

JOURNAL

of the

HELLENIC DIASPORA

VOL. 22.1 (1996)

GENERAL ISSUE

ESSAYS

(RE)THINKING THE ETHNIC BODY:
PERFORMING "GREEKNESS" IN CANADA

by CATERINA PIZANIAS

DEMETRIOS CAPETANAKIS:
A GREEK POET IN ENGLAND

by DAVID RICKS

APPROACHES TO NATIONALISM:
BASIC THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS
IN THE STUDY OF THE GREEK-CYPRIOT
CASE AND A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

by CAESAR MAVRATSAS

NOTES

ODYSSEUS ELYTIS AND THE THIRTIES GENERATION
IN MODERN GREEK POETRY

by KOSTAS MYRSIADES

BOOK REVIEWS

PELLA

\$12.00

ATLANTA JOURNAL *of the* **HELLENIC DIASPORA**

Editorial Office:

WEST CHESTER UNIV, WEST CHESTER, PA 19383

Tel.: 610 - 436-2901

Fax: 610 - 436-3150

www home page: <http://www.okstate.edu/artsci/philosophy/jhd.htm>

email: akitroef@haverford.edu kmyrsiades@wcupa.edu

Publisher

LEANDROS PAPATHANASIOU

Editors

ALEXANDER KITROEFF

New York University

KOSTAS MYRSIADES

West Chester University

Associate Editors

LAURIE HART

Haverford College

KYRIAKOS KONTOPOULOS

Temple University

Managing Editor

STEVE DANDOLOS

West Chester University

Associate Book Review Editors

GEORGE PILITSIS

Hellenic College

MICHAEL R. RHODES

Oklahoma State University

National / International Advisory Board

MARGARET ALEXIOU

Harvard University

LOUKAS AXELOS

Stochastis Publishers

STEVEN BOWMAN

University of Cincinnati

STAVROS DELIGIORGIS

The University of Iowa

MARIOS EVRIVADIS

University of Athens, Greece

ROBERT FAGLES

Princeton University

HAGEN FLEISCHER

University of Athens, Greece

ELENA FRANGAKIS-SYRETT

Queens College, CUNY

ANDRE GEROLYMATOS

Dawson College, Montreal, Canada

YIORGOS D. KALOYERAS

University of Thessaloniki, Greece

ANGELIKI LAIOU

Dumbarton Oaks

DIMITRI MONOS

University of Athens, Greece

KOSTIS MOSKOFF

Foundation for Hellenic Culture,
Alexandria, Egypt

NICOS MOUZELIS

London School of Econ., England

ALEXANDER NEHAMAS

Princeton University

PETER PAPPAS

Foundation for Hellenic Culture,
New York

JAMES PETRAS

SUNY at Binghamton

JOHN ANTHONY PETROPULOS

Amherst College

ADAMANTIA POLLIS

New School for Social Research

WILLIAM V. SPANOS

SUNY at Binghamton

STAVROS B. THOMADAKIS

University of Athens, Greece

CONSTANTINOS TSOUCALAS

University of Athens, Greece

SPEROS VRYONIS, JR.

Vryonis Center

EDITORIAL POLICY

The *JOURNAL OF THE HELLENIC DIASPORA*, a semiannual review, views the modern Greek experience in a global context in terms of its Balkan, Mediterranean and diasporic dimensions. The *JHD* maintains a vision of the Greek world as a paradigm for new conceptualizations of Western identity and society, standing as it does on the margins of eastern and western Europe and at the boundary of western and oriental constructs. The *JHD* takes a transdisciplinary perspective that examines the modern Greek experience from the point of view of anthropology, history, literature and literary criticism, philosophy and the social sciences.

The *JHD* welcomes widely ranging approaches that embrace a variety of methodologies and rhetorical perspectives. It accepts articles, review essays, and notes keyed to the Greek experience from the late eighteenth century to the present. The *JHD* carries reviews of books that deal with modern Greece, the Greek diaspora and the Balkan and Mediterranean worlds.

MANUSCRIPT INFORMATION

All submissions must be in triplicate, should use parenthetical or internal citations and a works cited page following the conventions of the *MLA Handbook*, 3rd ed. Articles should include a separate sheet with the author's name that should not appear elsewhere on the ms. Quotations and citations should appear in their original language. We cannot be responsible for returning manuscripts if the sender has not included a stamped self-addressed envelope. The Editors welcome proposals from persons wishing to guest-edit special issues. Authors wishing to submit non-solicited book reviews should contact the editors. Address all correspondence to the Editors, West Chester University, West Chester, PA 19383. Phone: 610 - 436-2901; Fax: 610 - 436-3150; e-mail: kmyrsiades@wcupa.edu or akitroef@haverford.edu

Articles in the *JHD* are abstracted and/or indexed in *Historical Abstracts*, *America: History and Life*, *Sociological Abstracts*, *Psychological Abstracts*, *Modern Language Association Abstracts*, *Language Bibliography*, *International Political Abstracts*, and *American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies*.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND ADVERTISING

The *JHD* is published semiannually in March and September. Annual subscription rates: Individual: \$20 (domestic); \$25 (foreign). Institutional \$30 (domestic); \$35 (foreign). Back issues: single \$10, double \$15 (each). Advertising rates can be had on request by writing to Pella Publishing Company, Inc., 337 West 36th Street, New York, NY 10018-6401. Tel.: 212 - 279-9586. Fax: 212 - 594-3602.

Published by

PELLA PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC.

337 West 36th Street

New York, NY 10018-6401

Copyright © 1996 by Pella Publishing Company, Inc.

