masterpiece of the Venetian-inspired literary and cultural Renaissance in Crete. The heyday of that Renaissance has generally been identified with the period of almost a century that separates the Battle of Lepanto (1571) from the fall of the last of the Cretan cities, Candia, to the Ottomans in 1669. But in reality, rather like the exactly contemporary heyday of the Elizabethan theatre in England, the heyday of the Cretan Renaissance seems to have been concentrated into a much shorter period.

The Venetians, who had ruled Crete since 1211, began pouring resources into the island after the loss of Cyprus to the Ottomans in 1571; the victory at Lepanto ushered in a period of heavy investment in this major outpost in the eastern Mediterranean; the spectacular fortifications of Candia (modern Heraklion) were strengthened. And it was in the last twenty years of the sixteenth century, and just into the first years of the seventeenth, that most of the surviving literary works of the Cretan Renaissance were written. The playwright Georgios Chortatsis, born in 1545, wrote his plays between 1580 and about 1601; Vitsentzos Kornaros, the author of *Erotokritos*,

* Some of the material included in the first part of this paper was presented in Greek at the international conference, "Ζητήματα ποιητικής στον *Ερωτόκριτο*", at the University of Crete at Rethymno, in November 2003; an earlier version of this material will be published in the proceedings. The full text was given as a lecture at Cambridge on 6 May 2004. I am grateful to participants on both occasions, and particularly to David Holton and Tina Lendari, for comments and criticism which have been silently adopted in the final version.

was eight years Chortatsis's junior, born in Siteia in 1553. The current consensus places the composition of *Erotokritos* somewhere between 1590 and 1610,[1] though I confess to a hankering for a slightly earlier date.[2]

Although not all specialists are equally convinced of the identity of the poet, all the evidence that has accumulated in the last twenty years confirms that, of the many recorded individuals with the name Vitsentzos Kornaros, this was indeed the author of *Erotokritos*. If so, he was a member of the Venetian-descended aristocracy, well connected with the Venetian government and with learned circles in Candia. His first language was the Cretan dialect of Greek, but he would have been more or less bilingual in the Venetian dialect of

---

[1] The range 1600-1610 is proposed by the text's most recent, and authoritative, editor; see Stylianos Alexiou, "Introduction", in idem (ed.), *Βιτσέντζος Κορνάρος, Ερωτόκριτος* [pocket edition], (Athens: Ermis 1988), p. xvii [hereafter Alexiou 1988]; cf. Stylianos Alexiou *Βιτσέντσος Κορνάρος, Ερωτόκριτος: κριτική έκδοση* (Athens: Ermis 1980), p. xc [hereafter Alexiou 1980]. For the wider range 1590-1610, see David Holton, "Romance", in idem (ed.), *Literature and society in Renaissance Crete* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1991), p. 212 and n. 9; idem *Erotokritos* (Bristol: Bristol Classical Press 1991) [Studies in Modern Greek], p. 5: "the last few years of the sixteenth century or the first decade of the seventeenth;" in any case after *Erofili*, probably completed c. 1595.

[2] Against Alexiou, Holton, and others, I would argue for a literal reading of the epilogue, which states that the poem had been in circulation for some time before this epilogue was written, and strongly implies that the poem itself had been written in Siteia *before* the poet's marriage (which we know took place in 1590) and his move to Candia. (At least, the references to Siteia are misleading, as well as inconsequential, if this is not the meaning.) Secondly, I would invert the well-established close relationship between *Erotokritos* and Chortatsis's tragedy *Erofili* (c. 1595), on the grounds that there is surely a marked and consistent evolution from the language, rhetoric, and versification of *Erotokritos* to the much denser, more complex and hugely more sophisticated usage of Chortatsis in *Erofili* (and also in the still later *Katzourbos*). On the other hand, exactly the same case has been made for the relation of *Abraham's Sacrifice*, now believed to be by Kornaros, and *Erotokritos*; but the Italian source for *Abraham's Sacrifice* was published as late as 1586 (Alexiou 1980: xc-xcii).

Italian and could write poems in the literary form of that language. The language of his formal education would have been Latin; there is no evidence that any of the writers of the Cretan Renaissance had more than a smattering of ancient Greek. Finally, although this has been little remarked, this branch of the Kornaros family belonged to the western, Catholic faith.[3]

The story of *Erotokritos* is briefly told (although the text runs to almost 10,000 lines). Boy meets girl; both fall in love. But there is an obstacle. Although both are well-born, she is the daughter of the king, he of the king's trusted counsellor. They cannot therefore marry. She is called Areti, which means "virtue"; she is also frequently called by the affectionate diminutive of her name, Aretousa. His name is Erotokritos, which means "tested by love", but on all but one occasion in the text this is abbreviated to Rotokritos (the form I will use here) or Rokritos. Aretousa pines for her secret love; to cheer her up, the king arranges a tournament in her honour. Rotokritos of course wins the tournament, but still cannot declare his love; Aretousa is to be married to another, a prince of royal blood. In the central episode of the story, the young couple meet clandestinely on a series of nights – chaperoned not only by the girl's nurse but also by the bars of the palace window that keep them apart. Despite this, they exchange rings and a secret engagement takes place.

Rotokritos now persuades his father, against his better judgement, to beg the hand of the king's daughter for his son. The king reacts as might be expected. Rotokritos is banished; Aretousa, refusing to marry the suitor of her father's choice, is thrown into prison. Five years pass before Rotokritos can return, disguised with the help of a magic potion, to save king and country from disaster in war. Finally, having almost lost his life and having delayed the long-awaited recognition scene

[3] Alexiou 1988: xiv.

longer than is decent, Rotokritos is reconciled to the king, reunited with Aretousa, and the pair live happily ever after.

In English, *Erotokritos* is easily characterised as a "romance". The term is useful, because unlike the term "novel", the definition of "romance" does not specify a work in prose. In English studies there is a well-entrenched tradition of using these two terms contrastively: the "romance" is something different in nature from the novel, which emerges out of the former in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as a form of negative response. This is the thesis of Ian Watt's celebrated *The rise of the novel* (1957); since restated in more elaborate form by Michael McKeon in *The origins of the English novel, 1600-1740* (1987; 2002). According to the opposite view, which I share, there is no opposition between these terms; the history of the novel is one and indivisible, although many-faceted, and runs more or less continuously from the earliest prose fiction known to us, written in Greek in the first century of our era, down to the best-sellers and Booker Prize winners of today. This was the view of Mikhail Bakhtin, whose long essay, "Forms of time and of the chronotope in the novel: Towards a historical poetics", charts the diachronic development of the genre. And the same view has been more recently championed by Margaret Anne Doody in her magisterial survey of the whole genre, *The true story of the novel* (1996).[4]

Neither of these, nor any other study that I am aware of in English, finds room in the story for *Erotokritos*. The Greek bibliography on Kornaros's work, which is understandably much larger, barely mentions the novel. No doubt reflecting the higher prestige of poetry in Greek culture until recently, it is

[4] M. M. Bakhtin, "Forms of time and of the chronotope in the novel: Towards a historical poetics", in: M. M. Bakhtin, *The dialogic imagination: Four essays,* ed. M. Holquist, trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist (Austin, Texas 1981), pp. 84-258; Margaret Anne Doody, *The true story of the novel* (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP 1996; London: HarperCollins 1997).

normal in Greek to refer to *Erotokritos* as a "poem" and its author as a "poet". The work has also often been called an "epic" – wrongly, but not without some justification with regard to details (such as the long "epic" similes, for instance, and the accounts of fighting). The most recent editor, Stylianos Alexiou, somewhat awkwardly, but accurately, classifies *Erotokritos* as "a novel in verse",[5] but the implications of this apparent oxymoron are not discussed by him or by anyone else. Only in French, where the term *roman* is helpfully inclusive, has *Erotokritos* earned its natural and justified place in the history of Greek fiction, in the study by Henri Tonnet of Greek fiction from Hellenistic to modern times.[6]

In this paper I aim to place *Erotokritos* within the context of the historical development of European fiction, from its Hellenistic origins to the establishment of the "bourgeois" novel in prose in the eighteenth century.[7] The paper falls into two parts. In the first, I situate Kornaros's work both in relation to its Hellenistic and medieval precursors, and then in relation to two "landmark" developments of the period of the Renaissance in the west. In the second, I sample some of the qualities of Kornaros's narrative that can with hindsight be recognised as "novelistic".

---

[5] Alexiou 1980: lxx-lxxiii; 1988: xxvii.

[6] Henri Tonnet, *Histoire du roman grec des origines à 1960* (Paris: L'Harmattan 1996), pp. 49-55. Greek translation: *Ιστορία του ελληνικού μυθιστορήματος* (Athens: Patakis 2001), pp. 64-71.

[7] The background is usefully and accurately sketched by Holton, "Romance", pp. 207-9. See, in particular, his comment, "These two separate strands of Greek and western narrative fiction come together in the *Erotokritos*" (p. 209). See also idem, *"Erotókritos* and Greek tradition," in Roderick Beaton (ed.), *The Greek novel A.D. 1-1985* (London: Croom Helm 1988), pp. 144-55. For Kornaros's knowledge of verse romances in vernacular Greek, written outside Crete in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, see Tina Lendari's paper "Ο *Ερωτόκριτος* και η ελληνική ερωτική μυθιστορία", to be published in the proceedings of the 2003 conference "Ζητήματα ποιητικής στον *Ερωτόκριτο*".

1.1. Hellenistic and medieval precursors

Whether Kornaros knew it or not, the broad plot of his romance is inherited from the Hellenistic origins of the genre. This was the common inheritance also of his immediate source, the fifteenth-century French prose romance, *Paris et Vienne* by Pierre de la Cypède, which he is assumed to have known via one of several Italian translations which circulated during the sixteenth century.[8] As is generally recognised, Kornaros transformed this work, organising its disparate material into a much tighter, more economical, plot; imposing to a large extent the pseudo-Aristotelian "unities" of place, time (with the exception of a briefly elided five-year gap), and action; and even evoking contemporary drama in the division of his work into five parts.

But at the same time there are significant elements retained, or restored, which go back beyond this immediate source and can be regarded as almost obligatory elements of the romance (or novel) as it developed from its Hellenistic origins.

One of these is the chastity of the lovers. This rule, which had been elevated to an almost mystical pitch by Heliodoros in the *Aithiopika*, is often flouted in the western medieval genre, including Kornaros's source, *Paris et Vienne*, but is rigorously restored in *Erotokritos*. Another is the motif of wandering and travel. Kornaros's Aristotelian structure does not allow much room for manoeuvre here, but the motif survives in attenuated form nonetheless. Rotokritos is exiled from his native Athens to the nearby island of Euboea (called here Egripos); as David Holton has convincingly shown, even with the unity of space largely maintained, the concept of exile runs through the whole work.[9]

---

[8] Holton, "Romance", p. 211; cf. Alexiou 1988: xxvi.

[9] David Holton, "Exile as theme and motif in the *Erotokritos*," *Antipodes* 21 (1987) 37-43; idem, "Romance", pp. 219-20.

Similarly, the inheritance of the Hellenistic genre is visible in the role assigned in *Erotokritos* to Chance and Fate.[10] Nor is the supernatural power of Love, represented by the semi-divine figure of Eros, absent. But these expected, traditional elements of the genre are retained only to be subverted in the course of the narrative. In *Erotokritos*, neither Chance nor Fate has the last word. The power of both is subordinated to the workings of a mechanism deeply embedded in the nature of things, whose effects seem to be accepted with stoical resignation by author and characters alike. This is already adumbrated in the opening lines of the poem, with their celebrated evocation of Fortune's wheel, a conventional idea of the medieval west. But the alternations that time brings, as the wheel turns in *Erotokritos,* are subtler, and more subtly conceived, than the traditional sudden, random reversals of Fortune. Aretousa, at a testing moment in the fourth part, when she has just been thrown into prison, begins to understand it like this:

> These things are flowers and blossoms, they come and go,
> the seasons change them and often undo them;
> like glass they crack, like smoke they vanish,
> they never stand still, they run and disappear.
> The higher the position Fate grants a man,
> the more it hurts him to be cast down from there;
> and those things that bring him greatest pleasure
> become his greatest enemies when the time comes to lose them.
> The more he is acclaimed as lord and hailed as king,
> just so much more must he fear, the more must he be afraid;
> because this is the nature of Fate's game,
> to take with one hand what the other gives.
> Whoever has been brought up in poverty, never touches
> the courses of the wheel, the way it likes to turn;
> but walks always without a care, eating and sleeping
> without ever fearing the jealous rage of fate.[11]

---

[10] In the Hellenistic genre, respectively Τύχη and Εἱμαρμένη. The equivalent terms in the language of Kornaros are Μοίρα and ριζικό.

[11] Τούτά 'ναι ανθοί και λούλουδα, διαβαίνου και περνούσι
και μεταλλάσσουν τα οι καιροί, συχνιά τα καταλούσι·

Even the tyrannical power of Eros is invoked, only to surrender its supremacy in the imagined world of the poem to what we can only call, after Freud, the internal drives of the protagonists.

Another survival from the Hellenistic origins of the genre is the apparent death of each of the lovers, known to modern scholarship by the German term first applied to it by Erwin Rohde in 1876: *Scheintod*. In the fifth part of *Erotokritos* the hero, expressly ignoring the rhetorical pleas of the narrator, persists in testing Aretousa's loyalty to him by visiting her in prison in disguise, and giving her a graphic account of his own death (V 883-984). There are two further instances, earlier in the narrative, in which Rotokritos has also been presumed dead. The third part closes with his parents weeping over his departure for exile, as though he had been already dead (III 1745-60). And the fifth part opens, in the aftermath of his single combat with the enemy champion Aristos, whom he has killed, with all the bystanders supposing that Rotokritos, too, has lost his life (V 4-8).

So, on no fewer than three occasions, in *Erotokritos* just as in its distant Hellenistic avatars, the hero's love for the heroine is tested to the extreme point of passing apparently through even death. The corresponding motif of resurrection, that has

---

σαν το γυαλί ραγίζουνται, σαν τον καπνό διαβαίνου,
ποτέ δε στέκου ασάλευτα, μα πιλαλούν και πηαίνου.
Κι όσο πλια η Μοίρα στα ψηλά τον άθρωπο καθίζει,
τόσο και πλιότερα πονεί, όντε τονε γκρεμνίζη·
κ' εκείνα οπού τον κάνουσι συχνιά ν' αναγαλλιάση
μεγάλοι οχθροί τού γίνονται την ώρα οπού τα χάση.
Κι όσο πλια αφέντης κράζεται και βασιλιός λογάται,
τόσο πλια πρέπει να δειλιά, πλιότερα να φοβάται·
γιατί έτσι το 'χει φυσικό τση Μοίρας το παιγνίδι,
να παίρνη από τη μια μερά, στην άλλη να τα δίδη.
Αμ' όποιος σε φτωχότητα αναθραφή, δε γγίζει
του κύκλου τα στρατέματα, ως θέλει, να γυρίζη·
μα πάντα ανέγνοιος πορπατεί, κι αν τρώγη κι αν κοιμάται,
του ριζικού την όργητα ποτέ δεν τη φοβάται (IV 605-20).

often been associated, since, with the idea of secular love as the equivalent of a mystical revelation, is also not lacking in *Erotokritos*, though understated. Rotokritos, presumed dead, revives. So too does Aretousa, whose first response to hearing the false report of her fiancé's death, supposedly devoured by wild beasts, is to faint. For the space of a dozen lines, and for several minutes in the imagined time of the narrative, she appears dead in the eyes of Rotokritos and her nurse Frosyni, who are present.[12]

Finally, whether or not he knew he was doing so, Kornaros finds an ideal solution in *Erotokritos* for an underlying narrative problem throughout the previous history of the genre. In the Hellenistic novel the protagonists, especially the men, are excessively passive. This may be functional, designed to reflect the nearest to a generic characterisation for the novel that exists in Greek before the nineteenth century: *pathos erotikon*.[13] But it has created difficulties for later readers, who have often been frustrated by the inability of these talkative playthings of Chance and Fate ever to *do* anything. On the other hand, in the western chivalric tradition, which stems from the Old French romances of Chrétien de Troyes, written in the 1170s and 1180s, the pure love interest tends to be subordinated to the *gestes* of the male hero, exploits whose overt purpose often seems to be nothing other than display.[14]

Between the earliest known novel, Chariton's *Callirhoe*, whose seventh book manages this rather well,[15] and the

---

[12] For Rotokritos's "resurrection" see *Erotokritos* V 470; V 751-4. Aretousa appears dead: V 957-69.

[13] Chariton, *Callirhoe*, ed. G. P. Goold (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press 1995) [Loeb Classical Library], 1.1.

[14] See e.g. Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis: The representation of reality in western literature,* trans. W. R. Trask (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1953), pp. 133-4, 140; Bakhtin, "Forms of time and of the chronotope", pp. 152-4; W. T. H. Jackson, "The nature of romance", in: *Approaches to Medieval Romance. Yale French Studies* 51 (1974), pp. 12-25.

[15] Chariton, *Callirhoe*; see esp. 7.5.12, where at the climax of the plot the rivals for Callirhoe are each respectively victorious on land and sea.

eighteenth century, it is hard to find a perfect balance between the passivity of love and the activity of warlike deeds. But this is exactly what Kornaros achieves, with his thematic division of *Erotokritos* into five parts, in which each theme alternately dominates.[16] In this way Rotokritos, like Chariton's Chaereas a long time before him, and like Fielding's Tom Jones some time after, is at once tested to the limit by his experience (*pathos*) of love and elevated *by his love for Aretousa* to the highest pitch of manly action that is possible in the world of the story.

1.2. Renaissance landmarks in the genre

I want now to place *Erotokritos* in relation to two prose romances (or novels), one of the early Renaissance period in Italy, the other almost the exact contemporary of Kornaros's romance at the other end of Europe, in England. In both, in different ways, the transition from the thought-world of the Middle Ages to that of the Renaissance has been traced, exactly as is the case also with *Erotokritos*.[17]

It is likely that Kornaros knew something of Giovanni Boccaccio, whose career in Naples and Florence, spanning the middle third of the fourteenth century, coincides with the first period of the Italian Renaissance. That career begins, effectively, with two long works, each of which is a reworking of a late medieval romance, a genre to which the prolific Boccaccio never returned, though he would quarry it extensively later, in his *Decameron*. Both these early romances of Boccaccio are works of the 1330s; both have titles which are pseudo-Greek.

---

[16] On this aspect of the romance's structure, see further below.