ISSN 0364-2976

CONTENTS

ESSAYS

CATERINA PIZANIAS

- (Re)thinking the Ethnic Body:
Performing "Greekness" in Canada* 7

DAVID RICKS

- Demetrios Capetanakis:
A Greek Poet in England* 61

CAESAR MAVRATSAS

- Approaches to Nationalism:
Basic Theoretical Considerations in the Study of
the Greek-Cypriot Case and a Historical Overview* 77

NOTES

KOSTAS MYRSIADES

- Odysseus Elytis and the Thirties Generation
in Modern Greek Poetry* 105

BOOK REVIEWS

LOUISE BRUIT ZAIDMAN AND PAULINE SCHMITT PANDEL

- Religion in the Ancient Greek City*
(Angelos Chaniotis) 125

R. B. RUTHERFORD

- The Art of Plato: Ten Essays
in Platonic Interpretation*
(Anthony M. Valentine) 130

ARTEMIS LEONTIS

- Topographies of Hellenism: Mapping the Homeland*
(Olga Augustinos) 135

DAVID H. CLOSE <i>The Origins of the Greek Civil War</i> (David C. Van Meter)	138
THANOS VEREMIS <i>Greece's Balkan Entanglement</i> (Gerasimos Augustinos)	144
I. K. HASIOTIS Ἐπισκόπηση τῆς Ἱστορίας τῆς Νεοελληνικῆς Διασπορᾶς [Survey of the History of the Modern Greek Diaspora] (Alexander Kitroeff)	147
DIMITRI C. CONSTAS AND ATHANASIOS G. PLATIAS (eds). <i>Diasporas in World Politics: The Greeks</i> <i>in Comparative Perspective</i> (Alexander Kitroeff)	147
HUGH POULTON <i>Who Are the Macedonians?</i> (Maria Todorova)	152

SMYRNA'S SHADOW

(27:00)

award-winning documentary available

Rare archival footage, interviews with Greek survivors tell of Asia Minor Catastrophe and aftermath. Only documentary on this topic. Excellent gift or educational tool.

Individuals: \$29.95 + shipping/handling.

Institutions: \$89.95

1-800-666-9970

Producers: CONSTANTINE LIMPERIS/CARA MERTES

Advisor: MARJORIE HOUSEPIAN-DOBKIN

ESSAYS

(Re)thinking the Ethnic Body: Performing "Greekness" in Canada

by CATERINA PIZANIAS

Introduction

Examinations of the body have been productive points for analyzing culture in general and problems of personal identity in particular.¹ This essay focuses on the changes in aspects of body use and collective representations of gender in traditional rural Greek communities and in a Greek community in Canada;² the essay concentrates on bodily praxis in the field of public dance performances in both places. I have chosen to focus on the social construction of gender within the context of public dance performances for the following reasons: (a) in preliterate or underdeveloped societies what is articulated through the body in dance is the ground of what is thought about women in the community; (b) dance performances³ raise questions of social convention and individual articulation of them; (c) the dancing body in the Greek countryside is both a subject and an object; and (d) dance events are of central importance both in Greece and in the Heritage Festivals of multicultural Canada.⁴ At first glance the differences in public dance performances might not appear to be of vital political significance, but upon closer examination they reflect broader conflicts such as structural stress between the ways knowledge and meanings are represented, controlled, and distributed between "mainstream" Canada

CATERINA PIZANIAS is a feminist cultural theorist interested in expressive culture and the traffic of cultural texts and values in their social and academic manifestations. She is based in Vancouver, Canada and she has held several teaching positions at Canadian Universities including Simon Fraser University and the University of Calgary.

and its ethnic communities—or within other multiethnic nations.

My inclusion of ethnic women⁵ in the discourse of the body is not an attempt to create a separate category for “ethnic” bodies. Rather, I seek to contribute to a broader discussion and understanding of female bodies in general—and not only the “western” bodies in advertising, movies, and art, but also, and more particularly, the “other” bodies whose public representations are those already appropriated by the dominant groups or by tourism: the folkloric-nostalgic rendition of the “exotic” other in multiethnic nations. My presumption throughout will be that female bodies and ethnic identities provide effective discursive sites at which to examine systems of domination in multiethnic and other stratified societies as well as to extend the body-gender identity discourse through the introduction of bodies from doubly dominated social groups—ethnic women—and by focusing on dominated forms of cultural expression—ethnic folk dance. I will invoke Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of habitus⁶ and will also go beyond it. My quest centers around the question of what happens to this habitus after the disruption of immigration—what sort of changes to the bodily praxis, mental dispositions, and social order does immigration trigger?

The setting is multicultural Canada, and the story concerns a group of women in a Greek community.⁷ The storyteller—myself—occupies a position in the story both as a sociologist and as a participant, since I was at some point an active member of the same community. I first outline my reasons for believing that Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of habitus provides the most fruitful means to address and explain the changes triggered by immigration in contemporary multiethnic societies. In the second section I describe and follow the trajectory of a group of Greek women and their kin and their search for an ethnic identity in Canada. Next, I outline some of the critical historical moments that have kept Canada and Greece under the grip of nostalgia for the recent past and which have propagated appropriations of it for the benefit of a politically neutered national identity and for profit by the cultural industries. I conclude with some thoughts and questions about embodied collective memories of the “homeland” and their textual presentation within the discourse of ethnicity.