[17] Antonio Enzo Quaglio, "Introduzione" [to *Filocolo*] in: Vittore Branca (ed.), *Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*, Vol. 1 (Milan: Mondadori 1967), pp. 47-59; see p. 49: "il 'rifacimento' rinvigorisce così l'incerto, quasi decadente mondo della fonte." That *Erotokritos* belongs fully to the spirit and thought-world of the Italian sixteenth century has been demonstrated conclusively by Alexiou (1980: lxxi-lxxiii and elsewhere); cf. Holton, "Exile", p. 42: "Kornaros opens with a traditional and medieval concept of the wheel of fortune... But the closing image of the poem is very different... Human endeavour has a purpose and a goal."

Filocolo, which is probably the earlier of the two, is in prose, and reworks the well-known tale of *Floire et Blancheflor*, a work which perhaps not entirely coincidentally has close similarities to Kornaros's source for *Erotokritos*, *Paris et Vienne.* The second, *Filostrato*, is in verse, and is best known in English as the source for Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde.*

Other links can be established between *Filocolo* and *Erotokritos.* Boccaccio, too, imposes a five-part structure on the disparate material of his source, although in his case, in the 1330s, the influence of Aristotelian theory can probably be discounted, and Boccaccio if anything outdoes his predecessors in the florid medieval digressiveness of his plot. Still, the precedent was there for Kornaros to adopt, from his own different perspective almost three centuries later. Not only that, but Boccaccio too, particularly in the second and third parts of *Filocolo,* shifts the focus from the traditional external adventures of the hero and heroine to explore their inner worlds, as Kornaros would also do later. Common ground between the two romances can also be found in the inclusion in each of the inserted tale of Cephalus and Procris, which derives from Ovid, although Boccaccio does not seem to have been Kornaros's immediate source for this.[18] Finally, the closing conceit, which compares the completed work to a ship brought safely home to harbour after passing many dangers, is again common to both *Filocolo* and *Erotokritos*, although that too goes back to Ovid and is to some extent traditional in the period.[19]

But the most telling link with *Filocolo*, and also with *Filostrato*, has to do with their Hellenising titles. "Filocolo" is the name that the hero of that romance, Florio, adopts when he goes in search of the heroine, Biancifiore; the false name is

---

[18] See Anna di Benedetto Zimbone, "Κέφαλος e Χαρίδημος. Il mito di Cefalo e il principe di Creta", *Θησαυρίσματα* 26 (1996) 178-95; see p. 183.

[19] Boccaccio, *Filocolo* 5.97 (cf. also 1.2); for the source in Ovid see editor's note 3, p. 968; *Erotokritos* V 1527-32.

explained by the narrator. Supposedly made up of two Greek words, it means "labour of love".

> "Filocolo" is made up of two Greek nouns: *philos* and *colon*; and *philos* in Greek means in our language the same as *love* and *colon* in Greek similarly gives in our language *effort/labour*: from which, linking them together one might say, switching round the components, *labour of love*.[20]

As commentators have pointed out, Boccaccio at this stage in his career knew little or no Greek, and this piece of hocus-pocus confirms it. Similarly, the title *Filostrato* is explained by the author as a reflection of the tragic fate of its hero, Troilo, with the meaning, partly again derived from Greek, of "ruined by love".

> Filostrato is the title of this book, and the reason is this: because this fits exactly the effect of the book. Filostrato is equivalent to a man conquered and ruined by love.[21]

Even if he had not read them, it is hardly likely that the Greek-speaking Vitsentzos Kornaros, bilingual in Italian, would not have *heard* of these illustrious predecessors in the genre in which he was writing. What better title could he find for his own fiction, and what better name for his own hero, than to "translate" these pseudo-erudite inventions of Boccaccio back into the language from which they allegedly came? The meaning of "Erotokritos" ("tried, tested in love") stands almost exactly midway between the meanings that Boccaccio

---

[20] Filocolo è da due greci nomi composto, da "philos" e da "colon"; e "philos" in greco tanto viene a dire in nostra lingua quanto "amore" e "colon" in greco similemente tanto in nostra lingua risulta quanto "fatica": onde congiunti insieme, si può dire, traponendo le parti, *fatica d'amore*. *Filocolo* 3.75, ed. Antonio Enzo Quaglio, in: Branca (ed.), *Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*, Vol. 1.

[21] Filostrato è il titolo de questo libro, e la cagione è questa: per ciò che ottimamente si confà con l'effetto del libro. Filostrato tanto viene a dire quanto uomo vinto e abbattuto d'amore ... *Filostrato*, ed. Vittore Branca, *Tutte le opere*, Vol. 2 (Milan: Mondadori 1964): title page.

claims for his cod-Greek coinages: "labour of love" and "ruined by love".[22]

My other point of comparison for *Erotokritos* in the western literature of the Renaissance is the prose romance (or novel) *Arcadia* by Sir Philip Sidney. Born in 1554, Sidney was just one year younger than Kornaros; he died at the age of 32, in legendary circumstances, of wounds received while fighting against the Spanish in the Netherlands. *Arcadia* was necessarily therefore a youthful work, and seems to have been completed by 1580. Shortly afterwards Sidney decided to rewrite the book, on a grander scale and in a more lofty style; as has aptly been argued recently, the rewrite was an attempt to shift his ground from his earlier classical model, Apuleius's *Metamorphoses*, to that of Heliodoros's *Aithiopika*, which was then coming into fashion.[23] This second version was left half-finished at Sidney's death in 1586; it was published four years later, in 1590; then in 1593 what was to become the definitive version appeared, in which the unfinished "New" Arcadia was completed by tacking on the final portion of the original version. It was in this form that Sidney's novel was known to readers and scholars until the early twentieth century. The original, complete version was rediscovered in 1907, and published for the first time in 1926. It is with Sidney's original version, the so-called *Old Arcadia*, that *Erotokritos* may be compared – and indeed with which its writing may have been more or less exactly contemporary.[24]

---

[22] For the meaning of "Erotokritos" see the first philological edition by Stefanos Xanthoudidis (Athens 1915), p. 368.

[23] Robert H. F. Carver, "'Sugared invention' or 'mongrel tragi-comedy': Sir Philip Sidney and the ancient novel", *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel*, Vol. 8, ed. H. Hofmann and M. Zimmerman (Groningen 1997), pp. 197-226.

[24] Katherine Duncan-Jones (ed.), *Sir Philip Sidney: The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (The Old Arcadia)* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1994) [World's Classics series]; for publishing history see "Introduction," pp. vii-x. References to *Arcadia* are to this edition. For the "New" Arcadia, see Sir Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, edited with an introduction and notes by Maurice Evans (Harmondsworth: Penguin 1977).

Sidney's romance, like *Erotokritos*, is set in a composite, imaginary ancient world, whose geography is fairly vague. At times the account of peaceful, pastoral Arcadia may be intended as "probably a covert eulogy of England, uniquely peaceful among Northern European countries in the late sixteenth century".[25] But while the action lasts, this fictional Arcadia is not particularly peaceful, still less is it idyllic; indeed the conventions of literary pastoral are consistently debunked, to humorous effect (though for this last there is no counterpart in *Erotokritos*).[26] Just as in *Erotokritos*, in *Arcadia* the time and place of the action are presented as remote, the customs of its ancient inhabitants are often alien, alienating, sometimes indeed surprising even to the characters themselves, who might be thought to have known better.[27]

Sidney too, just like Kornaros, retains, if playfully and only just, the chastity of his lovers. The Aristotelian unities are consciously preserved by Sidney too: the action takes place within the space of a few days, and even if the traditional elopement of one pair of lovers does go ahead, it is conveniently frustrated before they can cross the boundaries of the fictional space designated by the book's title; with neat irony, the near-transgression of pseudo-Aristotelian rules coincides with the near-transgression of the rule of chastity, and both are frustrated by the same agency: the apparently random, actually authorially contrived irruption upon the scene of a group of savages.[28]

---

[25] Duncan-Jones (ed.), *The Old Arcadia*, p. 369, n. 4; cf. "Introduction", p. xi.

[26] See e.g. *Old Arcadia*, 27, 33, 36 and all the scenes involving the "pastoral" characters Dametas, Miso and Mopsa. This element of robust parody is much reduced in the "New" Arcadia.

[27] *Old Arcadia*: 9-10 (scene-setting); e.g. 46, 114 ("then" distinguished from narratorial present); e.g. 24, 42, 113, 250 ("Greece" as somewhere different); 251 and 381 (editor's note *ad loc.*: the surprise discovery that sex outside marriage is punishable by death in Arcadia). For the fictional world of *Erotokritos* see Holton, *Erotokritos*, pp. 45-72; Alexiou 1980: lxxiii-lxxxii; Alexiou 1988: xxi-xxiv.

[28] *Old Arcadia*, 175-7.

But the most striking coincidence between these two Renaissance reworkings of the traditional genre, at opposite ends of Europe, is the adoption by Sidney, just as by Kornaros, of a five-part structure. In the case of *Arcadia* this is explicitly presented as analogous to that of contemporary drama. Each part is introduced by a subtitle: *The First Book or Act.*

The point of this comparison is not, of course, to suggest a direct link between Sidney and Kornaros. It is rather to show that each, at about the same time, and in response to some of the same literary precedents, took a definitive step in advancing the romance genre forward from its medieval, Hellenistic and Latin precedents, so as to refashion it in an enduring form for their own time, and for several centuries to come. Indeed there are significant parallels between the reception histories of the two works: *Arcadia*, in its hybrid, posthumously published form becoming staple reading for a wide cross-section of the English reading public until being ousted by the rise of the realist novel in the eighteenth century; *Erotokritos* being similarly staple reading throughout the Greek-speaking world through repeated editions published in Venice, from the belated *editio princeps* of 1713 down to the nineteenth century.

But while Sidney's achievement has always since been recognised as a significant milestone along the evolutionary path that leads from the first novels of antiquity to the successors of Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding, the history of Greek-speaking lands precluded any such recognition for *Erotokritos.* Most of Crete was lost to the Venetians and the Greek-speaking upper classes who had benefited from an Italian education, when the Ottomans overran the island in 1645. The process was completed in 1669, with the surrender of the fortifications of Candia, which had held out under siege for 21 years. As a result, there was to be no direct successor to *Erotokritos* in the history of fiction in Greek.

2. "Novelistic" qualities of Kornaros's narrative

In the first part of this paper, I attempted to situate Kornaros's fictional narrative in relation to the earlier and contemporary history of the genre. Here, I consider his text synchronically, anachronistically if you will, in order to identify in it qualities that, at least with the hindsight of today, might plausibly be claimed to link *Erotokritos* with the techniques of the novel, as the genre is now understood. These qualities are of two kinds: first structural, in the management of the links from one book, or part, to another, particularly when these generate suspense; secondly, I focus on what might be termed "human touches" of a kind not, of course, confined to the novel, but all of which would not be out of place in the genre today, and most of which, I think, have not been noticed before.

2.1 Narrative structure

As we just saw, the five-part division of *Erotokritos*, just like that of the *Old Arcadia*, provides an immediate link to Renaissance drama. A consequence, as we have already noticed, is to bring about a formal alternation between the two great themes of the work – some would say, the two great themes of all literature – namely love and war. This aspect has been most fully documented by David Holton in his paper "How is *Erotokritos* organised?"[29] At the same time as he emphasised, rightly, the importance of this thematic alternation, Holton was sceptical about some of the actual divisions between one part and another, pointing out, for instance, that the opening scene of Part III follows on with the same characters and without any apparent sign of a break in time from the closing scene of Part II.[30] In what follows I shall try to answer this point, among others.

---

[29] David Holton, "Πώς οργανώνεται ο *Ερωτόκριτος*;" *Cretan Studies* 1 (1988) 157-67, reprinted in idem, *Μελέτες για τον Ερωτόκριτο και άλλα νεοελληνικά κείμενα* (Athens: Kastaniotis 2001), pp. 87-102; cf. idem, "Romance", pp. 205-37; cf. Alexiou 1980, lxx-lxxii.

[30] Holton, "Πώς οργανώνεται", pp. 158-9 (reprint: 89).

Each of the first four parts ends, to varying degrees, with a traditional "cliffhanger" moment of suspense: as a defined episode comes to a close, the principal characters are left in an ever-more desperate situation, from which the reader can see no obvious way for them to extricate themselves. At the same time, the closing lines of each book cunningly shift the perspective onwards from the dominant theme of the book just ending (alternately love or war), either to adumbrate specifically the new theme that will dominate in the next, or to anticipate a later development in the narrative to come.

By the end of Part I, the mutual love of Rotokritos and Aretousa has been established. Being young and naive, they think they can keep up appearances at the palace merely by being able to see one another every day; things need go no further. So they think, but the narrator enlists the worldly knowledge of the reader. Whether they know it or not, the young lovers are on the brink. As around them preparations begin for the tournament that has been announced, and that will be the warlike subject of Part II, the narrator warns that the lovers, too, are about to be thrown into "war" and "battles", with their emotions, of which they have as yet no inkling:

> Although it is the first time and they have no experience,
> they have some idea of what is necessary in such dealings:
> Rotokritos shows the way and Aretousa for her part
> wisely hides her desire as though already an adult;
> and as if they had previously found themselves
> in such a *war*, they sense the demands of such a *battle*.[31]

---

31 Μ' όλον οπού 'ναι η πρώτη τως και μάθηση δεν έχου,
το κάνει χρεία σ' έτοιες δουλειές γνωρίζου και κατέχου:
Δάσκαλος είναι ο Ρώκριτος κ' η Αρετούσα πάλι
κρύβει τον πόθο φρόνιμα σα να 'τον και μεγάλη·
κι ωσά να θέλασι βρεθή άλλη φορά και λάχει
εις έτοιον *πόλεμο*, γροικούν ίντα ζητά έτοια *μάχη* (I 2211-16, my emphases).

At the end of Part II, with the tournament over and Rotokritos victorious, the "happy end" of this part is deftly turned aside in the final lines. While Aretousa hears the acclamations of Rotokritos's prowess on the field, her thoughts turn once more to her unrequited feelings for him, which have been in suspense, in effect, throughout the whole of Part II and will return to dominate Part III:

> and she, the more she hears [Rotokritos] praised,
> the more strongly desire lays siege to her heart;
> her pains increased, no longer can she conceal
> the fire of passion but must reveal it to Rotokritos.[32]

This third part, in its turn, ends with the lovers in a yet more difficult situation. They have secretly engaged rings and vows, but all their hopes seem to have been dashed with the king's furious banishment of Rotokritos. At this moment, the narrator ends on a sombre note, but one that in hindsight will be seen to have heralded two further moments of suspense in the narrative to come. As he leaves to go into exile, Rotokritos in his despair prays that he may be devoured by wild beasts (III 1716). Naturally, no such fate will befall the hero of the romance in reality; but in the scene in the final part where he will cruelly test Aretousa's constancy by falsely reporting his own death, it is exactly in this way that Rotokritos will supposedly have died (V 883-957). A few lines on, Part III concludes with the departing Rotokritos being mourned by his parents as though he was already dead. Not only does this create an ominous moment of suspense, as the focus is about to change away from the hero, and from love once more to war; it exactly foreshadows the ending of the following part, in which another hero will be mourned and Rotokritos's own fate will be left hanging in the balance.

---

32 κ' εκείνη τα παινέματα όσο και πλια τ' ακούει,
τόσον ο πόθος στην καρδιά πλια δυνατά την κρούει·
οι πόνοι τση επληθύνασι, πλιο δε μπορεί να χώση
τη λάβρα και του Ρώκριτου θα να τη φανερώση (II 1461-5).

Part IV focuses once more on war and conflict; and here the conflict is not only on the field of battle. Aretousa's struggle against her father's cruelty, which takes up the first third of this part, is also described by the narrator as a "war" (IV 679). Once we come to the actual fighting, the narrator's handling of suspense is firmer than ever. Approximately a hundred and fifty lines before the end of Part IV, the single combat of Rotokritos and the Vlach champion Aristos ends with both combatants apparently fatally wounded. With the exception of a single verse couplet, awkwardly expressed with a rhyme so perfunctory as to make one wonder if it really belongs here, no clue is given for the remainder of the hundred and fifty lines of Part IV as to whether Rotokritos is alive or dead. The offending couplet is given in italics:

> ... [Aristos] strikes Rotokritos a blow at that moment
> that pierced his breastplate, his chain-mail shirt,
> just below the nipple, close to the heart,
> where men's breath and life reside.
> The iron penetrated some way into the flesh,
> more dead than alive it left him then,
> *he was almost taken by Charos [Death],*
> *but lived and was cured with many aches and pains.*
> The kings [of each side] rush to see them, in fear and trembling,
> and all of them reckon Rotokritos has lost his life.[33]

Rotokritos is not mentioned again until the beginning of Part V, while the moment of suspense is dragged out with the protracted laments for his opponent which take up the

---

33 ... του Ρώκριτου μια κοπανιά δίδει την ώρα κείνη
και την κοράτσα επέρασε, το σιδερό ζυπόνι,
εις το βυζί αποκατωθιό, εις της καρδιάς τον τόπο,
εκεί που βρίσκεται η πνοή κ' η ζήση των ανθρώπω.
Μέσα στη σάρκα κάμποσο το σίδερον εμπήκε,
πλια παρά ζωντανό, νεκρόν ετότες τον αφήκε
κι ολίγο λίγον ήλειψε να τονε πάρη ο Χάρος,
μα 'ζησε κ' εγιατρεύτηκε με πάθη και με βάρος.
Τρέχου οι ρηγάδες να τους δου, τρομάρα τούς επιάσε
κι όλοι τως το Ρωτόκριτο λογιάζου πως εχάσε (IV 1876-85).

remainder of Part IV. In this way, both Part III and Part IV end with laments; one for Rotokritos, metaphorically dead as he departs for exile, the other literally for Aristos, while the actual fate of Rotokritos remains unknown. Even once Part IV begins, we have to wait for a further twenty-five lines before we know that Rotokritos, apparently dead, is in fact alive; and it will be some time before the severely wounded hero will be out of danger.

In this way, I argue, the five-part structure of *Erotokritos* proves not only the broadly Renaissance, dramatic, and rationalist structure of the work, but also Kornaros's narrative artistry in managing the transitions from one large unity to another, so as to achieve both an effect of suspense and a seemingly effortless, natural transition between the work's two overarching themes.

2.2 "Human touches"

Finally, and only very indicatively, I want to point out incidental qualities that emerge at moments of the narrative and which can be read, retrospectively, as pointers towards aspects of the novel particularly, but not only, as it has developed since Kornaros's time. Here I invoke a characterisation of the genre, across its whole long history, thrown out by Doody: "A novelist's primary calling is to give *a representation of what it feels like to be alive*."[34]

This is not the place to repeat what others have already said on the representation of characters in *Erotokritos*.[35] But it is worth emphasising, because this has become an important issue in more recent fiction, that all the major characters of the

---

[34] Doody, *True story*, p. 282, original emphasis. Of course, this formulation alludes to an aspect of all literature which goes back at least as far as Aristotle's *Poetics* and is not the unique prerogative of the novel. Cf. Auerbach, *Mimesis*, p. 191: "Imitation of reality is imitation of the sensory experience of life on earth – among the most essential characteristics of which would seem to be its possessing a history, its changing and developing."

[35] Holton, "Romance", pp. 220-4; idem, *Erotokritos*, pp. 45-56.

story are divided against themselves. This is most obviously true of Aretousa, who early in the story explains to her nurse Frosyni how she is tormented by the irreconcilable forces that govern her thoughts and feelings: on the one hand shame and fear of her father, on the other the new and terrifying force of her feelings for Rotokritos:

> Can't you see what torment I'm in
> what wild beast has me in its maw and won't let go?
> I hold to two opposite things, my life's in danger,
> all my effort is to reconcile them, I try and try,
> but I see it is impossible...[36]

But Rotokritos, too, for much of the narrative is pulled in diametrically opposite directions: by love for Aretousa on the one hand, and his duty as loyal subject of his king on the other. It is his achievement, carefully paced by the narrator throughout the five long parts of the narrative, finally and against all expectation to reconcile the irreconcilable: first in the tournament, without immediate result, then in the war between the Athenians and the Vlachs, in which he comes close to losing his life, Rotokritos is able finally to demonstrate that it is his *disloyal* love that gives him the strength to become the king's most *loyal* and effective defender. This is more than a conventional matter of divided loyalties. Rotokritos, like Aretousa, for much of the narrative is really two people; each is required to act out a given role in the life of the court. And each, without ever renouncing that role, is required also to live a completely different life, as the clandestine lover of the other.

---

36 Σαν πώς θαρρείς και βρίσκομαι και σ' ίντα παίδαν είμαι
κ' ίντα θεριό στο στόμα του μ' έβαλε και κρατεί με;
Σε δυο πράματ' αντίδικα στέκω και κινδυνεύγω,
να τα συβάσω και τα δυο ξετρέχω και γυρεύγω
και βάνω κόπο, μα θωρώ και μπορετό δεν είναι... (I 1643-7).

I turn now to smaller touches, to what the poet Yannis Ritsos once called, in a different context, the "insignificant details".

There is a particular tenderness in the way in which the relationship between Aretousa and her nurse is described. Aretousa is a child, only just emerging into adolescence; the older, experienced woman sees this, and treats her like her own child:

> Not as her mistress but her cherished child she speaks to her;
> she comes close and rests her cheek on [Aretousa's] head. ...
> All night [the two women] are tormented and do not sleep,
> when day breaks they see the light of dawn.
> The day dawned bright, they rose and sat
> each with her cheek cupped in her hand,
> they looked like two blind deaf-mutes
> while they sat and weighed up many sorts of things.[37]

At various points, despite the general "romantic" colouring of the narrative, there come moments of unexpected realism. In Parts II and IV, with their descriptions of jousting and war, this is not entirely unexpected. Rather different is the simile with which the narrator describes Rotokritos's sudden shock at discovering the loss of his most cherished, and also most dangerous, possession, the drawing he has made of Aretousa. In one of the long "epic" similes for which *Erotokritos* has justly been admired, his feelings are compared to those of a mother nursing an infant, who suddenly finds it has died in her arms:

---

37 Ωσάν παιδί τση σπλαχνικό, όχι ως κερά μιλεί της·
σιμώνει και το μάγουλο βάνει στην κεφαλή της. ...
Ολονυκτίς πειράζουνται δίχως να κοιμηθούσι,
όντε τα ξημερώματα το φως τσ' αυγής θωρούσι.
Ήρθεν η μέρα η λαμπυρή, σηκώνουνται, καθίζου,
στη χέρα τως το μάγουλο κ' οι δυο τως τ' ακουμπίζου
κι ωσά βουβές κι ωσάν κουφές κι ωσάν τυφλές εμοιάζα
και πράματα πολλώ λογιών εστέκαν κ' ελογιάζα (I 1611-12; 1693-8).

as when a child falls asleep in its mother's arms,
a much-loved only child, dearly cherished,
and when she comes to put it to the breast she finds it dead;
she jumps up, and loses her mind at the sudden discovery,
to see dead in her arms the child who was sleeping...[38]

Elsewhere this unexpected access of realism functions differently. The account of Aretousa's condition, in Part V, in the prison where she has languished for five years, is genuinely shocking, and the shock is the greater because it is her father who is speaking. Addressing the "stranger", who is of course Rotokritos in disguise, he tells him:

They tell me she's turned ugly,
utterly changed and unrecognisable, filthy and disgusting;
I'd like you to go by the prison so you can see for yourself,
because I've heard she's too revolting even for the flies.[39]

At the other end of the spectrum lies the gentle irony with which the narrator often treats his characters, and their all-too-human weaknesses.[40] My final example belongs loosely in this category. In Part IV, Rotokritos is about to embark on the most hazardous adventure of his life, to take part in the war between Athens and the Vlachs, even though under sentence of death if he should return. It is naturally important that his disguise should be effective. To this end, he enlists the services of a witch. In one of the few intrusions of the supernatural into the story, the witch sells him a magic potion, which will turn his face, and presumably also the rest of him, black. To be

---

38 ... σα όντε κοιμηθή παιδί σ' τση μάνας τη μασκάλη,
πολλά ακριβό και μοναχό, πολλά κανακεμένο
κι ως θα του δώση το βυζί, το βρίσκη αποθαμένο,
σηκώνη, ξαφορμίζη ο νους στο ξαφνικό μαντάτο,
να δη νεκρό στα χέρια της παιδίν οπού εκοιμάτο... (I 1810-14).

39 Μα λέσι μου πως άσκημη είναι καταστεμένη,
ασούσουμη κι ανέγνωρη, άτσαλη, βρωμεσμένη·
κ' ήθελα, ομπρός, στη φυλακή να κόπιαζες να πήγες,
να την δης, γιατί 'κουσα σιχαίνουνταί τη οι μύγες (V 235-8).

40 Holton, "Romance", pp. 234-6; *Erotokritos*, pp. 83-5.

exact, she sells him *two* potions; the second will restore him to his former colour. Although this is not made explicit, it must be equally important to Rotokritos that *both* will work; he has not only to win the war for Athens but also to reclaim Aretousa. So before he sets out, Kornaros gives us a delightful, one-line vignette, of the hero testing the witch's magic thoroughly, changing his face to black and back again.

> In a little flask she gave him another potion to keep
> and told him, when he wanted to change his appearance [again]
> and become white as before, regaining his former good looks,
> he should put this second potion on his face.
> And before he departs [for Athens], he tries these potions out,
> some of the time his face shines like the sun, the rest it's black.[41]

Conclusions

The first part of this paper has suggested how Kornaros's masterpiece, more often admired for its lyrical and dramatic qualities than as narrative fiction, can be situated in relation both to the long tradition of the novel before the late sixteenth century, and also, in the case of Sidney's *Arcadia*, alongside a close contemporary. In the second, I have given just a few instances of an advanced narrative technique and a grasp of complexity and of detail in representing both characterisation and what Doody has called "the experience of being alive".

This reading does not, of course, propose to devalue the poetic qualities of *Erotokritos*. One of the remarkable achievements of Kornaros is the extraordinary synthesis of elements from different genres.[42] But while other components of that mix have had their share of attention, less has been said about

---

41 Σ' ένα φλασκάκι άλλο νερό του δίδει να φυλάξη
και λέγει του, όντε του φανή τη στόρηση ν' αλλάξη,
να 'ρθη στην πρώτη του ασπριγιά, να 'ρθη στα πρώτα κάλλη,
εκείνο το 'στερο νερό στο πρόσωπό του ας βάλη.
Και πρι μισέψη, τα νερά ετούτα δικιμάζει
κι ώρες το πρόσωπο ήλαμπε κι ώρες το σκοτεινιάζει (IV 903-8).

42 Alexiou 1980: lxxi: "daring mixture of genres"; cf. Holton, "Romance", p. 213.

Erotokritos as narrative fiction. According to this reading, Kornaros was a true originator. Who knows, if the history of Crete and of the Venetian empire had turned out differently, how influential this artful and humane mingling of genres might have proved?

Still a "weak state"? Europeanization and structural reform in Greece

Kevin Featherstone
London School of Economics

Introduction

My argument in this paper is a broad one and aims at providing a general overview for discussion. Thus, my argument seeks to combine a focus on Greece and the European Union with state-economy relations within Greece. This should provide an appropriate basis for a discussion of contemporary Greek politics.

I begin with the proposition that whether Greece remains a "weak state" or not must be seen in two distinct contexts: European reputation and domestic modernization. Moreover, it is timely to link both contexts: the Greek Presidency of the European Union (in 2003) represented an opportunity to assess its external image and reputation; and the completion of two parliamentary periods by the Simitis government constitutes an appropriate point at which to take stock and reflect on what has changed and what has continued.

Indeed, "Europeanization" and "modernization" have often been seen, in modern Greek history, to go hand-in-hand. One has defined the other, just as it has elsewhere in southern Europe and it has come to do in central Europe today. Greek politicians identifying themselves as "modernizers" are also the most pro-European leaders.

But, however sensitive the images, we must question what we mean by "Europeanization", let alone "modernization". These can be painful issues of self-identity, but we must clarify our use of the term "Europeanization". Greece today is seen,

and sees itself, as far more "Europeanized" than pre-1996. Its reputation within the European Union is much higher: it is only rarely seen as the "awkward partner" of the past. Its recent EU presidency can be regarded as its most popular yet.

However, I will use the term "Europeanization" here in a very limited analytical sense. I will *not* use it to refer to whether Greece "belongs" to a European "family" or whether there are national cultural distinctions to be drawn. I will ignore these sometimes futile, emotive questions. Instead, I will refer to "Europeanization" as a process of adaptation between European Union and domestic policies. By "policies" I mean the laws, the so-called "soft policy" agreements, and the shared policy norms developed within EU institutions and transmitted to member states. "Europeanization" in this sense will be my "test" of Greece's external reputation and record of "modernization".

In assessing the extent of Greece's "Europeanization", I will draw a basic contrast. In foreign policy matters, Greece has positioned itself near the median point on major issues like the conflict with Iraq. (Relations with Turkey remain a problem area, but even here Papandreou's changes represented major shifts.) More generally, in holding the EU presidency, Greece had the potential to develop for itself a reputation as a consensus-builder within Europe. This is a truly remarkable shift from the climate of the 1980s.

However, in domestic economic policy, Greece's adaptation to the new demands of EU membership remains problematic. Here, we've seen shifts across two levels:

- The deepening of the process of economic integration within the European Union, from the creation of a single European market to the introduction of a single European currency. The consequence is that EU policies now penetrate further and more widely than ever before.
- A shift of attitudes within Greece towards the role of the state in the domestic economy. This entails a move away from the traditions of a state that in the past served the

oligopolistic interests of the few in a private, incestuous network, towards a state that regulates a more open and competitive market.

The momentum of this domestic change of attitudes was largely determined by the ideological shifts occurring within PASOK, as the main party of government. However, as the intra-party factional tensions and rivalries make clear, the ideological shifts within PASOK are far from unambiguous or unidimensional. The will to reform, the motivations behind "modernization", still remain open to question.

The incomplete transformation of PASOK has meant an incomplete transformation of state-economy relations. The limitations evident in the domestic modernization project are also those of "Europeanization", as the agendas are ostensibly practically the same. Both should be seen in terms of "will" and "capability". The incomplete domestic shifts are not merely voluntaristic: a lack of will on the part of Greek leaders. Rather, they are constrained by structural or systemic factors, rooted in long-term features of Greek political culture. The cultural obstacles can be identified as the weakness of social capital in Greece: in other words, the absence of trust, the suspicion of authority and the fear of co-operation.

The consequence is a reform process blocked by political veto-points: instead of credible mutual commitment to an optimal policy mix, rational social actors defect and seek to free-ride. Beyond the confines of government, business and union negotiation, there is a wider problem of social representation. Some interests remain distorted, lost or excluded from the central game. Many of these represent a natural constituency for the modernization project and their absence or weakness in the game is itself a factor holding back reform.

Thus, the modernization/Europeanization project is so far incomplete, partial, asymmetric, and often shallow. However, properly defined and pursued, it represents the optimal outcome for Greek society and for Greece's role in Europe. It also

remains the benchmark by which to analyse the strength or weakness of the Greek state in the contemporary period.

But, I've run through a set of propositions rather quickly. Let me cite some evidence to illustrate what I've just put forward. I will begin by making an obvious contrast in foreign policy.

My premise is that when Greece first joined the EU in the 1980s, both of these notions were central to her reputation in Europe. Andreas Papandreou was seen as being awkward, and successive governments in Athens were thought of as being too weak to bring about necessary structural reforms in the economy. In some places at the time, the embarrassment was close to that which we feel when watching the movie *My big fat Greek wedding*! More seriously, I recognise that the differences that arose between Greece and her European partners in the 1980s had much to do with clashes of ideology and of economic tradition. So, perhaps my more serious purpose should be seen as questioning whether these ideological differences still exist today and whether Greek economic policy has really shifted closer to the European norm. I will begin by looking at the theme of "awkward partner" and then proceed to look at economic policy convergence.

Awkward partner? The foreign policy sector

Greece gained its reputation as an awkward partner in relation to European foreign policymaking in the 1980s. Since then, we have seen a notable general shift placing Greece much closer to the EU consensus. But we also still see the occurrence of individual crises (sun, with isolated showers). Or, to use other terms: Greece has become much more orthodox, but in isolated cases can be a frustrating maverick. These terms were used by Takis Ioakimides (1996; cf. 2001) some years ago. In the 1980s, Greece was seen as the "black sheep" (to use Ioakimides's own phrase) because it distanced itself from the majority on a series of foreign policy issues. The invasion of Poland; the attack on the South Korean airliner; the invasion of Afghanistan: each

was subject to an "asterisk" by Greece. By contrast, in the 1990s and today, there are not the same "ideologically-inspired" disputes between Greece and the EU majority. The general climate is very different.

Instead, it is local issues related to Greece's own geo-political position that cause problems. Without doubt, Greece has had the most difficult neighbourhood of any member of the European Union. The reactions to the collapse of Communism in the Balkans left Greece isolated at times from her EU partners.

Greece soon came to condemn the clumsy way in which the West Europeans and the US responded to the break-up of Yugoslavia. The West failed to understand Balkan history and, in the words of Thanos Veremis (2002), engaged in "action without foresight". To its partners, Greece was playing with "ethno-nationalism". Takis Michas, in his book *Unholy alliance* (2002), has detailed the criticisms of the links with Bosnia and Serbia on the part of the Greek church and state. Whilst the book may not be the full truth, it seems to be part of the truth.

A particular crisis focussed on the issue of an independent Macedonian state. Today, the early positions adopted by Greece on "FYROM" by previous governments are the cause of some embarrassment. Much of the foreign policy community in Greece today appears to have disowned the original stance. The current trends are different. In 2002 Greece pushed for a NATO peacekeeping mission to FYROM and Greek enterprises are the biggest national investor in that country. Today, Greek policy towards the rest of the Balkans is very likely to be seen as "constructive" and "helpful" in the capitals of Western Europe. The FYROM issue almost appears like a bad dream to be forgotten about.

But it is important for me in this discussion to ask what Greece gained from its original stance on FYROM and what cost it suffered. There has been no substantive progress on the

name of the new state. At the same time, Greece lost credit in the EU for its obsession with the FYROM issue.

The lesson from the FYROM issue is, perhaps, the costs of adopting a seemingly rigid and isolated stance in the European Union. It was difficult to see how Greece could extricate itself from a "lose" position. The feasibility of victory was low. The fixation, the isolation and the rigidity made Greece appear a very awkward partner: a tiresome guest at the top table. At the height of the tension, "informed opinion" in France, Germany and Britain questioned Greece's very membership of the European Union.

In 2001-2 another issue divided Greece from her partners in the European Union. The creation of the "European Security and Defence Policy" (ESDP) inevitably raised difficult issues about the relationship of the new structure with NATO, not least because the memberships are different. Greece had been particularly concerned about the implications for Turkey and security in the region. It found itself in a major clash with the Blair government on the issue: in contrast to the concerns in Athens about ESDP capability being undermined by Turkey, London viewed the Greek attitude as either petty or nationalistic.

The relevance of the issue to my paper is that this is an issue – like that of FYROM – where the score was 14 vs. 1: Greece vs. the rest of the EU. The Greek position was isolated, seen as obsessive and rigid. At the European Council meeting in Brussels, Solana was given three weeks to secure a deal. The patience of Greece's partners was running out fast.

But the episode was a difficult one. The British and Greek governments disputed the process leading up to the Ankara Text, on which London took the lead. Athens complained it was not consulted; London officials swore that Athens was kept informed "at the start, in the middle, and at the end" of the process. Athens was attacked for playing to domestic emotions on the issue.

As with the FYROM issue, Greece was seen as having dug itself a hole from which it could not climb out. EU meetings emphasized the isolation of the Greek position. The eventual outcome involved only minute changes to the earlier text: not enough to justify the delay or the strength of the opposition from Athens.

If Greece had kept to its original stance on the Ankara Text, the fear in other EU capitals was that she could have killed the ESDP idea. ESDP might have limped forward like another weak Western European Union (WEU), playing far less of a role than expected. The European Union would have effectively failed, leaving the territory to NATO. Instead, the progress of ESDP is very much in Greece's interests.

Greece was also seen as trying to put old wine in new bottles by seeking security guarantees for the external borders of the EU, including the Aegean and Cyprus. In London, at least, it seemed inconceivable that Britain or Greece's other EU partners would defend Cyprus against a Turkish attack. The belief was that neither the UK nor the EU had sufficient resources to do so. As one informed observer put it to me at the time, there are not many "serious" armies left in Europe, but Britain has one, and so does Turkey. If the Greeks thought Britain would defend Cyprus, they were wrong. Thus, it was not clear which, if any, of Greece's partners were prepared to defend her against Turkey.