My textual strategy in this essay is to use a bricolage of diverse theoretical bases—phenomenology, deconstruction, and variations of feminism. This essay is

postmodern, ethnography (that) seeks to unearth the meaning of the social world through intersubjective conversations aimed at capturing the intentionality of the human agents within particular contexts. The self-conscious goal of this appropriation is to produce an evocative text that simultaneously gives voice to its subjects and shapes the way the sociocultural processes presented in the text are registered and made sense of by the reader.⁸

What follows is a view taken from a specific point in time: it is an inquiry into the world of “ethnic” bodies and a departure on a writing expedition by one of these same “ethnic” women; it is memory and autobiography, description and ethnography, invention and reinvention of the ethnic self through dance or writing; it is women’s words and women’s bodies belonging to one culture and written up in the language of another.

I

Scholarly inquiries are constructed in relationship with persons, events, or texts in the “field” that have had a direct role in opening or closing doors, maintaining boundaries, creating or solving problems, or unearthing findings and contradictions. For me, what began as an opportunity to take part in a conference in Greece a few years back resulted in a quest to understand the discourse of multiculturalism in Canada and the Greeks’ position in it. In the process of writing I discovered the price of writing in the diaspora about one’s own diaspora experience, and it is high: cultural dislocation and disciplinary dispersal. But, following the lead of Nicole Ward Jouve, who claims that “there is an appropriate honesty, however, in working on, writing out of the here and now. In all its ordinariness and modesty. . . . If we cannot make something out of what we are, out

of what we know, how shall we ever cease to colonize others . . . ?" (Ward Jouve 1991, viii)—I have decided not to ban all remnants of my identity and personal experience from the research, but to cross disciplinary borders, to allow my writing and theoretical alliances to be "hybrid" as that of a woman/Greek/feminist/sociologist, and so on, the writing of a woman "of necessity split." I want to be all four and more, because to be either a Greek woman or a feminist sociologist would mean banning part of me or of what I know.⁹ Despite the lip service continually paid to interdisciplinarity and "embodied" knowledge and writing, it has not become any easier for me to tell a story in which I was a player.¹⁰ Questions that I am always faced with are the following: Is it ever possible to capture experience objectively? What about the uneasy relationship between what happened and the telling of it—especially the telling of it as if I were not part of the experience, let alone being affected by it? How does one keep one's distance, or should one keep one's distance, in ethnographic writing? Every effort—including this one—has been a balancing act. Paraphrasing Ward Jouve, "[S]ometimes I write as academic, straining towards theory, and as a woman. Sometimes I allow everything I am to filter through into writing, and then I become frightened of what I've done, and I push it under" (viii-ix).¹¹ Abandoning given conditions, modifying constituted signifying processes, and wishing to chip away at the contradictions between belonging and representation, that is, coming to terms with diaspora existence, has become a major part of my academic project. Pierre Bourdieu has given me the theoretical basis, the temperament as well as the stamina to sustain such a problematic. In his essay on Martin Heidegger, Pierre Bourdieu spoke of discourse as being "the product of a compromise between an expressive interest and a censure constituted by the very structure of the field within which the discourse produces itself and within which it circulates."¹²

Despite the many English translations of Bourdieu's work that have appeared during the last couple of years, and despite the concerted efforts and accommodations made by his translators, editors, and apologists to make his work fit Anglo-American sensibilities, his work has not taken strong roots yet.¹³

There is not space in this essay to tell how I came across Bourdieu's work; I shall say simply that I have found his concepts of field and habitus a *terra firma*—albeit somewhat arid and in need of fertilization by gendered actors, actors whose identities are nonessential, contingent, and negotiated as effects of power, rather than fixed entities or imagined communities grounded and connected by supposed sets of common traits, sentiments, and practices.¹⁴

Pierre Bourdieu has argued that any cultural practice or form is embedded in a broader field of cultural production. He conceived of the "field"¹⁵ as *objectively structured* by the given "positions" actors in it can occupy, the relations between these positions, and the space of possible strategies or "positionings" available to these same actors. The "position takings," that is, strategies any actor might take at any given moment, in any given position of a field, is determined by the struggle(s) for specific profits—symbolic or material—and the temperament or habitus of each actor.

From his early definition of habitus in *Outline of A Theory of Practice* (1977) as a "system of durable and transposable dispositions" (72), as "a whole body of wisdom, commonplaces, ethical precepts (that's not for the likes of us), and, at a deeper level, the unconscious principles of the ethos" (77), as "imposing different definitions of the impossible, the possible, and the probable, caus[ing] one group to experience as natural or reasonable practices or aspirations which another group finds unthinkable or scandalous or vice versa" (78), to the most recent defining attempts extracted under the probing of Bourdieu's most successful apologist/collaborator, Loïc Wacquant, [habitus] as

the durable and transposable systems of schemata of perception, appreciation, and action that result from the institution of the social in the body (or in biological individuals), and fields, i.e., systems of objective relations which are the product of the institution of the social in things or in mechanisms that have quasi-reality of physical objects . . . and of course everything that is born in this relation, that is, social practices

and representations, or fields as they present themselves in the form of realities perceived and appreciated. . . . (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 126, 127)

Applications of the concept of habitus by Bourdieu and others have proven their heuristic and explanatory agility.

We need to undertake archeology of the recent past by deconstructing the central dialectic of the colonial discourse, which sustains the practices of cultural production in multiculturalism, tourism, and the nostalgia for a romanticized past, the premodern and the exotic. Bourdieu's schema of the fields is the best "tool kit" with which one may undertake such an exercise. His conception of the field allows us to map out the positions, the actors, and their positionings according to the overriding capital of colonialism.