In the event, with the ESDP-NATO issue resolved, Greece's profile on Turkey came to be seen as more clearly positive. The support repeatedly expressed by both Simitis and Papandreou for Turkey's entry into the EU meant that Greece was not to be seen as the "awkward partner" on the issue. Instead, the issue divided London and Paris, amongst others. The rapport with the Erdogan government was sustained by Athens when the new Karamanlis government took over.

The general theme here is clear: amidst the turmoil in the Balkans, Greece had distinct national concerns. On FYROM and ESDP-NATO they were mishandled. Lessons were learned:

the general momentum was to "Europeanize" Greece's foreign policy. This prioritized the value of being part of the EU consensus. Under Papandreou, Greece was more consensual.

Indeed, at the time of the Greek Presidency of the EU in early 2003, the Simitis government displayed an unprecedented ability to be a consensus-broker during the tumult of the Iraq crisis. Never before had Athens been such a bridge between the EU and the US.

Awkward partner? Economic policy

In the area of economic and social policy, Greece was able to move much more quickly towards the EU consensus. We have seen a transformation in Greece's external economic relations:

- from the domestic climate of "Τσοβόλα, δώσ' τα όλα" towards what George Pagoulatos (2003) has termed a "stabilisation state";
- from the message given in the famous letter from Jacques Delors to Prime Minister Zolotas in April 1990. Delors, it will be recalled, warned that Greece's economic divergence from the European average carried "the danger of permanently undermining the country's progress towards the single European market, Economic and Monetary Union and European integration". Now, Greece is in the euro-zone and no one questions its participation.

Many of the key economic indicators have been turned around:

- On inflation, in 1996 there was a 5 percentage point difference between Greece and the average amongst its partners. By 2002, it was less than 1%.
- The previous interest rate differential has been erased by EMU.
- In 1996, Greece's budget deficit was almost 8%; with entry into the euro it fell significantly (though by 2004 it breached the 3% ceiling of the Stability and Growth Pact).
- Economic growth in Greece has been well above the EU norm in recent years.

Despite the continuing huge levels of public debt, the general progress has been a major Greek achievement. In the language of the literature on "Europeanization": the domestic economic policy paradigm has undergone an EU-inspired transformation. Beyond the euro, across the general range of EU legislation, the record of the last decade shows that Greece has been part of the normal EU majority.

In a recent article, Mattila and Lane (2001) analyse the recorded voting patterns in the Council of Ministers for the period 1995-98. Their general survey shows that:

- in the Council of Ministers, the Greek government is one of those most likely to be part of the majority. Greece hardly ever votes against the EU majority.
- Only Finland and Luxembourg were less likely to record a "no" vote or to abstain in the Council of Ministers.

The research also shows that small states, in general, are unlikely to vote "no" in the Council of Ministers, so admittedly the Greek behaviour is not unusual in comparative terms, but it represents a significant shift for Athens.

The insertion of Greece into the core consensus on general economic policy issues in the EU has been the basis for a major shift in the external image of Greece. The old criticisms have gone. There is something here, though, about the domestic advantages gained from EMU. This takes me from the question of whether Greece is seen as an awkward partner, to whether Greece can still be seen as a weak state.

Still a weak state?

Traditionally, the modern Greek state has been seen as "a colossus with feet of clay", to use the description employed by Dimitris Sotiropoulos (1993). To many, this has been a colossus with an inelegant form, however: huge, ill-coordinated and dysfunctional. It has feet of clay because of its own institutional weakness; whilst it is unbalanced because of the weakness of civil society and its easy penetration by party interests. As Calliope Spanou (1996) put it, the Greek state has been

"hypertrophied, omnipresent, but ultimately weak". Public choice theory would highlight a weak state hindered by rent-seeking behaviour (Krueger 1974), with sectional interests competing for favours, resources and subsidies. This underlines the relevance of the social setting for reform (Lyberaki and Tsakolotas 2003).

The criticisms of the past are well-established and sharply put. How, then, does this picture square with the recent performance and Greece's entry into the euro-zone?

The Maastricht convergence criteria and the Stability and Growth Pact set clear policy parameters and created an external discipline for monetary policy in Greece. At home, the government was empowered: the legitimacy of the EU and the precision of the convergence criteria carried a difficult reform process forward. This needed much political skill and careful consensus-building, but ultimately the strength of the domestic reform initiative would have very probably run aground without Maastricht.

Further evidence about the capabilities of the Greek state might come from areas less closely related to the disciplines of the euro. In other policy areas there is an obvious overlap between the domestic political project of "modernization" in Greece and the European Union's expansion of its own policy scope.

- Since the 1980s, the EU has become much more concerned about the need for Europe to become more competitive in the international economy. The concerns of the Delors White Paper on "Competitiveness, Growth and Employment" in 1993 were taken up in 2000 with the launch of the so-called "Lisbon process". The common focus has included the objectives of reducing state regulation in the economy and reforming welfare expenditure.
- In parallel, European Council meetings at Cardiff, Luxembourg and Cologne have elaborated on the "Broad Economic Policy Guidelines" set for member states.

- At Helsinki, a review process was set in motion for structural reforms across the member states. These concerns link with the objectives of privatization and pension reform pursued by successive governments in Greece since 1991.

So, the test of whether the Greek state should be seen as still weak or strong focuses on its ability to bring about structural reform in areas like these. Here, my conclusion is that much progress has been made, but much more needs to be done to indicate a fundamental shift from weakness to strength.

Privatization has gone forward, but it has been through so many "stops" and so many "starts". By comparison with the historic legacy, the current record can look impressive. About 30 public sector enterprises have been partially privatized since 1998. The strategy for privatization has been to float these enterprises on the stock market. This has had the advantage of reducing the size of the government sector and has reduced the government's budget deficit. In some cases, it has even raised productivity. The bad news is that the deficits of these state enterprises have remained large and 46% of their deficits have had to be met by EU funds. Thus, the importance of public subsidy remains. In addition, privatization has not reduced state control as much as might have been expected. In many cases, government control over their operation and decisions has continued. As the case of OTE has shown, a minority stake held by the government is sufficient to exercise control, if the other shares are widely dispersed. Thus, the record of privatization in Greece clashes with the prevailing neo-liberal inspired norms found elsewhere in the EU.

Externally, the motive behind Greek privatization is often seen not as a shift of government behaviour, nor as a redefinition of state-society relations. Instead, the perception is of a short-term budget fix by Athens to raise revenue. The logic of electoral politics appears to have won out over the logic of institutional reform.

- Raising revenue by these means was politically easier than cutting expenditures or subsidies. Cutting these would have meant confronting powerful and entrenched domestic interests.
- Entry into the euro-zone was governed by rules that lengthened the time horizons of policy makers. Long-term convergence deadlines were set. By contrast, domestic structural reforms are linked only to softer coordination mechanisms at the EU level. Instead of convergence tests, there is the "Open Method of Coordination", reports and peer pressure. The external discipline is weaker, empowerment more difficult. In current academic terms, the Europeanization pressure has been weaker.

Perhaps a more relevant focus than privatization is that of pension reform in Greece. Here, Greece faces a policy challenge substantially similar to that found elsewhere. Social changes and budget pressures are evident across Europe. This is borne out by the consistency of policy prescriptions offered to successive Greek governments for pension reform, by domestic and foreign experts. What is exceptional, however, is the particular distribution of power and interests in Greece that weaken the will and capability for reform.

The relationship between government, unions, and employers in this area is strategically complex. The key actors are participants in what rational choice theoreticians would term "a prisoner's dilemma". The rational self-interest of each player weighs against serious reform. Indeed, it is not at all clear who really wants change. For any Greek government, the political cost of failure on pension reform is high and immediate. The only real gains would come in the long term. For any individual group of workers today, it is worth holding out against change to protect their accumulated privileges, whatever any other group might do. The only groups for whom pension reform is in their self-interest are those currently unrepresented and future generations who do not yet have a voice. For the key players, however, the prisoner's dilemma

game is one of high uncertainty over potential gains and low trust as to the motives of the other players.

The key variable here is trust – or the lack of it. Pension reform has been protracted, spread over time by piecemeal instalments. This actually worsens the problem of trust, in that at each instalment of reform earlier promises have to be broken. So, the system continues along a low trust/low co-operation/little reform scenario.

The reforms of March 2002 advanced by Reppas and Christodoulakis may be seeking to learn these lessons. An investment is being made in trying to build trust amongst the key players: the deployment of financial capital to develop social capital.

For the last ten years, reform has faced a social blockage. Successive Greek governments – whatever their political will – have confronted immovable social actors able to veto reform. In short, the case has highlighted the structural weakness of the Greek state. This is a feature well beyond the actions or inactions of any individual minister or prime minister: the system has defeated individual political will over a prolonged period of time.

Across the cases of pensions and privatization, the composition of the reform movement seems isolated and shallow – showing the lack of engagement of a wider section of society with wider European norms.

Conclusions

I recognise that my paper has been very general in scope. But there are a number of themes that emerge and I offer a few comments for further consideration.

1. Greek membership of the EU has displayed a general pattern of policy shift. The breadth of support for Europe in Greece is tremendous. Today, where are the "anti-Europeans"? A maverick PM has been replaced by a maverick Archbishop! More seriously, as the EU has changed, so with it the criteria by which to base support or opposition have also changed.

2. It is only in foreign policy – and, in particular, policies related to Greece's own immediate neighbourhood – where crises of divergence have arisen: most notably FYROM and ESDP. These clashes did not arise out of some general ideological difference or out of a flirtation with non-alignment between East and West, but out of a distinct national interest in a threatening region.
3. In monetary policy, and across the general range of EU policies, Greek positions have converged with the core majority in the EU. The euro has been a special case: here a set of relatively fixed convergence criteria with a fixed timetable has created a clear external constraint. The choice for Greece over entry into the euro was brutal. As such, key policy actors at home were empowered by the European link. This was the domestic political advantage of "tying one's hands". Difficult policy shifts were engineered by Europe. Guido Carli noted a similar pattern in Italy: he talked of the benefits of a "vincolo esterno".
4. The policy mechanism behind the increasing EU concern with competitiveness and market openness is much looser than that created for EMU. The general focus is on a liberalization of the role of the state in the domestic economy. Here, Greek policy norms have shifted tremendously when seen in purely domestic terms. The modernization project has moved Greece a long way from the position of the 1980s. The Greek response to EU pressure here has been somewhere between "accommodation" and "transformation". Existing policies and institutions have been "patched up" and there is the promise of replacing them with substantially different ones. Government ambitions have not been fully realized. Indeed, when seen in comparison with Greece's European partners, the shifts in Athens appear much slower and more shallow. Greece appears as something of a "foot-dragger" or "policy laggard" on privatization and on pensions.
5. The signal given here is that difficult policy shifts depend on an external force to strengthen the domestic reform process.

Or, in other words, a weak state is unable to face down rent-seeking traditions at home without help from abroad. The EU is not the only external force, of course. In other cases, the pressures of Europeanization and globalization become tied. George Pagoulatos, in his excellent new book, refers to liberalization in the financial sector as a principal instrument for shifting the existing Greek policy paradigm. There is a consistency between EMU and financial market liberalization: in both cases, Greece has been a "policy-receiver" not a "policy initiator". New policy norms have been set elsewhere and imported into Greece. The domestic choice has been brutal. It has had foreign policy implications. Greece has fallen into line.

6. All of this suggests that Greek governments face a critical challenge: between domestic weakness in the face of entrenched interests, and external empowerment in the name of ambitious, imported policy objectives.

7. Moreover, in the softer areas of EU policy – like pension reform and privatization – the domestic challenge of external adjustment is stronger because the EU constraint is weaker. Here, "modernization" ultimately means adjusting to a fiscal discipline, without the aid of "convergence criteria". This requires the Gordian knot of domestic veto-points and rent-seeking behaviour to be overcome. This is the difference between a domestic response of transformation and one of resilience. Transformation requires deep political and cultural shifts (Ioakimides 1998).

Progress on structural reform therefore ties my two themes together: it will determine the extent of Greece's convergence with the rest of the EU and it will answer the question of whether the Greek state is overcoming its past domestic weakness. I do not wish to adopt a normative position of my own on whether further structural reform is a good or a bad thing. I note the pronouncements of the Bank of Greece and the Ministry of National Economy on the need for greater reform in order to achieve more external adjustment. The current Greek government has set itself the objective of "the

acceleration of structural reforms". Rather, my core point is simply that it is in this area that Greece's reputation in Europe will be built.

For Greece in the European Union, the goalposts have shifted: the test of being a loyal and strong partner is not whether Greece enters an asterisk on a statement condemning martial law in Poland, as in the 1980s, but on whether Greece is isolated or a foot-dragger on structural reform in the new "Open Method of Coordination". Domestically, Europe hits home much more strongly than before and Greece's position in Europe has changed tremendously as a result.

References

Ioakimides, P. (1996). "Contradictions in the Europeanisation process", in: K. Featherstone and K. Ifantis (eds.), *Greece in a changing Europe: Between European integration and Balkan disintegration?* Manchester: Manchester University Press

Ioakimides, P. (1998). Π. Ιωακειμίδης, *Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και Ελληνικό Κράτος: επιπτώσεις από τη συμμετοχή στην ενοποιητική διαδικασία.* Athens: Themelio

Ioakimides, P. (2001). "The Europeanization of Greece: an overall assessment", in: K. Featherstone and G. A. Kazamias (eds.), *Europeanization and the Southern Periphery.* London: Frank Cass

Krueger, A. O. (1974). "The political economy of the rent-seeking society", *The American Economic Review* 64.3, 291-303

Lyberaki, A. and Tsakolotas, E. (2003). "Reforming the economy without society: Social and institutional constraints to reform in post-1974 Greece", *New Political Economy* 7.1, 93-114

Mattila, M. and Lane, J. (2001). "Why unanimity in the Council? A roll call analysis of Council voting", *European Union Politics* 2, 31-52

Michas, T. (2002). *Unholy alliance: Greece and Milošević's Serbia.* Houston: Texas A & M University Press

Pagoulatos, G. (2003). *Greece's new political economy: State, finance and growth from postwar to EMU.* London: Palgrave

Sotiropoulos, D. A. (1993). "A colossus with feet of clay: The State in post-authoritarian Greece", in: H. J. Psomiades and S. B. Thomadakis (eds.), *Greece, the new Europe and the changing international order.* New York: Pella

Spanou, C. (1996). "On the regulatory capacity of the Hellenic State: A tentative approach based on a case study", *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 62, 219-37

Veremis T. (2002). *Action without foresight: Western involvement in Yugoslavia.* Athens: Hellenic Foundation for European and Foreign Policy (ELIAMEP) and Yalco

Reflections on language-centred approaches to Greek "society" and "culture"

Alexandra Georgakopoulou
King's College London

Introduction

The enquiry into the relationship between language and culture has been the subject of intense theorizing from a number of perspectives, in particular since the first half of the twentieth century. (This is when several leading anthropologists made language a central theoretical concern in their study of various communities, particularly those of the fast-disappearing native American languages, e.g. Boas 1911, Malinowski 1922, Mead 1939.) For a long time, the concern was centred on the extent to which a language can be viewed as a structure which orders and defines social reality, constituting its speakers as social beings and thus mapping the "limits of their world", to echo Wittgenstein (1958). In this respect, the question was if and how speakers can escape the "prison-house of language", in Jameson's famous terms (1972); in other words, if they can contest the logic or conceptual categories of the experienced community language. This view, which accords primacy to language structure over individual agency, goes back to the influential if much debated Sapir- (1921) Whorf (1956) hypothesis, according to which the language of each community dictates a set of categories through which speakers make sense of and are bound to their socio-cultural reality. Departing from this rather deterministic view and under the influence of paradigm shifts within the social sciences (e.g. post-structuralism), socially minded linguistics (e.g. socio-linguistics, anthropo-

logical linguistics, discourse analysis) has been increasingly shifting towards a realization that the relationship between language and culture is not a straightforward one but of a subtle kind and quite complex.

Even if accepted as complex, there are certain aspects of this complexity that have been disentangled and that there is broad agreement on:

(a) The relationship between language and culture is widely considered as dialectic, in that language is not a static reflection of society and culture, but dynamically invokes and even *constructs* them. In other words, language is not simply seen as a medium for the representation of a language-independent reality but as a ubiquitous resource for (re)constructing social reality (Wetherell 1991: 391-406). In this respect, it can occasionally play a vital role in effecting social and cultural change.

(b) The exploration of language as a point of entry into culture-specificity mainly attends to language in use in specific environments. In this way, the analysis of the particular concrete context where a language is used takes precedence over the study of linguistic structure. By extension, the sort of language that is prioritized in the analysis is that which occurs in ordinary communicative encounters, i.e. in talk or conversation (Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 2004: 22-3).

(c) In this dialectic relationship between language and culture, there seems to be less convergence on the definitions and views of culture. At the risk of over-simplifying matters, two rather opposing views of culture have fed into socio-linguistic research: (i) Culture as a unifying, homogeneous, static and a priori defined set of values, beliefs and behaviours that are invoked in communication. As I will argue below, this has been the dominant paradigm in studies of Modern Greek (henceforth MG) language, society and culture. (ii) Culture as fluid, heterogeneous, under-patterned, and emergent through interactions. This is frequently referred to as the anti-essentialist view of culture and, although not exclusive to it, it has been associated

with post-structuralist thinking (for discussions, see Duranti 1997: 23-50, Rampton 1999).

With the above as a backdrop for the discussion which is to follow, I will first outline what I see as the common denominators in studies of the relationship between MG language and culture. More specifically, I will argue that (socio)linguistic research has brought to the fore the significance of certain "communication styles" in Greek that either provide further evidence for, or are interpreted in the light of, a set of "core cultural values". I will subsequently assess the impact of such studies and findings, arguing that they have been instrumental in placing the Greek case in the framework of ethnography of communication (e.g. Hymes 1974), which celebrates cultural difference and diversity, and of multiculturalism, which shies away from evaluative statements of cultural superiority and uniqueness. At the same time, I will critically discuss their weaknesses, gaps and methodological misconceptions. I will suggest that an antidote to the essentialist view of language and culture that they have largely been based on can be offered by a "discourse perspective". I will outline the main assumptions and methodological principles of such a perspective, proposing it as a way forward for studies of MG language and culture which set out to provide accounts that are nuanced, empirically grounded, and sensitive to local sense-making.

Modern Greek language and culture: communication styles and cultural values

Despite any methodological and analytical differences, studies of MG language and culture can be brought together on the basis of having invariably invoked a set of social and cultural values as central to social and communication encounters in Greece. These values have been established as markers of the ethos of the culture affecting a variety of social actions, and have subsequently served as a form of a wider contextualization for sociolinguistic work in Greek. In this way, sociolinguistics in MG has not actively engaged in social and cultural theory

except for either using it as a post-analytical, interpretative frame of reference or providing further evidence for it through the results of empirical language-centred work.

The aforementioned core values have largely emerged from social psychological and cultural studies, some of which go back to the 1970s (e.g. Hofstede 1980, Triandis 1990, Triandis and Vassiliou 1972), and rural anthropological studies (e.g. Herzfeld 1985). At the time, dichotomous views of cultural differences were quite influential in the social sciences and the humanities alike; a specific distinction that has since resonated across psychology, sociology and anthropology is that between individualist (i.e. independent) and collectivist (i.e. inter-dependent) cultures (e.g. Marcus and Kitayama 1991). As we shall see, this dichotomy has been instrumental in work on MG language and culture.

The core cultural values mentioned above are as follows:
(a) *Sociability*: here, emphasis is placed on a range of values that have the effect of creating and reaffirming intimacy, close-knit relationships, and in-group membership (see Triandis and Vassiliou 1972, Marcus and Kitayama 1991). Coterminous with this notion of sociability and sometimes used interchange-ably in the literature are the concepts of *solidarity* and *involvement* or *engagement* (Hirschon 2001, Tannen 1989).
(b) *Autonomy* (i.e. *independence, freedom*): these may seem contradictory to (a) above, as they inevitably compromise, or are compromised by, the necessity for social engagement; but it is notable that: (i) these values have been invoked less than those in (a) within sociolinguistics, and (ii) when they have been appealed to, it has been stressed that they should not be confused with the common meanings of individuality developed in the West; instead, they are to be viewed as central to a specifically Greek construction of self and personhood. This does not involve a reluctance to engage with other people and express solidarity, as in the case of Western individuality. It is rather marked by a pervasive concern with contesting hier-archy and defying authority, that is, being less accepting of

power differentials and not conceding rank (cf. Hirschon 2001: 22, Hofstede 1980).

Evidence for the cultural salience of the above values comes from the frequency, roles, and functions of certain linguistic choices (e.g. features, devices) attested to by relevant studies. These choices, found to be at the heart of communication practices in contemporary Greece, can be described as communication styles or strategies. The term "style" is used here in the rather broad sense of "the language habits shared by a group of people at one time" (Crystal and Davy 1969: 10); the term "strategies" simply invokes the notions of individual agency and purposeful creativity involved in language use. Both of these formulations point to the existence of a systematic co-patterning between elements of language form, content, functions and context (i.e. environment of use), which currently constitutes one of the main assumptions in linguistic studies of communication (Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 2004: 28).

Substantial linguistic evidence for the culture-specificity of communication styles or strategies characterizing a variety of social actions and encounters in Greek comes from the systematic study of politeness. This is no accident: first, politeness happens to be one of the most researched areas of inter-cultural communication, on the assumption that this is where cross-cultural misunderstandings frequently occur and cultural differences become visible. Secondly, politeness within socially minded linguistics has long been defined as comprising a universally applicable set of requirements and needs (e.g. Leech 1983). From this point of view, it lends itself well to a study of the relation between language and culture that is based on the following thesis: language-producers across cultures are presented with the same set of requirements as to the way to use language in a given situation. Cross-cultural differences concern the strategies employed to attain this universally applicable set of requirements. At the level of linguistic choices, politeness is normally explored with reference to speech acts, that is, acts of speaking by which we do not just say things but also perform

actions (Austin 1962). Cross-cultural differences in the uttering ("realization") of certain speech acts (e.g. requests, apologies, compliments) have been the object of numerous studies (e.g. most notably Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989) that have attested to their culture-specificity in various communities worldwide and at various levels (e.g. definition, cultural salience, frequency and environment(s) of use, linguistic forms of expression, etc.).

Politeness studies across cultures have mostly been based on an influential model by Brown and Levinson (1987), which this paper cannot do full justice to or examine in detail. What is notable for our purposes is the distinction that Brown and Levinson posed, in their now classic monograph, between positive and negative politeness strategies. Working with the concept of face (Goffman 1967), which can be crudely defined as a speaker's public self-image, Brown and Levinson argued that politeness strategies attend to either the positive aspect of face, i.e. the desire to be liked, appreciated, approved of, and feel part of a group, or the negative aspect of face, i.e. our wish that our actions are unimpeded by others and that our territory is not intruded upon, our need for independence and privacy (1987: 61). As may be obvious already, positive face can easily be mapped onto the values of involvement and sociability that have been postulated as salient in Greek culture. It may then not be surprising that the results of numerous politeness studies in Greek, most notably those by Sifianou (e.g. 1992; see also papers in Bayraktaroglu and Sifianou 2001), have suggested a cultural preference for the use of positive politeness strategies. To put it differently, polite conduct in Greek more often than not draws on involvement and solidarity-building, which claims common ground and in-group membership, as opposed to being associated with formality, distancing, and evasiveness. The above explains a wide range of linguistic choices for the utterance of speech acts such as requests in everyday interactions: e.g. the frequency of pure imperatives and/or diminutives and other instances of affectionate language; the avoidance of

distancing modality (e.g. the equivalent of would/might, which seem to abound in English), etc. In general, the communication style of positive politeness in Greek can be summed up as follows:

Positive politeness
Immediate
Personal
Implicit
Direct
Informal
Claiming common ground

In the light of the above, it becomes apparent that the linguistic study of politeness in Greek has been instrumental in documenting the importance of sociability values in Greek culture, as discussed above. (In her influential studies, Sifianou frequently appeals to them, citing the work of Triandis [1990] and Triandis and Vassiliou [1972].)

Another strand of research that has provided evidence for these values comprises studies of text-types (or genres) in Greek. Text-typological research is invariably interested in textual distinctions that revolve around speaking and writing and/or around rhetorical stances, such as telling a story, arguing, describing, etc. (Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 2004: 40ff.). In turn, such distinctions become operational by means of their systematic co-patterning with textual features and styles that are prototypically associated with the respective poles of a distinction (e.g. speaking–writing). In this respect, speaking and spoken texts have been found to be prototypically more immediate, animated, dramatized, implicit in expression, participatory, local and context-bound than written texts. On the other hand, writing and practices associated with written language have been argued to be abstract and distinct from immediate activity, so as to facilitate norms of self-reflexive engagement (for a detailed discussion of relevant studies, see

Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 2004: 33-9). Similarly, the narrative mode (e.g. storytelling) trades on the teller's and the audience's emotional and experiential engagement with the events narrated and, as such, it is prototypically more associated with processes of subjectivity. In contrast, non-narrative (e.g. expository) texts have been argued to draw more on processes of reasoning, objectivity, and critical argumentation (ibid.: 40-55; see also Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 2000).

In the case of Greek, studies not just within linguistics, but also in cultural and literary studies, have stressed the orality bias of contemporary Greek society which is manifested not only in the importance of oral modes of communication, but also in the preponderance of features typically associated with oral texts in written text-types, ranging from novels to essays (Mackridge 1985 and 1992, Tannen 1989, Tziovas 1989). Typically oral – in the sense of face-to-face, conversational – features have also been found to abound in the new media, e.g. computer-mediated communication (Georgakopoulou 2001a). The main attributes of this orality-based or -biased style are summed up below, where the overlaps with the features of positive politeness above are immediately evident:

Orality-b(i)ased style
Immediate
Personal
Implicit
Animated/Dramatic
Informal
Context-bound

A style that is frequently presented as an exponent of the orality-based style is the so-called "high involvement style" occurring in conversational exchanges and characterized by increased frequency of interruptions, speakers' overlapping contributions, animated paralanguage (e.g. gestures, loud voice),

etc. This style was noted by Deborah Tannen in American-Jewish conversations (1984) and its occurrence was (re)-affirmed in her work on Greek conversations (1989). A specific feature of this style is the propensity for confrontation and dispute that does not threaten social relationships. This tendency for so called "sociable disagreements" (Schiffrin 1984) has been found to be prevalent in conversations amongst intimates in Greek (Tannen and Kakava 1992). Despite having the surface characteristics of a confrontation, a sociable disagreement remains non-serious. In other words, participants engage in it for its own sake, for the pleasure afforded by the activity itself, rather than in order to resolve the issues that were the ostensible subject matter of disagreement. In terms of their discourse features, sociable disagreements present vulnerable argumentative frames (i.e. easily exited or re-keyed as non-serious) and co-operativeness (Schiffrin 1984). A case in point in Greek is the affectionate use of first names in diminutive form following the particle "ρε" (Tannen and Kakava 1992).

One of the main rhetorical strategies for argumentation in Greek is that of telling (personal experience) stories frequently put forth as personal analogies (Tannen and Kakava 1992). This is closely related to the special place of storytelling as a rhetorical mode in a wide variety of settings in Greece, as attested by numerous studies (Georgakopoulou 1997, Herzfeld 1989, Kostouli 1992, Tannen 1983). The preference of Greek interactants to base their evidence for the views expressed on hearsay and the anecdotal, experiential knowledge conveyed through stories, as opposed to more abstract, deductive processes of reasoning, can be described as a "narrative bias" (see Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 1999, 2000). Furthermore, this narrative bias tends to be realized by means of performed (i.e. animated, dramatized) storytellings, which let the events speak for themselves, imply a story's point and tellability rather than explicitly stating it (Georgakopoulou 1997). In

sum, the main exponents of this narrative-based or -biased style are as follows:

Narrative-b(i)ased style
Personal
Experiential
Anecdotal evidence (i.e. hearsay) for argumentation

Performed narrative style
Implicit
Animated/Dramatic

As we can see above, the narrative-biased style is highly compatible with the orality-biased style, not least because the tendency for dramatization and animation cuts across both of them. In more general terms, this is revealing of an emphasis on the teller's verbal artistry and communicative skill and of attention to linguistic form. In turn, this is relatable to findings about the prevalence of language play and "γλωσσοπλασία" in Greek communication (e.g. Hirschon 1992).

Discussion
The above exposition has presented certain interrelated cultural values and communication styles in MG: the values of sociability, engagement and solidarity as well as those of autonomy and freedom (in the sense of resistance to normative meanings), independently postulated as being at the core of cultural processes in Greece, have been corroborated as well as being employed as interpretative grids for certain communication styles, found by linguistic studies to be at the core of communication practices in MG. These styles are centred on language choices that are immediate and implicit on the one hand and serve as devices for dramatization and performance on the other.

It is worth examining here the sort of culture that is emerging on the basis of those communication styles and, by

extension, the kinds of cultural affiliations that Greece turns out to have with other communities, from the point of view of culture specificity as attested in language use: to put it somewhat crudely, the linguist's answer to the perennial question of whether Greece is in the East or the West or somewhere in the middle seems to be that Greece is East, or at least that it is not West. This bold statement is based on the fact that non-western cultures, since the critical gaze of Malinowski and other anthropologists turned on to their practices at the beginning of the twentieth century, have been invariably found to emphasize sociability values, which are, in turn, intimately linked with an interdependent, in-group oriented and antipersonalist construction of self (Marcus and Kitayama 1991). Similarly, communicative styles of performance and dramatization and ritualized, rhythmic practices have been found to characterize either "exotic" (American Indian) cultures (Hymes 1981) or ethnic, cultural and social minorities within Western states such as Black-African-Americans, working classes in the U.S.A., etc. (e.g. Gee 1985, Michaels 1981). Finally, positively polite strategies have been reported to be dominant in the Mediterranean cultures, China, Japan, and certain countries of Asia (e.g. Jordan) and Africa (e.g. Nigeria), at least those from which we have empirical linguistic studies (e.g. Eelen 1999, Gu 1990, Matsumoto 1988).

Studies of cultural and social groups which fall into the interdependent end of the continuum of cultural differences have succeeded in proving the complexity and intellectual potency that can in fact be found in their rituals, and furthermore that there are no superior languages or cultures. They have thus been instrumental in moving away from the view of cultural diversity as deficit, which subscribed to notions of high and low culture, to that of cultural diversity as difference, which subscribes to the notion of multiculturalism and relativism (Harris and Rampton 2003: 7-8). In the case of Greek in particular, it is arguable that one of the spin-offs of this kind of research is that it has largely legitimated "low culture", rural

Greece, and "spoken/oral, non-literary" Greek as an object of inquiry (cf. Hess 2003). At the same time, it has served as an antidote to one of the most dominant discourses of cultural studies in Greece, that of exceptionalism, which is in itself closely connected with the narrative of continuity (see Jusdanis 1997, Lambropoulos 1997): instead of stressing the uniqueness and cultural superiority of Greece, it has placed it in the comparative frameworks of ethnography of communication and multiculturalism.

Nonetheless, however noble the aims of such research, one common pitfall lies in its point of departure. This is the premise that there exists a set of norms of a dominant culture and language, in this case "the Western world", that can be more or less explicitly used as a reference point and yardstick for whatever departs from it. To put it differently, the underlying assumption seems to be that whatever is not the norm needs to be affirmed and sanctioned. A subsequent danger here is that the object of inquiry is exoticized and through that exoticization, its marginal status is in the end (re)affirmed (a similar critique has been voiced in relation to research on language and gender, e.g. Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1999). This has been frequently noted with concern in relation to (earlier) ethnographic studies of Greece: Tziovas (2001), for instance, has recently linked the ethnographic idealization of the exotic land of Zorba the Greek with the ambivalent position that MG culture has historically occupied in Western scholarship; this is to be found in crude binary oppositions between European Hellenism and Greek Hellenism, the Hellenic and the Romaic, European rationalism and oriental indiscipline, presented as clear-cut, which permeate studies of MG history and culture.

Taking those macro-accounts of dualistic stereotypes and dichotomies for granted in linguistic research has two notable methodological repercussions: not only are linguistic differences often exaggerated to fit them, but also certain conceptual links are made a priori between linguistic meanings and social

relations of solidarity or dominance, which may then interfere with the findings or interpretation of empirical research (cf. Eelen 1999, Rampton 1999), creating a circularity of accounts. For example, an accepted cultural macro-account of sociability and involvement inevitably makes the linguistic displays of power and conflict incompatible with its framework unless they are in effect construed as sociable behaviour. As my study on disagreements in the conversations of an all-female group of Greek adolescents showed (Georgakopoulou 2001b), treating disagreements as sociable and linking them with the cultural values of engagement and solidarity simply reifies accounts and naturalizes data. Without attempting to go into detail here, it suffices to mention that the study demonstrated that the following parameters bear on the linguistic forms and discourse functions of disagreement in the data: (a) the participants' shared interactional history and the implicitness that this history affords; (b) the participants' larger social roles and identities, such as internal hierarchical divisions amongst them that are in turn reflected in local discourse roles: e.g. who has a leading role in what, who argues more, complies more, etc.; (c) the activity-type in which disagreements mostly occur (in this case, talk about the future), which defines disagreements as a process of positing, negotiating and revising alternative versions of reality for the events to take place.

Another closely related issue that has been intensely debated in anthropology (see Duranti 1997) involves the degree to which concepts such as involvement, politeness, engagement, sociability, etc., which have so often accompanied descriptions of MG culture and communication are consistent with, make sense of, and have any sort of reality for the participants themselves and their perspective. For instance, it is not always clear – and sometimes even doubtful – whether the interactants that produced X data would, when so asked, also qualify those data in terms of sociability, positive politeness, etc. (Eelen 1999; cf. Mackridge 1992: 118-19). In most cases, it is fair to say that these concepts are in fact analytical,

that is, *etic*, as opposed to indigenous or *emic* and, furthermore, they frequently present an ethnocentric bias. That said, certain indigenous concepts have been flagged up for MG, such as φιλότιμο, παρέα, κέφι, etc., but (a) there has not been a systematic attempt to bring them together with the existing analytical concepts, and (b) they have not emerged from language-focused analysis of interactional data; they have largely occurred in ethnographers' interviews with informants. They are thus reports of cultural meanings in language use as opposed to actual language use.

On a different note, seductive as they may be, structural characterizations of the relations between language and culture such as the ones we have seen in the case of Greek seem to be over-normative and highly artificial impositions upon complex histories. They seem to be based on an essentialist idealization of one homogeneous Greek culture and do not allow a lot of room for more ambiguous, often contradictory linguistic practices differing among Greeks with different identity aspects in different contexts (cf. Tziovas 2001).

The idea that the time is ripe for socio-cultural studies of Greece, be they language-focused or not, to move away from idealizations and embrace document hybridity and dialogue has, in recent years, frequently been put forward as a plea within Greek studies (e.g. Jusdanis 1997, Tziovas 2001). What exactly is the way forward is less well recognized and agreed upon. Below, I will suggest an approach that draws on (situated) discourse analysis and (interactional) sociolinguistics as an avenue for future research on MG language, society and culture. Both discourse analysis and sociolinguistics are fast-growing areas and encompass a wide range of models, some more contextualized than others. The terms in parentheses above, i.e. situated and interactional, are largely part of an internal dialogue within socially minded linguistics and aimed at highlighting emphasis on contextualized accounts of language use in communication encounters.

Concluding remarks: Towards a discourse perspective

An alternative focus of research on the relations between language, society and culture in Greece would involve shifting emphasis from the macro- to the micro-: in other words, moving from the large and all-encompassing notions of society and culture that have monopolized research so far to "micro-cultures", that is, shrunk down, more manageable in size, communities of people who, through regular interaction and participation in an activity system, share linguistic and social practice norms as well as understandings of them. A fine-tuned concept that is currently gaining ground within socio-linguistics is that of community of practice (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1999, Lave and Wenger 1991): the notion is symptomatic of a dramatic recasting of "culture", "community" and the like from their traditional definitions as fixed and static collectivities to symbolic and even imagined constructions that are based on co-participation in specific activities (Rampton 1999). This pluralization of the notions of society and culture allows for members' participation in overlapping and intersecting communities.

A micro-focus at the level of analysis recommends attention to the particularities and exigencies of specific data in specific contexts, so that linguistic forms are by no means mapped with interactional functions or social meanings (be they sociability, politeness, solidarity) on a one-to-one basis and irrespective of local contexts.

This alternative focus of research is frequently described in the literature as a discourse turn or perspective (cf. Harris and Rampton 2003: 7ff.) and is currently part of a wide shift in the humanities and social sciences, particularly with respect to the study of (personal, social, cultural) identities. The discourse perspective comes with a rich descriptive apparatus that looks at socio-cultural phenomena close up, that is, in the moment-to-moment unfolding of communication. Its analytic point of entry is thus specific interactional events, specific occasions of communicative practice, specific speech events and activities.