II

In Canada in the early 1980s, at the invitation of a Greek community board, I was asked to become involved with the young adult Greeks in the community in matters of culture. I accepted the invitation and decided to work with them in the areas of contemporary Greek poetry and theater, areas I was familiar with and liked. I very quickly learned that government funding was plentiful if the group was involved in folkloric activities—such as dance—but there was almost no funding for contemporary poetry and/or Greek theater. The problem was that I neither knew much about nor cared to learn folk dancing, something I had never done in Greece outside the mandatory lessons during basic schooling. But the opportunities to obtain grants for costumes, travel, and teaching were tempting, so "folklore" sustained our main interests. Because of our expected participation in heritage celebrations, I began inviting dance instructors from eastern Canada, the United States, and even Greece to teach us how to dance,

All the invited dance instructors came to the group with impressive credentials as to their connection with Dora Stratou—Greece's most widely known folkloric dance ensemble—which

is apparently the only provenance that counts. They gave instruction on steps and body posture, left tapes of music and patterns for making costumes, provided some minimal information as to the region or origin of the dance and the original social function of the dance, and introduced either too few dances or too many for a weekend workshop—and always left us with a feeling of unfinished business. Needless to say, the group paid the expenses and honoraria for the traveling “keepers” of the Greek folkloric tradition in the diaspora. To someone like myself, who sat out the dancing and instead kept copious notes (an after-effect of my sociology training) in an effort to write on paper or record on audio and video tape this immense tradition, what quickly became apparent was that “correctness” and “authenticity” boiled down to nominal variations stemming not from historical research but from the technical abilities of the teacher/dancer/keeper of tradition for any given dance. Each one, though, had something unpleasant to say about the others. Nonetheless, our group persevered, and under the watchful eye of my most able collaborator, a home economist at a local university, women from all immigration cohorts helped sew costumes for the group, which became the best-looking dance troupe—both in execution of dozens of dances and the sharpness of their costumes—as well as the favorite of politicians.

Right after a spectacular public performance of dances of my choosing—by then I was the artistic director of the group—I heard many complaints from the dancers’ parents as well as from community leaders about my choices (those complaining were from the postwar immigration cohort). My choices were based on my notes and videos of the workshops, on the music I liked (island music), and on the dances that allowed the dancers, women and men, to show off some fancy footwork (dances from Pontos, northern Greece, and the islands). The problem? Almost all the members of the community came from the Peloponnisos or parts of mainland Greece which produced music I found monotonous and dances I found austere. The parents and community leaders also vehemently disapproved of my conducting auditions for the public performances; even though everyone who wanted to learn was taught the dances,

they felt that anyone who wanted to dance had to be allowed to participate in the public performance, even if the small stage would look like a mob scene (which is how the dance floor looks during Greeks-only celebrations). They reminded me that back in the village participation in a dance depended on generational, kinship, and gender matters, not on some outsider's decision as to who danced best. They found the steps of the dances from their region "done up" a bit but basically all right, but they disliked my decision to dress the dancers with identical dresses from the regions of the dances performed; they found the uniformity boring. For them the performances were an opportunity for their daughters to dress in the old ways, an opportunity to show off their children rather than to live up to some aesthetic ideas of an "outsider." For a time the outsider prevailed. While the group was moving up in popularity among mainstream audiences, the Greeks continued to complain about what I was doing—about the theatricality of our performances and all that entailed. They were looking for a connection with their past village life, and all they were getting were polished stage productions.

Their uneasiness with the unnaturalness of our performances was exhibited directly. Whenever we danced for one of the community's organizations at their annual *glendi* (celebration), most people kept their backs turned to the performers and simply went on having *kefi* (a good time) with their *parea* (those sitting around their table). My reaction? To demand that for future performances we have a raised stage set, so we could dance at a prominent level and command their attention. I was wrong once again. When we performed on theater stages, I had to cajole, beg, and even threaten to stop the performance before the audience would stop chatting and catching up on the latest news. I once evoked the wonder of a couple of the most successful restaurateurs—"Who does she think she is?"—when I declined to allow the group to put on "floor shows" at their businesses on the weekends. And the list goes on. It never dawned on me that to dance in and for the community was only one aspect of other concurrent events. This knowledge came to me many years after I had left the group, through my

continuing interest in, research into, and reflection on aspects of women, ethnicity, and the body.

Increasingly, I was becoming aware of and feeling guilty for having brought such "outsider" habits to the community. First of all, my folk dance experience was limited to the *panhellenic* school dances taught during what passed as physical education classes in the crowded schoolyards of Athens. Year after year, we practiced the same dances, which we performed for our parents during the end-of-school-year celebrations in June. Invariably, the girls were dressed in the costume of *Amalia*, and the boys in *fustanellas*. The Amalia costume comes from a couturier's invention to dress up Queen Amalia to look like a Greek woman—which she was not—during her inauguration. The *fustanella* is an adaptation of a type of kilt favored by rebel fighters of the Greek countryside—but done up very short and streamlined into a fancy-looking uniform worn by the *evzones*, the former royal palace guards. Second, my experience of rural living and dancing is as limited as my folk dancing experience. When I was growing up, most Athenian families left the city for their ancestral villages for the summer months. My family was no exception. We spent our summers on a Dodecanese island, in one of the island's more isolated summer villages—composed of a couple of dozen homes—occupied by families that were for the most part related. The monotony of the long summer days was broken by a series of *paniyiria*—local festive celebrations honoring one saint or another. (Saints in Greece are honored by attending church services on their name day, then later joining the community for food, dance, and general merriment.) Summer after summer nothing much changed: The first *paniyiri* was on July 27, for *Ai-Panteleimona*, the patron saint of the whole island, and as such the religious aspects dominated the celebration—it was more of a pilgrimage. Then it was *Tis Panagias*, the Dormition of the Virgin, on August 15, a day celebrated by all Greeks across the country. The most fun and the least religiosity happened on the name day of the village's church, that of *Ai-Yiannis* on August 29, and on the name day of *Ai-Mamas*, an obscure saint whose church was at a summer village of about ten homes.