Below, I will outline the main assumptions and methodologies guiding the discourse perspective (adapted from Harris and Rampton 2003: 8).

Approach to language: Constructionism. Discourse and interaction are crucial to the processes through which socio-cultural realities and identities get reproduced, resisted or created anew.

View of culture (and identities): Anti-essentialism. Culture emergent in (primarily discourse) activity; involved in situated and dialogical sense-making. On the basis of this, social and cultural identities are neither fixed not categorical entities; instead, they are emergent in the sequentiality of discourse, where they present an irreducible situational contingency (Androutsopoulos and Georgakopoulou 2003: 1).

Politics/social/cultural theory: Endorsement of macroscopic facts about late modernity and globalization (particularly as involving major population shifts, new social movements, and the explosion of new information technologies; Gillespie 1995). There is a recognition that "the complexity of social experience in a late modern era" is such that "it makes it hard to predict" or pinpoint "its impact on particular groups and individuals" (Harris and Rampton 2003: 8).

Descriptive focus: Micro- (see discussion above).

Data: Interactional; institutional (see discussion above).

Analytic focus: Attention to details of talk; close linguistic analysis. The assumption here is that culture is produced in the practices associated with specific positions in certain types of interactional exchanges (see papers in Antaki and Widdicombe 1998).

The adoption of the discourse perspective by studies of language, society and culture in relation to MG would shift research questions: instead of asking what is culture-specific about language use the question would be: How are cultural resources enacted and reconciled but also contested in the contingencies of situated activity? What do participants orient to

in terms of their cultural identity in specific contexts? How do they draw upon it as a resource for affiliation or disaffiliation? In addition, instead of examining "Greekness" in isolation and as a distinguishable attribute that can be singled out and kept apart from other identity aspects, the discourse perspective warrants an investigation of how it gets co-constructed and co-articulated with other aspects of identity in discourse (e.g. gender, age, social class). This is on the basis of the assumption that identities tend to be indirect and co-articulated in language rather than articulated neatly and separately from one another (for details, see Androutsopoulos and Georgakopoulou 2003: 1-25). At the same time, taken to its logical conclusion, the discourse perspective would question the very methodological and analytical validity of the quest for "Greekness" as opposed to research that looks into culture if and when the data foreground it and make it relevant.

As I have attempted to show in this paper, the discourse perspective is currently lagging behind within Modern Greek studies of the interrelations between language, society and culture, as these tend to hypostasize society and culture and treat them as compact totalities. By the same token, inter-disciplinarities between (socio)linguistics and cultural studies, which tend to be a hallmark of the discourse perspective, are far and few between. In this respect, ethnographic studies of culture could benefit from a focus on language in the broad sense of discourse. On the other hand, linguistic studies such as the ones discussed above have tended to be agnostic about the sort of social and cultural theory and reality they subscribe to and ultimately driven by "dominant" macro-accounts of MG culture, "shuttling too fast up into grand theories from theories of data" (Rampton 1999: 2). A discourse perspective would thus be instrumental in forging timely and much needed inter-disciplinarities between linguistics and certain strands of cultural studies.

Moving to the discourse paradigm is partly a matter of shifting focus to data that have failed to be at the centre of

attention in research on MG. Interactional occasions within institutional, formal and public contexts of language use are certainly under-researched. At the other end of the spectrum, popular culture is only just beginning to make it to the centre of analytical attention. In his recent study, Hess suggests that there is an unwillingness within Neohellenic studies to fully encounter the commonplace aspects of Greek existence and that a shift toward popular culture as an object of intellectual inquiry is imperative (2003: 39; cf. Georgakopoulou 2000). Techno- could certainly be added to popular culture so as to capture the new media and technologies that we know have been embraced by Greek society at large, but what their impact has been on socio-communicative relations and networks is far less understood. Finally, conflictual moments, moments when questions of cultural identity are more likely to be oriented to (Gumperz 1982), as is the case in contact contexts where cultural, ethnic, and linguistic diversity are accentuated and made relevant, are also particular worthy of investigation in today's Greece, at a time when the demographics have been changing rapidly and when hybridity seems to be at the heart of cultural processes.

References

Androutsopoulos, J. and Georgakopoulou, A. (eds.) (2003). "Introduction", in: *Discourse constructions of youth identities*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 1-25

Antaki, C. and Widdicombe, S. (eds.) (1998). *Identities in talk*. London: Sage

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press

Bayraktaroglu, A. and Sifianou, M. (eds.) (2001). *Linguistic politeness across boundaries: The case of Greek and Turkish.* Amsterdam: Benjamins

Boas, F. (ed.) (1911). *Handbook of American Indian languages.* Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J. and Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Crystal, D. and Davy, D. (1969) *Investigating English style.* Harlow: Longman.

Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic anthropology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Eckert, P. and McConnell-Ginet S. (1999). "New generalizations and explanations in language and gender research", *Language in Society* 28, 185-201

Eelen, G. (1999). "Politeness and ideology: A critical review", *Pragmatics* 9, 163-73

Gee, J.P. (1985). "The narrative of experience in the oral style", *Journal of Education* 167, 9-35

Georgakopoulou, A. (1997). *Narrative performances: A study of Modern Greek storytelling.* Amsterdam: Benjamins

Georgakopoulou, A. (2000). "On the sociolinguistics of popular films: funny characters, funny voices", *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 18, 119-33

Georgakopoulou, A. (2001a). "Self-presentation and interactional alliances in e-mail discourse: the style- and code-switches of Greek messages", in: A. Georgakopoulou and M. Spanaki (eds.), *A reader in Greek sociolinguistics*: *Studies in Modern Greek language, culture and communication.* Oxford/Bern: Peter Lang, pp. 303-32. [Reprinted from *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 7 (1997) 141-64]

Georgakopoulou, A. (2001b). "Arguing about the future: on indirect disagreements in conversations", *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, 1881-900

Georgakopoulou, A. and Goutsos, D. (1999). "Η αφήγηση ως βάση κειμενικών διακρίσεων: Ένα μοντέλο ανάλυσης λόγου και οι εφαρμογές του στα ελληνικά" (Narrative as the basis of text distinctions: a model of discourse analysis and its applications in Greek), *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Greek Linguistics, Athens 22-24 September 1997*, Athens: Ellenika Grammata, pp. 693-701

Georgakopoulou, A. and Goutsos, D. (2000). "Revisiting discourse boundaries: the narrative and non-narrative distinction", *Text* 20, 119-33

Georgakopoulou, A. and Goutsos, D. (2004). *Discourse analysis: An introduction.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press [1st edition 1997]

Gillespie, M. (1995). *Television, ethnicity and cultural change.* London: Routledge

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior.* New York: Doubleday [now published by Pantheon]

Gu, Y. (1990). "Politeness phenomena in Modern Chinese", *Journal of Pragmatics* 14, 237-57

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Harris, R. and Rampton, B. (eds.) (2003). "Introduction", in: *The language, ethnicity and race reader*. London: Routledge, pp. 1-14

Herzfeld, M. (1985). *The poetics of manhood: Context and identity in a Cretan mountain village*. Princeton: Princeton University Press

Herzfeld, M. (1989). "Embarrassment as pride: narrative resourcefulness and strategies of normativity among Cretan animal-thieves", *Anthropological Linguistics* 31, 319-44

Hess, F. L. (2003). "Close encounters of the common kind: The theoretical and practical implications of popular culture for Modern Greek Studies", *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 21, 37-66

Hirschon, R. (1992). "Greek adults' verbal play, or, how to train for caution", *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 10, 35-56

Hirschon, R. (2001). "Freedom, solidarity and obligation. The socio-cultural context of Greek politeness", in: Bayraktaroglu and Sifianou (2001), pp. 17-42

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage

Hymes, D. (1974). "Ways of speaking", in: R. Bauman and J. Sherzer (eds.), *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 433-52

Hymes, D. (1981). *"In vain I tried to tell you": Essays in Native American ethnopoetics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

Jameson, F. (1972). *The prison-house of language: A critical account of structuralism and Russian formalism.* Princeton: Princeton University Press

Jusdanis, G. (1997). "Introduction: Modern Greek! Why?", *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 15, 167-74

Kostouli, T. (1992). "On the structure of textual rhetoric: some evidence from Greek narratives", *Text* 12, 373-95

Lambropoulos, V. (1997). "Modern Greek Studies in the age of ethnography", *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 15, 197-208

Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics.* London: Longman

Mackridge, P. (1985). *The Modern Greek language. A descriptive analysis of Standard Modern Greek.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Mackridge, P. (1992). "Games of power and solidarity – Commentary", *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 10, 111-20

Malinowski, B. (1922). *Argonauts of the Western Pacific.* New York: Dutton

Marcus, R. M. and Kitayama, S. (1991). "Culture and self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation", *Psychological Review* 98, 224-53

Matsumoto, Y. (1988). "Re-examination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese", *Journal of Pragmatics* 12, 403-26

Mead, M. (1939). "Native languages as field-work tools", *American Anthropologist* 41, 189-205

Michaels, S. (1981). "'Sharing time': children's narrative styles and differentiated access to literacy", *Language in Society* 10, 423-42

Rampton, B. (1999). "Sociolinguistics and Cultural Studies: New ethnicities, liminality and interaction", *Social Semiotics* 9, 355-74

Sapir, E. (1921). *Language, an introduction to the study of speech.* New York: Harcourt Brace

Schiffrin, D. (1984). "Jewish argument as sociability", *Language in Society* 13, 311-35

Sifianou, M. (1992). *Politeness phenomena in England and Greece: A cross-cultural perspective.* Oxford: Clarendon Press

Tannen, D. (1983). "'I take out the rock-dok!' How Greek women tell about being molested (and create involvement)", *Anthropological Linguistics* 25, 359-74

Tannen, D. (1984). *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex

Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking voices. Repetition, dialogue and imagery in conversational discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Tannen, D. and Kakava, C. (1992). "Power and solidarity in Modern Greek conversation: disagreeing to agree", *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 10, 11-34

Triandis, H. C. (1990). "Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism", in: J. Berman (ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1989*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, pp. 41-133

Triandis, H. C. and Vassiliou, V. (1972). "A comparative analysis of subjective culture", in: H. C. Triandis, V. Vassiliou, G. Vassiliou, Y. Tanaka and A. V. Shanmugan (eds.), *The analysis of subjective culture.* New York: Wiley, pp. 299-335

Tziovas, D. (1989). "Residual orality and belated textuality in Greek literature and culture", *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 7, 321-35

Tziovas, D. (2001). "Beyond the Acropolis: Rethinking Neohellenism", *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 19, 189-218

Wetherell, M. (1991). "Beyond binaries", *Theory and Psychology* 9, 391-406

Whorf, B. L. (1956). "The relation of habitual thought and behavior to language", in: J. B. Carroll (ed.), *Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 134-59

Wittgenstein, L. (1958). *Philosophical investigations*. Ed. G. E. M. Anscombe and R. Rhees, trans. G. E. M. Anscombe. Oxford: Blackwell

"Sie sprechen wie ein Buch": G. N. Hatzidakis (1848-1941) and the defence of Greek diglossia*

Peter Mackridge
St Cross College, Oxford

The story of the Greek language controversy – like the history of the Greek language itself – has usually been told in a somewhat teleological fashion, tracing the course that it followed until it reached the present situation. When Greek diglossia was officially abolished in 1976, it was (in theory, at least) the demotic rather than the *katharevousa* version of Modern Greek that became the official language of the Greek state. For this reason, those who study the Greek language question tend to concentrate on the arguments of the demoticists, since these arguments have a double advantage: they seem eminently reasonable, and they seem to have won the day. What I aim to do in this article is to look back at the arguments of the principal proponent of the written language, commonly known as *katharevousa*, namely Georgios Hatzidakis (1848-1941). I aim to avoid a teleological approach and instead to place myself in Hatzidakis's position, in an attempt to understand what it felt like at the time to be defending the diglossic status quo against the powerful attacks of those who promoted the exclusive use of demotic for all spoken and written purposes.

Before I go any further, I would like to clear up a potential confusion about the identity of demotic by quoting a recent

* An earlier, shorter, version of this article was given as a paper at the 140th anniversary conference of the Department of General Linguistics, St Petersburg State University, 19 March 2003.

statement by Anna Frangoudaki which in my view accurately presents the situation:

> Although a large segment of the literature on the Greek sociolinguistic situation maintains the contrary, *Demotiki* [sic] is not a vernacular, or a dialect, or a variety. It is in fact a standard. It is the product of a process of codification and normalization of the spoken language, out of the varieties used by the educated in the urban centers. This process occurred approximately between the 1880s and 1930s.[1]

I would add that when we say demotic is a standard, we imply that it is primarily a *written* language.

Katharevousa attempted, in its orthography, morphology and vocabulary, to resemble Ancient Greek as closely as possible, although in syntax it deviated significantly from the Classical language, while in semantics, style and turns of phrase it relied heavily on French and German models.[2] *Katharevousa* therefore ignored the phonological changes that had occurred in spoken Greek since antiquity, as well as most of the morphological developments and many of the lexical substitutions that had taken place during the same period.[3]

---

[1] Anna Frangoudaki, "Comment. Greek societal bilingualism of more than a century", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 157 (2002) 102. This special issue, edited by Joshua A. Fishman, is entitled *Focus on Diglossia*; Frangoudaki's article is a comment on an article by Alan Hudson, "Outline of a theory of diglossia", published in the same issue.

[2] Hatzidakis quotes the German linguist Karl Foy as stating quite correctly that "η καθαρεύουσα αρχαΐζει μεν ως προς τους τύπους, νεωτερίζει δε ως προς την έκφρασιν" (quoted in "Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 1, reprinted in G. N. Hatzidakis, *Γλωσσολογικαί μελέται* (Athens 1901), Vol. 1, p. 279). The four parts of Hatzidakis's article were originally published in the journal *Αθηνά*: 2 (1890) 169-235; 5 (1893) 1-65; 7 (1895) 145-282; 8 (1896) 147-75.

[3] Whereas in reality the fundamental differences between *katharevousa* and the modern Greek dialects are phonological and morphological, Hatzidakis often confined his discussion to vocabulary: e.g. *La Question de la langue écrite néo-grecque* (Athens 1907), p. 119 (this work was originally published in German (*Die Sprachfrage in Griechenland*,

I don't think *katharevousa* could have survived as long as it did (i.e. until 1976) if it hadn't had such an eminent proponent as Hatzidakis. As the first – and in his time the only – Professor of Linguistics at Greece's sole institution of higher education, the University of Athens, Hatzidakis held a unique position of authority in linguistic matters.[4] Then, as now, teaching appointments at the university were made directly by the Ministry of Education. For this reason, the pronouncements of university professors could be interpreted, and even intended,[5] as representing the official views of the Greek state. But Hatzidakis didn't simply hold a powerful and prestigious office; he was also a first-rate linguist who was able to impose his views on the basis of a profound study of the medieval and modern phases of the Greek language.

Hatzidakis was one of the three great Greek scholars of the second half of the nineteenth century onwards who laid the foundations on which the modern Greek national identity has been constructed. First Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos, influenced by Vico and by various currents in German thought (which included Hamann and Herder), wrote the *History of the Greek Nation*, about which I shall say more later. Then Hatzidakis and his contemporary Nikolaos G. Politis (1852-1921) seemingly went on to share the task of transferring the ideas and method pioneered by Jacob Grimm to the Greek context, Hatzidakis following the scientific study of the historical development of language inaugurated by Grimm in his *Deutsche Grammatik* (1819-37), and Politis following Grimm's *Deutsche Mythologie* (1835) in studying what he claimed to be the survivals of ancient Greek mythology in modern Greek

---

Athens 1905) as another riposte to Karl Krumbacher: see notes 12 and 30 below).

[4] The University of Athens was often known at the time as "the national university".

[5] "Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 3 (1895) = *Γλωσσολ. μελέται* 1, p. 503.

folklore.[6] Hatzidakis placed the study of the historical development of Medieval and Modern Greek on a scientific basis; yet when it came to his polemical writings on the language question, which are the subject of this article, he often abandoned scientific method under the influence of ideological prejudice.

Hatzidakis was born in 1848 into a poor family in the tiny village of Myrthios near the south coast of western Crete, while the island was still part of the Ottoman Empire.[7] Between them, his father and grandfather had fought in four rebellions by the Christian population of the island against the Ottoman administration. Georgios Hatzidakis came late and, it seems, by accident, to learning. He attended primary school in Crete, where he also assisted his father, who was a miller, by transporting grain up to the mill, on donkeys and mules, from caiques moored in Plakias harbour; he also acted as καλονάρχης to his father, who was ψάλτης in the village church, and in this capacity the boy came into close contact with ecclesiastical Greek.[8] Hatzidakis's early life has many similarities with that of his contemporary Joseph Wright (1855-1930), the second holder of the Chair of Comparative Philology at Oxford (1901-1924). Wright too came from a very poor family; he worked as a "donkey-boy" at the age of six, became a "doffer" at a Yorkshire textile mill at the age of seven (changing bobbins on the spinning frame), never had any schooling, and

---

[6] It is no coincidence that N. G. Politis's first book was entitled *Νεοελληνική μυθολογία* (Athens 1871).

[7] Biographical details from Dikaios V. Vagiakakos, *Γεώργιος Ν. Χατζιδάκις (1848-1941). Βίος και έργον* (Athens: Academy of Athens 1977); and from R. M. Dawkins, "Myrthios to Sphakia" (unpublished travelogue), in f.Arch.Z.Dawk. 12 (12) in the Taylor Institution Library, Slavonic and Greek Section, University of Oxford.

[8] R. M. Dawkins, who paid two visits on Hatzidakis's 100-year-old father Nikolaos in Myrthios in 1916 and 1917, describes the καλονάρχης as "the boy who chants as a sort of prompter about half a phrase ahead of the singer, to the great confusion of the listeners".

taught himself to read and write at the age of 15.[9] Just as Wright produced the monumental *English dialect dictionary* (6 volumes, 1896-1905), so in 1908 Hatzidakis initiated the *Historical dictionary of the Modern Greek language* (compiled under the aegis of the Academy of Athens from 1927 onwards), which turned out to be predominantly a dialect dictionary too.[10]

Georgios Hatzidakis took part, alongside his father, in the long but ultimately unsuccessful Cretan revolt of 1866-8. It was towards the end of that revolt that he found himself by accident on board a ship bound for the Kingdom of Greece, where, aged 20, he enrolled in high school in Athens. He graduated from high school at the age of 24 in 1873 and took his first degree at the University of Athens. He then received a Greek state scholarship to study linguistics for four years in Germany, where he successively attended the universities of Leipzig, Jena and Berlin. In 1885 he was appointed to a position in Linguistics and Indian [i.e. Indo-European] Philology at the University of Athens, and in 1890 became "regular professor" in the same subjects. But even after this, during the last of the Cretan revolts in 1897, he returned to Crete as a revolutionary leader. He was totally committed to the cause of Greek nationalism, and his active participation in liberation struggles made it natural that, like his equally pugnacious and implacable opponent Yannis Psycharis, Hatzidakis should have wanted "glory and fisticuffs" (δόξα και γροθιές) in the scholarly arena as well as on the field of battle.[11]

---

[9] For this and other information about Wright I am indebted to Professor Anna Morpurgo Davies.

[10] The first volume was published in 1933; the most recent volume (Vol. 5), reaching the word δαχτυλωτός, appeared in 1989.

[11] "Ανδρειωθείς εις ηρωϊκόν περιβάλλον, μαχητής διά την ελευθερίαν κατά την νεότητά του ως επιστήμων, κατορθώνων να επιβάλληται έναντι πεισμόνων και πολλάκις φανατικών αντιπάλων του, Ελλήνων και ξένων, δι' ακαταμαχήτων όπλων" (Vagiakakos, op. cit., p. 106). The phrase "θέλω δόξα και γροθιές" is quoted from Psycharis, *Το ταξίδι μου* (Athens: Ermis 1971), p. 42 [1st ed. 1888].

Hatzidakis's arguments in favour of preserving the written language commonly known as *katharevousa* were firmly based on nationalist ideology. In brief, his chief arguments were (a) that the Greek written language in use in his time was the natural development of the written language used by the Greeks since Alexandrian times, and (b) that the written language was the only factor that united the Greeks in all the regions that they inhabited, both in the Kingdom of Greece and in the Ottoman Empire.[12] Basically, then, he implied that the most important link between individuals of the same nation is their sense of belonging to a common linguistic tradition, and he claimed that the written Greek language was a unifying force in both diachronic and synchronic terms.[13] Any attempt to impose a spoken version of Greek as the written language would, in his view, have two catastrophic effects for the Greek nation: it would cut the modern Greeks off diachronically from their past, and it would split the Greek nation synchronically into regional groups characterized by distinct spoken dialects. Cutting the modern Greeks off linguistically from their past would sever their connections not only with Classical antiquity, but with the Holy Scriptures that underpinned the Greek Orthodox Church, and it was precisely the Church that, in his view, had earlier united the Greek people during the long centuries of foreign occupation.[14] Nevertheless, whereas almost

---

[12] See, e.g., "Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", in: *Το πρόβλημα της νεωτέρας γραφομένης ελληνικής υπό Κ. Krumbacher και Απάντησις εις αυτόν υπό Γεωργίου Ν. Χατζιδάκι* (Athens 1905), p. 819. This article, which was published as an appendix to Hatzidakis's response to Krumbacher (pp. 774-843: see note 30 below), was written for the *Revue des études grecques* in early 1902 in the wake of the Gospel Riots in Athens 1901 (before Krumbacher gave his lecture), but proved too long to be published in full in that journal.

[13] "Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 3 (1895) = *Γλωσσολ. μελέται* 1, p. 466.

[14] In the Ottoman Empire the Patriarch of Constantinople was the religious leader of the *Millet-i Rum* (Orthodox Christian community). This has led Greek nationalist historians to claim that the Orthodox

all Greek Orthodox Christians during the Ottoman period were united in a single flock under the Patriarch of Constantinople, since the foundation of the Church of Greece in 1833 the Greek Orthodox Christians were divided into two separate flocks: the inhabitants of the Greek state were subject to the Church of Greece, while those of the Ottoman Empire (including, until 1913, Hadzidakis's native Crete) remained subject to the Patriarchate. This was why Hatzidakis saw the Greek language as the only factor uniting the Greeks of his time.

Before the mid-nineteenth century, Greek nationalists saw the middle ages as a dark period of their history. The rhetoric of the intellectual and political leaders of the Greek independence movement in 1821 implied that, at some unspecified time in the distant past, Greek culture had gone into hibernation, from which it was now reawakening. In the 1850s, however, partly perhaps under the influence of a growing rapprochement with Orthodox Russia and a disaffection with Protestant Britain and Catholic France, certain Greek intellectuals came to rehabilitate Byzantium and to see it as the missing link between ancient and modern Greece. In the monumental *History of the Greek Nation* by Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos (1860-74), which Paschalis Kitromilides has characterized as "the most important intellectual achievement of nineteenth-century Greece",[15] Greek history and culture came to be presented as unitary and uninterrupted "from Agamemnon to George I", as Hatzidakis aptly expressed it.[16] Paparrigopoulos argued that there had never been a break in historical and cultural continuity among the Greeks as there had been in the West, where the fall of Rome had made it necessary

---

Church kept alive the sense of Greek nationhood during the Ottoman period.

[15] Paschalis M. Kitromilides, "On the intellectual content of Greek nationalism: Paparrigopoulos, Byzantium and the Great Idea", in David Ricks and Paul Magdalino (eds.), *Byzantium and the Modern Greek Identity* (Aldershot: Ashgate 1998), p. 28.

[16] *Το πρόβλημα*, p. 699.

to create a Renaissance. The ideology of the continuity of Hellenic culture was especially desirable at a time when the geographical boundaries of the Greek state were so narrow that they excluded more than half of those people who could be classified as being ethnically and culturally Greek. Thus the idea of a diachronic unity both compensated for the lack of a synchronic unity and encouraged the desire and hope for the geographical unification of all the lands inhabited by Greeks, a unification analogous to those that were taking place at that time in Germany and Italy.[17]

---

[17] Hatzidakis appeared to contradict himself when he claimed that during the period of Frankish rule "we forgot we were Greeks", and that the oblivion of national unity and Orthodox Christianity went hand-in-hand with the use of local dialects in literature (*Το πρόβλημα*, p. 820); nevertheless, he may have believed that the Ottoman conquest of Greek lands from the Franks restored the authority and unity of the Orthodox Church, a view recently put forward by Molly Greene, *A shared world. Christians and Muslims in the Early Modern Mediterranean* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 2000). Hadzidakis claimed in 1890 that the literary works of the Frankokratia were incomprehensible to the rest of the Greeks because they were written in their local dialect ("Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 1 = *Γλωσσολ. μελέται* 1, pp. 250-1) – a view refuted by, among others, George Seferis, who wrote about his childhood memories of hearing the 17th-century Cretan verse romance *Erotokritos* being sung by fishermen near Smyrna. Hatzidakis presented contradictory attitudes to the Renaissance literature of his native Crete; earlier in his career, at least, he wrote that he would have been happy if the language of Cretan Renaissance literature had prevailed as the national literary language: G. N. Hatzidakis, *Γλωσσικών ατοπημάτων αναίρεσις* (Athens 1886), p. 78 (this volume consists of a collection of articles that Hatzidakis wrote as part of his long-running battle against Dimitrios Vernardakis, who was soon to be succeeded by Psycharis as Hatzidakis's *bête noire*). See also *Μελέτη επί της νέας ελληνικής ή Βάσανος του ελέγχου του Ψευδαττικισμού* (Athens 1884), p. 82, where he states that the fall of Crete to the Turks was a tragedy for the Greek language, since the Cretans were developing a demotic suitable for their contemporary cultural needs: "Τω 1453 επεσφραγίσθη η πολιτική, τω δε 1669 η γλωσσική ως ειπείν δουλεία του έθνους."

Hatzidakis's view of the Greek language could be seen as the linguistic counterpart of Paparrigopoulos's historical view.[18] Whereas earlier scholars, such as Korais, had simply compared Modern with Ancient Greek, Hatzidakis studied Medieval Greek as the missing link between the two. Concentrating on the history of Greek language and culture since Classical antiquity, Hatzidakis argued that there had never been a Dark Age in Greek medieval history, since the Greeks had never ceased to look to the ancient Greek language as the model and benchmark for their own written expression. The West abandoned Latin after the Dark Ages, when each nation was emerging from a period of barbarism and ignorance during which, on the level of oral expression, Latin had split into the various distinct Romance languages; each nation then set about cultivating, enriching and standardizing its own spoken language in order to produce a variety suitable for written purposes. Hatzidakis argued that Greek had never split into distinct spoken languages in this way, that Ancient Greek, as I said, always continued to be the ultimate model for writing, and that, through their constant exposure to the language of the church, even uneducated people could understand the written language without difficulty.[19] (Here we recall Hatzidakis's childhood experiences as assistant cantor in his village church.)

Hatzidakis's fondness for making comparisons between the Greek situation and that of western nations sometimes led him to make contradictory statements. He wrote that, when he was a student in Germany, people used to tell him: "Sie sprechen wie ein Buch".[20] He saw this as an indication that in every civilized nation one variety of the language is used by the

---

[18] Simos Menardos said as much at the event held at the Academy of Athens in 1929 to mark Hatzidakis's 80th birthday: "Ο Γεώργιος Χατζιδάκις είναι κάτι περισσότερον ή Κωνσταντίνος Παπαρρηγόπουλος της γλώσσης" (quoted by Vagiakakos, op. cit., p. 128).

[19] "Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 1 (1890) = *Γλωσσολ. μελέται* 1, p. 249.

[20] "Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 3 (1895) = *Γλωσσολ. μελέται* 1, p. 489.

uneducated in their speech, and another is used for writing (according to this view, educated speech consists of a mixture of features from both varieties). Indeed, Hatzidakis argued that the possession of a *single* language variety (what he called "το μονόγλωσσον") was the "unenviable privilege" of barbarian peoples or newly emerging nations.[21] (By a single language variety he meant spoken language only[22] – what might be called monoglossia as opposed to diglossia.) On the other hand, he sometimes claimed that the linguistic situation in Greece was unique, indeed, that the modern Greeks were superior to the French, the English and the Germans precisely because they possessed two different forms of their language.[23]

While Hatzidakis contributed more than any other linguist to the study of the historical development of spoken Greek in medieval and modern times, he was equally contradictory when it came to his approach to the question whether or not there was a common spoken language in his day. He often argued that there was no common spoken Greek,[24] and that the spoken language was split into dialects. Furthermore, he argued that in cultures and periods where a common spoken language has appeared, it evolved not by amalgamating the common features of two or more dialects, but as a result of the dominance of a single dialect which, through its cultivation in classic works of literature, eventually supplanted the other dialects.[25] If a body of great literature had been produced after the ancient period in any Greek dialect and had imposed itself on the whole nation, then that dialect might have become the national written language, and the Greeks might have achieved what he once called "the desired linguistic unity" (a contradiction with his

---

[21] *Το πρόβλημα*, p. 809.

[22] "Περί του σκοπού και της μεθόδου της περί την Μέσην και Νέαν Ελληνικήν ερεύνης", *Μεσαιωνικά και Νέα Ελληνικά*, Vol. 1 (Athens 1905), p. 362 (article first published 1892).

[23] *Το πρόβλημα*, p. 829.

[24] Ibid., p. 792.

[25] "Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 3 (1895) = *Γλωσσολ. μελέται* 1, p. 501.

denigration of "το μονόγλωσσον").[26] But, Hatzidakis argued, this had not happened. Up to his time, the single body of literature that had imposed itself on the whole of the Greek nation was the literature of antiquity.[27]

In the very early years of his career, Hatzidakis was a linguistic conservative; at that stage, he needed to do no more than encourage the preservation of the diglossic status quo. From the late 1880s, however, he became a linguistic reactionary, for it was then that concerted efforts began to be made to oust *katharevousa* and replace it in written use by a version of the spoken language (commonly known as demotic).[28] There were three chief periods during which Hatzidakis devoted himself to attempting to demolish the arguments of the so-called demoticists. The first of these, which lasted from 1887 to 1896, centred around the extreme demoticist theory and practice of the Paris-based linguist Yannis Psycharis. The second came in 1902-1908, in the wake of the political crises brought on by riots in the streets of Athens, which were provoked by the publication of a trans-

---

[26] "Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 2 (1893) = *Γλωσσολ. μελέται* 1, pp. 358-9; cf. "Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 3 (1895) = *Γλωσσολ. μελέται* 1, pp. 453-4. Contrary to Hatzidakis, Achillefs Tzartzanos maintained that "η κοινή ομιλουμένη νέα Ελληνική, η γλώσσα των Αθηνών" derives partly from "μια ανάμειξι των ιδιωμάτων των διαφόρων Ελλήνων", but chiefly from "τη λόγια παράδοσι, ήτοι απ' τη γλώσσα των σχολείων εν γένει, απ' τη γλώσσα της εκκλησίας, του τύπου, της διοικήσεως κλπ." (A. Tzartzanos, *Το γλωσσικό μας πρόβλημα. Πώς εμφανίζεται τώρα και ποια είναι η ορθή λύσις του* (Athens: Kollaros 1934), pp. 22-3). Anna Frangoudaki (*Η γλώσσα και το έθνος 1880-1980. Εκατό χρόνια αγώνες για την αυθεντική ελληνική γλώσσα* (Athens: Alexandreia 2002), p. 70), quoting selectively from the same pages, omits Tzartzanos's reference to "the learned tradition".

[27] In fact, Hatzidakis displayed very little interest in literature – a poor qualification for a linguist, in my view!

[28] Manolis Triantafyllidis wrote of Hatzidakis that "η θέση του πάντα ρυθμίζονταν από τον αντίπαλο": see M. Triantafyllidis, *Από τη γλωσσική μας ιστορία. Βερναρδάκης – Κόντος – Χατζιδάκις* (Athens: Sergiadis 1935), p. 29; article reprinted from *Τα Νέα Γράμματα* 1 (1935).

lation of the Gospels into demotic and the performance of ancient Greek tragedies in a mixture of *katharevousa* and demotic.[29] These events had brought Greece and the Greek language controversy to the attention of the world media. Hatzidakis's major intervention this time was sparked off by a lecture in which Karl Krumbacher, Professor of Byzantine Literature at the University of Munich, ridiculed the Greeks for their use of *katharevousa* and encouraged the use of demotic for written purposes.[30] The third phase was Hatzidakis's reaction to the Liberal government's educational reforms of 1917, which introduced demotic as the sole language of textbooks and instruction in the first four grades of primary school. In what follows, I will concentrate on the first of these three phases, then add a few observations on the last phase.

Hatzidakis consistently argued that spoken Modern Greek could not be used for written purposes until it had been adequately studied, and that *katharevousa* could not be abandoned unless and until a rival variety of written Greek had imposed itself by means of a respected body of literary texts. Psycharis broke out of the vicious circle implied in Hatzidakis's views by presenting his argument for demotic in the form of a large-scale literary work written in the version of the language that he was promoting. It was easy to find arguments against the language of Psycharis's demoticist manifesto *Το ταξίδι μου* (1888). It is clear that Psycharis, who had never lived in

---

[29] For details of the Gospel Riots see Philip Carabott, "Politics, Orthodoxy and the Language Question in Greece: the Gospel Riots of November 1901", *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 3.1 (1993) 117-38. The actual linguistic form taken by Georgios Sotiriadis's translation of the *Oresteia* is uncertain. No modern scholar appears to have seen the text, which has never been published. If the text still exists in manuscript form, it should definitely be reassessed.

[30] Krumbacher delivered his lecture on 15 November 1902 and published it as *Das Problem der neugriechichen Schriftsprache* (Munich 1903). The volume that Hatzidakis published in response (see note 12 above) consists of miscellaneous material, including his Greek translation of Krumbacher's book (pp. 2-182) and his own riposte (pp. 301-773).

Greece, had distilled his version of "pure" demotic in a linguistic laboratory, and the German-orientated Hatzidakis was able to argue that Psycharis's language was just another Paris fashion.[31] There is no doubt that it was an artificial language, based as it was on Psycharis's scholarly study of the development of Greek phonology and morphology in medieval and modern times. Psycharis, who had studied under French linguists such as Michel Bréal, Arsène Darmesteter, Louis Havet and Gaston Paris,[32] detected systematic trends in the historical development of the Greek spoken language, and he realized correctly that underlying the superficially divergent modern Greek dialects there was a uniform phonological system.[33] The language in which he wrote his book was based on the common phonological and morphological features of the modern dialects and was purged as far as possible of all ancient features that

---

[31] *La Question*, p. 92. As is to be expected from the fact that Hatzidakis was spurred into action by the writings of a foreign scholar, namely Krumbacher, the arguments he put forward during his second period were often aimed at an international audience.

[32] Irene Philippaki-Warburton, "Ο Ψυχάρης ως γλωσσολόγος", *Μανταtοφόρος* 28 (December 1988) 34-9. It is not without political significance that Psycharis was orientated towards France (and that the demoticists tended later to align themselves with Venizelos), while Hatzidakis was orientated towards Germany. In 1914, Hatzidakis became one of the founders of the Ελληνογερμανικός Σύνδεσμος (Vagiakakos, op. cit., pp. 11, 14), a fact that places him firmly in the pro-Constantine camp. His connections with the Greek royal family date back to at least 1901, when he dedicated one of his books to Prince George, then governor of Crete. Nevertheless, it was during Venizelos's premiership in 1914 that a Royal Decree set up the *Historical dictionary* as a "public service", and, at least after 1922, Hatzidakis was on good terms with his fellow-Cretan Venizelos, as is shown by their amicable correspondence (see Vagiakakos, op. cit., 94-8) and by the fact that Venizelos himself addressed the special meeting of the Academy of Athens convened in 1929 to honour Hatzidakis on his 80th birthday (cf. note 18 above).

[33] The first systematic study that made clear the phonological rules underlying the Modern Greek dialects was Brian Newton's *The generative interpretation of dialect. A study of Modern Greek phonology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1972). This "Newtonian" study remains the greatest contribution to the understanding of the Modern Greek dialects ever published.

were not to be found in the dialects. Ironically, however, while those commentators who are sympathetic to demotic have traditionally branded Hatzidakis and his allies as "purists", Psycharis, with his aversion to linguistic compromise, was actually more of a purist than Hatzidakis.