Listening to the mothers of the dancers in Canada telling

me stories about how things were, the etiquette and expectations in community celebrations, I found their memories very different from mine. Theirs were different because they all came from mainland rural villages with customs and traditions very different from those on an island. But even as islands go, my experience was further skewed: I was a member of a summer community, a community comprised mostly of relatives, and for all practical purposes a community of women only. During the summer months, the able-bodied-men—fathers, husbands, brothers—were away with the sponge-diving fleets or sailing on merchant ships. So, much less censoring was required to keep up appearances compared to what might have been required in other places during similar times. But even then, not anything was acceptable. The invisible presence of patriarchy was sensed: only men played music; women and men could dance or sing, but only men could sing the *pismatika*, rhythmic couplets where the singer has public license to praise, berate, or make fun of other members of the community—supposedly in good humor, but a lot of hurt could be incurred; they never danced mainland dances, sticking instead to variations of the island dances of *sousta*, *isos*, *ballos*, and *tripi(th)itos*. What I carried with me from those summers was a lasting love for playful island music, song, and spirited dances (as long as others performed them), but hardly any knowledge of the socio-political aspects of public dance events as they were/are practiced in rural Greece.

As the dance group leader in Canada, I knew I had to compensate for my lack of knowledge and experience. I read anything I could get my hands on about Greek folklore, and I visited folk museums and libraries in Greece, all without much success. But I shared whatever historical and cultural information I found about the regions with the group members, to give a grounding to the polished performances, which they mostly ignored: they treated my efforts as “she’s doing her thing.” The dancers were much more interested in the social opportunities of the dance rehearsals and out-of-town performances than any grounding in our quickly acquired knowledge.

Subsequently, I thought that if some of the information was shared with their parents, then the dancers might develop respect

for it—so I started regular folklore readings during the Greek radio hour. But mine was a voice in the wilderness. Needless to say, I was the only one panicking—the parents thought my academic efforts backward-looking, and the troupe members thought knowing social history and tradition irrelevant to doing the dances. What mattered was the performance event, the daughters staying in the fold, and good earnings for the community coffers during Heritage days. All that was needed were mechanical execution of steps and spectacular costumes. All they could see was that the most spectacular tourist summer show in Athens was Dora Stratou's, and the most spectacular amateur dance troupe at the Heritage Festival was ours—the most Stratou-like one.

Slowly, no longer feeling “grounded” in my own efforts, I removed myself from the group and the community. The group had come of age. The older members had matured as performers and administrators and took responsibility not only for sustaining themselves but also for training a younger generation with a heritage I had reluctantly brought to them, one from which I felt increasingly alienated.

Their success has gone well beyond the confines of a small prairie community. They have performed by invitation in other parts of Canada and in the United States, and they have toured parts of Greece; they continue to bring in “experts” to give workshops, but they now give workshops themselves—they too have joined the ranks of legitimators. But the arbitrariness of the heritage exists unnoticed: the group members, like their parents and the other community members, when they are having fun during their family or communal *glendia*, continue to dance only those panhellenic dances we were all taught at school—*tsamikos*, *kalamatianos*, *syrtos*, and *ballos*, along with *syrtaki* and the dances of the metropolitan underclass of Greece, the *rebetes*, the dances that have become known as “taverna dances”—the *hasapikos*, *zeibekikos*, and *tsifteteli*.¹⁶ But still, when we go public, so to speak, as Greeks in multicultural Canada, we are expected to perform a heritage that in many ways is as awkward, foreign, and exotic to us as it is to our audiences.

Our community was not much different from others in

Canada. The first wave of Greeks arrived in Canada during the massive immigration to western industrialized countries that took place between 1880 and 1922, when fundamental political transformations had negative effects in the Greek countryside. Most families in the villages were left without the ability to provide the necessary dowry for their daughters.¹⁷ In the 1950s and 1960s, when the second cohort of Greek immigrants arrived in Canada, their reasons for migrating were similar, but there were some important differences: although they too had come from rural Greece, they were not necessarily from the same villages as the pioneers, and many of them were single women who came as domestics—and were seen by the previous women as being potentially disruptive.

Immediately a gap was created—generational and cultural. The women of this second group had a more difficult adjustment than the first: they not only had lost their status and prestige opportunities that village life offered, they could not participate in the affairs of their adopted community except as bystanders. By the time they arrived, the immigrant community was organizationally complete, and the positions of authority were filled by the pioneer families or their offspring. To make matters worse, opportunities for economic advancement for unskilled workers were minimal; moving up the ladder was much more difficult than in the first quarter of the century. Therefore, the pioneers thought of the majority of the newcomers as simply lazy, as not interested in working as hard as they had worked. The newcomers tried as hard as they could to build up structures already erected by the pioneers on nineteenth-century models. They seized the opportunity to take charge of the Heritage Festivals initiated in 1976, and they did pretty well. But there was a big problem, a crisis of authority between the older generation of Greeks and those of the second cohort. And, to complicate matters, the second cohort was divided along class lines as well as by politics and geography.

The mothers of the dance group members were women whose knowledge of English was minimal, learned aurally at work—speaking with their husbands and other Greek coworkers whose knowledge of English was also merely functional, picking up some phrases through listening to their children, who almost

always spoke English or an amalgamation of Greek and English, a patois of sorts that covers only basic conversation in everyday life. Most of the time the women were under the watchful eyes of their husbands, who, although good and steady providers of material needs, do not interact much with their wives. For their part, the women depended on men to drive them to visit with friends or relatives—either because the family owned only one car, or because the women did not know how to drive. Most did not have many relatives in Canada, but all had developed an extensive hierarchy of relationships based on “clientelistic” (Mouzelis, 1978, 78) accounts of personal debts, or on symbolic/religious kinship through becoming *koumbari*—godparents or best men/women—at each other’s christenings or weddings. This way they guaranteed a covert system of economic and moral obligations, and through gift exchanges at religious festivals a constant traffic within the community was guaranteed.¹⁸ But the traffic for the women was limited: familial or religious obligations were what kept them in touch with other women. The men, on the other hand, struck up friendships with other Greek men, or with non-Greek business associates, and spent their free time visiting *kafeneia*, men-only coffee shops, or each other’s restaurants after hours.

Over time, I also realized that the women had ambivalent feelings at best, or hostile ones at worst, toward persons who could strike up friendships not cemented first via a ceremonial act like becoming godparents or marrying into the family. I was one such person—not having any accepted formal relationship with any member of the community—and they made their feelings clear by never inviting me to their homes. My only adult friend in the group was the person in charge of costumes—another academic. The same ambivalence and at times hostility was shown toward my habit of going to the library to find solutions to whatever queries came up in the group’s affairs; they mistrusted books as much as they mistrusted a woman with no formal ties to the community. But they put up with me because, however mistrusted my efforts were, they believed in my intentions; moreover, I kept their children within the “fold,” and that is what they wanted above all else. The end justified the means, sort of the lesser of two evils confronting the family.

The women's commitment to hold steadfastly to the values, knowledge and skills, and habits they brought with them from Greece—as a way not to lose their Greek identity—caused them to retreat inside the home, honing their home skills and maintaining a village ethos, none of which has much currency in Canada. The overt patriarchal, moral, and religious obligations within the family and community as well as the public performances of the Heritage events have to this date denied these women and their daughters opportunities to protest, amend, or adapt the social system and its values, to speak about the complexity of their lives, of their fears and ambivalences. They have become speechless in matters expressive of culture, objects to be looked at and exchanged in order to maintain the status quo within and outside the community. There is no dialectic at work, no fit between the subjective hopes to maintain a sense of Greekness in the diaspora and the objective chances available to them in multiethnic Canada (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 130).

The staged affairs of the Heritage Festivals had removed dance, costume, and song from the original space of the village, where they played an integral and active role in the dancers' everyday lives, an everyday life so different from the one lived in Canada. Both the structure and context of the village ritual performances reflect the continuous interplay between the stability and fluidity of the tradition while at the same time offer opportunities to challenge the status quo, thus allowing women and others to establish their own identity, as I was to find out much later through my research. In the second half of the 1980s, a handful of studies were published in cultural anthropology from feminist and other poststructuralist bases that gave us a clearer picture of the contemporary Greek countryside—inland and island—a far cry from the works that were published during the 1950s and 1970s when American anthropologists, folklorists, and dance instructors discovered Greece as a field ripe for study.

Jane Cowan's *Dance and the Body Politic in Northern Greece* (1991) rescued Greek dance from the numbing grip of the physical education musclemen, as well from the self-proclaimed keepers of the Greek folklore tradition in the diaspora. Cowan examines dance as a practice particularly loaded with her-

menautical and political/ideological content. Pavlos Kavouras's article "Dance at Olympos, Karpathos: Cultural and Political Confrontations" (1992) is directly influenced by Cowan's work, and it examines closely a *paniyiri*, that of *Ai-Yiannis* (August 28), on the Aegean island of Karpathos. Kavouras's article, more than any of the others recently published, for me filled in the gaps left by the "professional" dance instructors' official discourse in their visits with us, as well as the many moments of *aporia* the mothers and I were left with, blankly looking and talking past each other. In what follows, I provide the reader with some of the analytical concepts that Kavouras uses, which for the first time afforded me a ground on which to place what is observed in the field of public performances in Greece:

The Olympians regard the dance as their most important public event and attribute particular significance to its physical and symbolic space, which they call the *parousia* (literally presence, appearance). In traditional discourse the concept of *parousia* is synecdochically synonymous with the concept of community; the word is used of a place or an occasion when the community "appears" or declares its "presence."

The concept of *parousia* introduced two distinctions into the symbolism of space: that between ritual and everyday space, and that between mixed gender, ritual and public space. For the concept of *parousia* to be articulated, there must exist a relationship of otherness which binds the Olympian community together through its relationship with the cultural other. The concept of the cultural Other is rendered by the adjective *xenos* (foreign, alien, strange). The Olympians use the word *xenos* to describe anything that is not part of their everyday experience, and hence anything for which there is no word in the vocabulary of their community.

The concept of *xenitia* is intertwined with the idea of

topikismos (literally, localism), which constitutes yet another distinct way of conceptualized space considered from the geo-cultural angle. Neo-traditionalist Olympians speak of a culturally familiar space—at once a place (*topos*) and a way of life (*tropos*)—as (e)ndopios (local) or *dhikos* (ours), in contradistinction to any other, which is *xenos* (foreign).

Older Olympians, on the other hand, use the word *xenos* to describe anything that does not conform to their traditional culture but always refer to their own domain by its proper name: they say “an Olympian woman” (*Olymbitissa*) rather than “a local woman,” and “places in the Olymbos area” (*Olymbitikameri*) rather than “our part of the world.” (Kavouras 1992, 176)

In view of the above typology, a typology that is transportable to other Greek villages or to Greek communities in the diaspora, the question that becomes imminent is: how are we to negotiate a personal and collective ethnic identity when the static dioramas of the Heritage activities are the principal mediators among the disparate, differentiated options facing us in Canada? How will we make sense out of the apparent confusions and contradictions of the new foreign environment? The potential for the majority of Greek women to assert ourselves as historical subjects is becoming nil, thanks to the linguistic, economic, and cultural marginality accorded most of us in Canada.