Hatzidakis characteristically accused Psycharis not only of denying his fatherland,[34] but of spreading heresy,[35] the implication being that *katharevousa* was the linguistic orthodoxy. Hatzidakis's chief arguments against Psycharis's version of demotic, apart from the charge that it had never been spoken in any Greek *demos*, was that the language question was not primarily a linguistic matter but a cultural and historical one. Hatzidakis argued that Psycharis's linguistic views were based on the erroneous belief that language is a natural phenomenon and that therefore its study is a natural science.[36] Psycharis seemed to believe that phonetic laws, like the laws of physics, do not admit exceptions. Against this, Hatzidakis (quoting authorities such as William Dwight Whitney, Hermann Paul, Berthold Delbrück, Karl Brugmann[37] and others) argued that a nation's language is formed by that nation's historical experiences, and that therefore the study of language is a historical and social science. In this respect Hatzidakis's views accord with modern linguistics; paradoxically for a linguistic conservative or reactionary, his ideas on language were in this sense more modern than those of Psycharis.

According to Hatzidakis, the Greek written language had developed over the millennia and was inherited by the modern

---

[34] "Αρνησίπατρις": *Το πρόβλημα*, p. 822.

[35] *La Question*, pp. 46-7.

[36] E.g. "Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 1 (1890) = *Γλωσσολ. μελέται* 1, pp. 236-7. Another factor that caused Hatzidakis to argue that linguistics was a human rather than a natural science was the presence of the "ψυχικόν στοιχείον" and "ψυχικός παράγων" ("Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 3 (1895) = *Γλωσσολ. μελέται* 1, pp. 388, 415).

[37] Joseph Wright also worked with Brugmann in Leipzig from 1885 to 1887.

Greeks when they set up their independent nation state in the 1820s. The mixture of ancient and modern features that came to be known as *katharevousa* was a "historical necessity", since the fathers of the independent Greek state could not do otherwise than adopt the already available written language that had been handed down to them over the generations and adapt it to suit the requirements of modern civilization; Hatzidakis argued that one cannot go against "the commands of history",[38] and admitted that one had to live with the situation one had inherited: "We are all slaves to habit!"[39] (this could be called the "argument from inertia"). Furthermore, he wrote, the Greeks had awoken from the torpor of servitude by fixing their gaze on their glorious ancient past, which enabled them to orientate themselves as if it were the pole star.[40] Ancient Greek language and literature, he argued, had been and continued to be the later Greeks' sole source of enlightenment. He claimed that modern written Greek had the additional advantage that it was comprehensible to those non-Greeks who had learned the basics of the ancient language, and he once wrote the following:

> We have easily developed a language that is widely known and useful for culture, [whereas] the Academicians of St Petersburg published the great Indian [i.e. Sanskrit] lexicon in German and compose most of their work in German or French or Latin, because if they were published in Russian, very few people would read them and Russian scholarship would make an insignificant contribution to culture.[41]

---

[38] "Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 1 (1890) = *Γλωσσολ. μελέται* 1, p. 293; cf. ibid. pp. 455, 470. Krumbacher, *Το πρόβλημα*, pp. 96-8, accused Hatzidakis of presenting his explanation of Greek diglossia as a justification for it.

[39] "Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 1 (1890) = *Γλωσσολ. μελέται* 1, pp. 301-3.

[40] *Το πρόβλημα*, p. 819; also "Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 1 (1890) = *Γλωσσολ. μελέται* 1, p. 260.

[41] "Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 1 (1890) = *Γλωσσολ. μελέται* 1, p. 283. In this quotation he is referring to O. Böhtlingk and R. Roth, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. Hrsg. von der Kaiser-

As far as vocabulary was concerned, Hatzidakis argued that if one used Ancient Greek words, the reader could ascertain their meanings by looking them up in a dictionary, whereas spoken words were semantically fluid.[42] For him, the form and meaning of a word were defined and dictated not as a result of negotiation among speakers within the contemporary community, but by its etymology and its semantic history, that is, by the external authority of textual tradition. As for the foreign words used in spoken Greek, Hatzidakis argued that they are "like wedges driven into the body of the language, and they remind us [the Greeks] of the miserable days of our homeland".[43]

In 1917 Venizelos's Liberal government introduced educational reforms that included the imposition of demotic as the sole language of instruction and study in the first four grades of primary school. Hatzidakis, who by this time was nearing the age of seventy, failed to notice the considerable differences between the "demotic" of the 1917 reformists and that of Psycharis, including their significant concessions to *katharevousa* and the greatly reduced distance between their language and ordinary Athenian speech.

In his attacks on these reforms, Hatzidakis contradicted what he had written elsewhere by acknowledging that there was indeed a "common spoken language" and that this was close to the written language.[44] He alleged, with some reason, that this "common spoken language" was different from the so-called

---

lichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 7 vols., St Petersburg 1852-1875. (I am grateful to Professor Yuri Kleiner for this reference.) Hatzidakis's point is rather weakened by the fact the authors of the Sanskrit dictionary were obviously both of German origin.

[42] *Μελέτη*, p. 87. I am grateful to Dr Io Manolessou for having traced this reference, which I had mislaid.

[43] *Το πρόβλημα*, p. 778; see also "Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 2 (1893) = *Γλωσσολ. μελέται* 1, p. 359.

[44] E.g. "Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 2 (1893) = *Γλωσσολ. μελέται* 1, p. 346 (contrast with Germany, where there is no common spoken language); "Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 3 (1895) = *Γλωσσολ. μελέται* 1, p. 508n.

"demotic" of the new schoolbooks, which was based on the rural language of the Greek folksongs,[45] a language that was more or less unaffected by the learned written tradition but had little relevance to modern culture. He argued that there was no unified demotic language,[46] no "homogeneous popular spoken language".[47] On the contrary, he favoured the urban language spoken in polite society – what he called "the language of the *salons*"[48] (it is interesting that this erstwhile villager had become the spokesman of an urban elite); this "langue des salons" was not the continuation of the popular "μητροδίδακτος παράδοσις" ("mother-taught tradition") but rather a mixture of this tradition with the learned tradition of the Church, the school, the press, the administration and books; he characterized this learned written tradition as "πατροπαράδοτος" ("handed down by the father").[49] Here we observe a

---

[45] *Γεννηθήτω φως. Ο μαλλιαρισμός εις τα δημοτικά σχολεία* (Athens 1920), p. 4; cf. "Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 2 (1893) = *Γλωσσολ. μελέται* 1, pp. 347-8, where he claims that the urban spoken language is not the language of the folk songs but a mixture of *katharevousa* and demotic features.

[46] *Γεννηθήτω φως*, p. 32.

[47] *Γλωσσολογικαί έρευναι*, Vol. 2 (Athens 1977), p. 363. This particular article first appeared as a slim volume entitled *Διατί είμαι μεν δημοτικιστής αλλά δεν γράφω την δημοτικήν* (Thessaloniki 1926). This interesting late contribution by Hatzidakis to the language controversy was written immediately after the inauguration of the University of Thessaloniki, where he was elected as the first Rector and Professor of Linguistics, but where some of his fellow-academics used and promoted the demotic in their teaching and writing; these included Manolis Triantafyllidis, also appointed as a professor of Linguistics, who had been one of the superintendents of primary education in the Ministry of Education who had planned and implemented the education reforms of 1917.

[48] "Η γλώσσα των αιθουσών" ("Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 2 (1893) = *Γλωσσολ. μελέται* 1, p. 346), "η γλώσσα των συναναστροφών" (e.g. "Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 4 (1896) = *Γλωσσολ. μελέται* 1, pp. 510-11; *Το πρόβλημα*, p. 808).

[49] *Γεννηθήτω φως*, pp. 4, 10; for mixture see also "Περί του γλωσσικού ζητήματος εν Ελλάδι", Part 1 (1890) = *Γλωσσολ. μελέται* 1, pp. 282-3, 285, 290, 293.

very telling, though perhaps not altogether conscious, distinction between the "maternal" popular language and the "paternal" learned one, with each individual Greek learning his/her language from both sides. We can infer from this distinction that in Hatzidakis's patriarchal and essentialist view the "maternal" language is appropriate for expressing emotions and simple everyday concepts, while the "paternal" language is suitable for the expression of sophisticated abstract concepts. Hatzidakis denounced so-called educational demoticism as what we today would call social engineering. His arguments were given greater weight by the fact that the Venizelos government that introduced the 1917 reforms was of doubtful constitutional legality, and Hatzidakis alleged that the superintendents of primary education had imposed their reforms by "autocratic" and "terrorist" means.[50] Furthermore, the outbreak of the Bolshevik revolution in the year that the Greek linguistic reforms were introduced enabled him to allege that the community formed by the fictional schoolchildren of the novel *Τα ψηλά βουνά* by Zacharias Papantoniou, which constituted one of the school readers, was a "soviet".[51] It is not surprising that the linguistic reforms in education were overturned when the Liberal Party lost the 1920 general elections.

Greek is an important case for sociolinguistics, because those of us who are more than forty years old have been able to observe, in our own lifetime, the change from a diglossic to a monoglossic situation. Despite the fact that with hindsight Hatzidakis appears now to have been fighting a losing battle, in three important respects his views have been borne out. In so far as there has been a victory of demotic, this has come about

---

[50] By using the term *τρομοκρατία* ("terrorism": *Γεννηθήτω φως*, p. 56), Hatzidakis was perhaps intending his readers to think not only of the Bolsheviks but of the Bulgarian *komitadjis* who, during the Macedonian Struggle of 1904-8, had "terrorized" the Orthodox Christian population of Ottoman Macedonia in an attempt to force them into declaring themselves Bulgarians, with the intended result that this territory would eventually be annexed by Bulgaria rather than Greece.

[51] *Γεννηθήτω φως*, p. 51.

chiefly through the combined effort of four groups of people: literary writers, grammarians, educational demoticists (who included child psychologists) and politicians. Greeks have become accustomed to written demotic (a) through literature, especially since the 1880s; (b) through the use of demotic as the object of language study and the medium of instruction in the first grades of primary school since 1917; and (c) through the grammar of Triandafyllidis (1941). Subsequently, the over-use (and indeed misuse) of *katharevousa* by the Colonels' dictatorship of 1967-74 led to a popular revulsion against it, and when the Colonels fell the Greek nation almost unanimously rejected it. But much of the credit for the abolition of *katharevousa* is due to literary writers, particularly those of the so-called Generation of 1930 such as the Nobel-prize-winning poets Seferis and Elytis, who indeed produced a respected body of literature in demotic that has "imposed itself on the whole nation". Secondly, Hatzidakis promoted the gradual progress of the spoken language towards the written, and indeed the actual language written and spoken by educated Greeks today is not the pure version promoted by the demoticists, but consists of a mixture of popular and learned lexical and grammatical features. Lastly, Hatzidakis's belief that Ancient and Modern Greek are essentially the same language – and that to view Ancient and Modern Greek as two distinct languages is tantamount to claiming that the ancient and modern Greeks are distinct peoples – is still passionately held by many Greeks today.

The year 2003-4 at Cambridge

Students

Natalia Marisova was awarded a first class in Modern Greek in Part IA of the Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos. Tim Coomar and Gwen Edwards spend the third year of their course in Greece, studying at the Universities of Thessaloniki and Crete respectively.

Five students were successful in the examinations for the Certificate in Modern Greek; two of them, Sophia Domokos and Alexander Ioannidis, passed with Credit. Georgia Ladbury achieved a Distinction in the examinations for the Diploma in Modern Greek.

Tassos Kaplanis submitted his dissertation in July 2003 and was approved for the degree of PhD in October. His dissertation is entitled: "Ioakeim Kyprios' *Struggle* (mid-17th century): A study of the text with an edition of selected passages". Dr Kaplanis, who was the first holder of the A. G. Leventis Foundation Studentship at Cambridge, has since been appointed to a Lectureship at the University of Cyprus.

Teaching staff

Dr Dimitris Karadimas continued to teach Greek language courses, as Language Assistant seconded by the Greek Ministry of Education. Dr Tina Lendari, Temporary Lecturer, taught courses in Greek language and literature during the Michaelmas Term, while Dr Holton was on leave of absence. A course on modern Greek history was taught by Mr Kostas Skordyles, of the Universities of Surrey and Westminster.

Visiting speakers

Eight lectures were given during the year. The programme was as follows:

16 October. Professor Peter Mackridge (St Cross College, Oxford): *"Sie sprechen wie ein Buch": G. N. Hatzidakis and the defence of Greek diglossia*

20 November. Dr Alexandra Georgakopoulou (King's College London): *Reflections on language-centred approaches to Modern Greek "society" and "culture(s)"*

22 January. Professor Arnold van Gemert (University of Amsterdam): *Cretan literature, culture and fine arts, c. 1400*

5 February. Professor Kevin Featherstone (LSE): *The Simitis project and the politics of structural reform*

26 February. Dr Catia Galatariotou: *Reflections on the psychological implications of recent historical events in Cyprus*

4 March. Dr Sarah Ekdawi: *Translating the living and the dead: my recent experiments with modern Greek poetry*

29 April. Sir Michael Llewellyn Smith: *Olympics in Athens, 1896: the invention of the modern Olympic Games*

6 May. Professor Roderick Beaton (King's College London): Erotokritos *and the history of the novel*

Graduate Seminar

The Graduate Seminar held five meetings in the course of the year. Papers were given by three invited speakers: Professor Karin Boklund-Lagopoulou (University of Thessaloniki), the author Mrs Veatriki Saias-Magrizou, and Ms Elina Tsalicoglou (Wolfson College, Oxford). Other papers were given by Aleida Paudice and Marina Rodosthenous.

Research project: A grammar of Medieval Greek

The University of Cambridge has been awarded a major research grant by the Arts and Humanities Research Board, for the compilation of a grammar of Medieval Greek. The project is under the direction of Dr David Holton and Professor Geoffrey Horrocks (Faculty of Classics). Other members of the project team will be Dr Io Manolessou (University of Patras), who will act as a consultant, and two Research Associates. The grant covers a period of five years beginning in October 2004.

The project will be based in the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages. The aim of the research programme is to produce a substantial reference work, which will be the first ever systematic and comprehensive description of medieval vernacular Greek, covering the period from 1100 to 1700.

Activities of members of the Modern Greek Section

Dr David Holton resumed the headship of the Department of Other Languages in January 2004. During the year he gave lectures to the Cambridge University Hellenic Society, and at the Universities of Lund and Copenhagen. He attended the International Conference on Greek Linguistics at Rethymno in September 2003, and presented a paper at an international conference on the poetics of *Erotokritos*, also at Rethymno, in November 2003. He was invited to deliver the seventh annual lecture in memory of Nikolaos M. Panagiotakis. The subject of his lecture, given in Greek at Heraklion in June 2004, was "The phenomenon of the Cretan Renaissance". He also spoke at the launch in Nicosia of a book on the *Chronicle* of Machairas, at the invitation of the University of Cyprus. He has published:

"Antonis Samarakis" [obituary], *The Guardian* (16 August 2003)

"Κρυμμένα [πράγματα] σε μερικούς καβαφικούς τίτλους", in: D. Theophanopoulou-Kontou et al. (eds.), *Σύγχρονες τάσεις στην ελληνική γλωσσολογία* (Athens: Patakis 2003), pp. 60-76

(With Peter Mackridge and Irene Philippaki-Warburton) *Greek: an essential grammar of the modern language* (London: Routledge 2004)

Dr Dimitris Karadimas participated in an international conference, organised by the Foundation of Culture and Education "Andreas Lentakis" at the European Cultural Centre of Delphi, on *Eros in Ancient Greece*, 19-21 September 2003. He gave a paper under the title: "Έρωτας και ρητορική: Μια ανάγνωση του Εγκωμίου της Ελένης". He has published two works on subjects related to classical rhetoric:

Tatian's Oratio ad Graecos: Rhetoric and philosophy/theology [Scripta minora Regiae societatis humaniorum litterarum Lundensis] (Lund 2003)

"Ναυσιφάνης και Επίκουρος: οι περί ρητορικής απόψεις τους", *Αρχαιογνωσία* 12 (2004) 111-39

Dr Tina Lendari gave a paper on the myth of Narcissus in the Byzantine vernacular romances, at King's College London. In November 2003 she participated in the international conference on the poetics of *Erotokritos* in Rethymno, with a paper entitled "Ο λόγος της επιθυμίας και η απουσία του: ο *Ερωτόκριτος* και οι μεσαιωνικές δημώδεις μυθιστορίες". She has a number of papers in press on various topics relating to late-Byzantine and early modern Greek romance.

About the contributors

Roderick Beaton is Koraes Professor of Modern Greek and Byzantine History, Language and Literature at King's College London. He graduated from Cambridge (Peterhouse) in English Literature, where he also took his doctorate in Modern Greek, under S. J. Papastavrou. His first book, *Folk poetry of modern Greece*, was reissued earlier this year by Cambridge University Press. He has also published *The Medieval Greek Romance* (1989; 2nd ed. 1996), and most recently *George Seferis: Waiting for the Angel. A biography* (Yale University Press 2003, and in Greek: Athens: Okeanida 2003).

Kevin Featherstone is Eleftherios Venizelos Professor of Contemporary Greek Studies and Director of the Hellenic Observatory at the London School of Economics and Political Science. He was previously Professor of European Politics at the University of Bradford and has taught in Minnesota and New York. His recent publications include: *Europeanization and the Southern Periphery* (co-edited with G. A. Kazamias) (London: Frank Cass 2001); *The politics of Europeanization* (co-edited with C. M. Radaelli) (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2003); and a series of journal articles on Greece and the EMU. His current work focuses on Greece and structural economic reform, covering pensions, labour markets and privatisation.

Alexandra Georgakopoulou is Reader in Modern Greek Language and Linguistics in the Department of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, King's College London. Her research areas are discourse/narrative analysis and sociolinguistics, with special reference to Modern Greek. She has published widely on the interactional and socio-cultural roles of narratives in conversational contexts in contemporary Greece. She has co-edited (with Jannis Androutsopoulos) a volume on *Discourse constructions of youth identities* (Amsterdam: Benjamins 2003)

and the second edition of her co-authored book (with Dionysis Goutsos) *Discourse analysis: An introduction* (Edinburgh 1997) has just appeared. She is currently involved in a collaborative ESRC-funded project entitled "Interaction, ethnicity and popular culture in contemporary urban classrooms".

Peter Mackridge is Professor Emeritus of Modern Greek at the University of Oxford and a Fellow of St Cross College. He is the author of *The Modern Greek language* (1985) and *Dionysios Solomos* (1989), the co-author of a comprehensive grammar of Modern Greek (1997) and an essential grammar of the same language (2004) and the editor of *Dionysios Solomos, The Free Besieged and other poems* (2000). He has co-edited a book on the development of Greek Macedonian cultural identity (1997) and *Contemporary Greek fiction in a United Europe: From local history to the global individual* (2004). He has also published a large number of articles on medieval and modern Greek language and literature.