The mothers of the group's members, women from the second immigrant cohort, were those with whom I spent most of my time, directly or indirectly. We were all Greek women who had immigrated voluntarily—they in order to find a suitable husband and I in order to escape a military junta. The Greece we had left was very different, and our memories of it were also different, as were the lives we had built in Canada. The web that bound us was the Greek language and a yearning for the “homeland.” English and my habit of going to the books kept us apart. They had mostly grown up in small villages and

towns in Greece, and I had grown up in Athens. They had left their families behind but had created their own here: children, grandchildren, godchildren, and so on. I too had left my family behind, but unlike them I did not create another one here that would conform to Greek expectations. During the time I was involved with the group I became consciously aware of my alien status: I belong here *and* there, myself both "exhibited" *and* "concealed," a forked and marked existence, not unlike that of a feminist sociologist or an immigrant woman.

III

"There will, I am sure, be general agreement with the view that the people of Canada do not wish, as a result of mass immigration, to make a fundamental alteration to the character of our population."

— MACKENZIE KING, 1947¹⁹

The rise of multiculturalism in Canada can be traced to a series of events during the 1960s both within and outside Canada.²⁰ Ever since its inception as an idea and its later entrenchment in the constitution, multiculturalism has received wide acceptance among politicians, bureaucrats, and part of the intelligentsia, but it has created problems for the newcomers to Canada who have attempted to fit within a framework—linguistic and cultural—not of their own making. Jean Burnet, a sociologist and one of the original framers of the legislation on multiculturalism, inadvertently said it best, that multiculturalism was never meant to imply "a full and vital maintenance of distinctive ways of life by all Canada's peoples within society" (Burnet 1976, 205). But the question remained: if not a full and vital maintenance of the cultures, then what was to be maintained? A review of the literature on multiculturalism and the "mosaic" aspect of the nation neither reveals the origins nor eliminates the ambiguities. Looking away from mainstream social science disciplines into folklore, cultural history, and feminist art, a prevailing opinion of the ruling intelligentsia emerges, one that delegates persons other than those of Anglo-Celtic descent into the category of quaint exotica. The decidedly

foreign aspects of the populace have become core to the creation of social policy such as multiculturalism, a policy that has become nothing more than a mechanism for insider/outsider identification and for boundary maintenance among the varied ethnic groups.

Most nations go through a period of inventing a national identity—Canada's has been unusually long.²¹ The role and influence of the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) in the economic and political future of Canada is widely accepted. What is not so widely accepted is the role some of its early employees played in creating a decidedly Anglo-Saxon identity. The CPR was built to entice the most western province of British Columbia to stay within the confederation, and to populate the west, thus preempting U.S. claims to Canada's northwest. The CPR was also instrumental in promoting immigration and colonization, a process that required an extensive bureaucracy of agents in both central Canada and Europe.²²

Two of the CPR's employees played a most important role in Canada's future expressive culture. Its first manager, Sir William Van Horne, was instrumental in fostering the fine arts. The other culturally pivotal employee was John Murray Gibbon, General Agent of Publicity in charge of advertising and public relations. Gibbon provided for the wide majority the visual metaphor and the written record of Canada as a "mosaic"²³ and was the organizer of the early Heritage Festivals, the first of which took place in 1926 at the Banff Springs Hotel. The festival was deemed so successful that the CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation) asked Gibbon to produce a series of radio programs with song, music, and commentary on the Canadian "mosaic." The radio program was so popular that Gibbon wrote about his experience in a book entitled *Canadian Mosaic: The Making of a Northern Nation*, which received the Governor General's Award. Following this string of successes, Gibbon was recognized by the Association of Canadian Authors in 1946 as a nation builder, and in 1949 he received the Lorne Pierce Gold Medal of the Royal Society of Canada. Gibbon's narrow notions of identity, stemming from an Anglo-Saxon framework of ideas about nature, race, and nationality, were readily apparent in his book.

In Gibbon's *Canadian Mosaic* the pattern is set for the unidirectional monologue and the habit of focusing on the colorful surface issues of lifestyle as opposed to life chances. Within forty years of Gibbon's much-recognized efforts, not only an ideology but the requisite bureaucracy was in place to make sure that the cultural contribution of non-British Canadians would consist only of food, song, and dance shared at periodic intervals throughout Canada.²⁴ The Heritage Festivals that have become very popular tourist attractions are historical vacuums in which ethnic communities have been condemned to live a partial existence, in which colonial values are preserved and strengthened; where, as Erving Goffman would have said, we are witnessing the "bureaucratization of the spirit," distorting any attempt at identity construction. But those who have been participating from within the ethnic communities and those who have been attending on a regular basis have noticed an increasing lack of enthusiasm in the displays, performances, and variety of foods provided. Every year the Heritage Festivals provide politicians²⁵ an opportunity to praise the marvel of multiculturalism, provide the ethnic communities a quick way to raise funds through the sale of food, and give the general public an opportunity to get away from the routine of everyday life, to graze at some rather increasingly unadventurous food and, while they are at it, catch some sights and sounds, weather permitting. Needless to say, the same politicians have begun complaining about the state and status of multicultural Canada, mostly because they want to find opportunities to balance the budget, unable as yet to think outside the binary "us" (Anglo-conformity) and "them" (everyone else).

Despite the crises around aspects of ethnicity and nationhood erupting all over the world, Canada is still preoccupied with policy issues, issues of funding and procuring a notion of multiculturalism that includes only dance, dress, food, and music. Organizing and managing a society around aspects of lifestyle is much easier than trying to deal with aspects of "differential specificity" of different groups—their historical, political, and class formation, "in order to grasp what is at stake in the diasporic resonance of the metaphors of being silenced, invisible or marginal—namely the struggle over representation

that inevitably comes with the territory wherever societies organize themselves around the metaphors of ethnicity and race."²⁶ Both ethnicity and race continue to be used in government and most of the academy as unproblematic categories, naturally occurring and not affected/contaminated by aspects/discourses of class, gender, or sexuality, which are always historically specified.²⁷

During the same period in the 1960s and 1970s, Greece underwent an identity crisis, a crisis that resulted in the installation of the military junta of 1967-74. The generals of the junta enforced the exultation of rural life and Christian values which resulted in a turn, unprecedented in recent history, toward extreme rightwing political ideologies.²⁸ This turn toward an idyllic rural life proved profitable for the tourist industry, an industry that experienced at that time a resurgence. As more and more tourists were flown in by charter planes, less and less was their knowledge of classical—the symbolic capital of the monied and learned—Greece: folk dancing, with its colorful costumes and almost unending variety of dances, proved to be a favorite pastime. In Greece as in Canada, peasant dancing's specific ritual foundation was removed from its social moorings by the new gatekeepers and functionaries of "folk dance" and put at the service of the cultural heritage industries. Greece's John Murray Gibbon was, in a roundabout way, Dora Stratou.

Dora Stratou²⁹—a ballet dancer in the mould of Martha Graham and Isadora Duncan, with impeccable conservative credentials—became fascinated with the folk dances of Greece in the postwar era. She decided to go to rural Greece to record music, catalog steps and dances, and collect costumes and photographs from each area. Although through her perseverance and hard work she managed to record steps for hundreds of dances and collected dozens of costumes³⁰ from throughout Greece, her interest was neither folkloric nor ethnographic: she wanted to put together a spectacular stage show, regardless of the effects the decontextualization and dispersment might have on the originating village tradition, or the sort of effect such panhellenic representations might have on the audience.

Stratou, like many others before her, was passionately committed to finding the roots of Greek folk dances in antiquity.

However passionate her commitment, her efforts as presented in her book *The Greek Dances: Our Living Link with Antiquity* (1966) are at best rather impressionistic and at worst naive and misleading, for she assumes that some photographs of ancient reliefs and vases, along with quotes from Homer, Plutarch, and Xenophon, convincingly support her alleged "living" connection. All the same, the government reprinted thousands of copies of her book and gave them to schools free of charge. Before long, her Dora Stratou Association and Dancers became widely known (and accepted), through popular summer performances, as having brought to life the "renaissance" of Greek folk tradition in the areas of dance, music, song, and costume.

Because of her government connections, Dora Stratou was able to tour her spectacle and dazzle Greek communities abroad, which in turn sent representatives back home to learn with her. Some of these students faded into the background of folk dance groups on university campuses, others made a living dazzling restaurant patrons with their Zorba renditions. A few others—all men—became the new consciousness managers of "Greekness" and (mostly women) dancers' decorum in the diaspora. Each one of these experts claims to be the true carrier of the Stratou tradition; some come with patterns for the costumes, most come equipped with "authentic" recordings of music and song, and all provide their talents and knowledge for a fee. Cultural correctness is good for business in multicultural Canada.

Back on the trail in search of the origins of the Greek folk dance tradition, Marika Rombou-Levidi, in her thoughtful essay "Some Thoughts on the Relationship Between Folk Dance and Modern Dance in Greece Today" (1992), makes the following provocative point, that "tradition is comprehensible only if there is something alive today to be handed on, and the question is whether tradition can impregnate the net of today's complex art forms" (216). I believe it is necessary to ponder for a moment, to search and to see how the tradition of Dora Stratou and her epigones and the rest of us in the "heritage" milieu of multicultural Canada is comprehensible in Rombou-Levidi's terms.

Rena Loutzaki, in her essay "Greek Dances: A Critical Review of Books Relating to the Traditional Dances" (1992), reviews the literature from the point of view of a cultural

anthropologist committed to the proper theoretical and methodological constructs that would allow dance a proper disciplinary grounding and position. I read this article (and some other of her work)⁸¹ from my point of interest, that is, to establish the genealogy of a "tradition" (in Rombou-Levidi's terms), a tradition that intuitively felt rather dead and heavy-handed. Read from a Foulcaudian sensibility, Loutzaki's essay exposes a social, political, and ideological system that reflects the needs/interests of conservative forces in Greece as well as the similar needs/interests of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century travelers to Greece to see her "as the living relic of the ancient civilization" (Kouria 1992, 211), a way of thinking in which folk dance "became a cliché that appeared time and again in works imbued with the fascination of Romanticism for the picturesque, the exotic, and for local colour" (Kouria 1992, 211).

Rena Loutzaki, in "Greek Dances," reviews twenty-four published works, from as early as 1892 (Argyrios Andreopoulos) to as late as 1990 (Yiorgos Roubis). Only four of the authors are women: Anna Krestinitou (1914), Lady Domini Crosfield (1948), Dora Stratou (1966), and Maria Kynigou (1988). Argyrios Andreopoulos was director of the Parisian School of Dancing in Athens and in this capacity he also became dance instructor to the royal princes. He published a book in 1892, *The Practice and Theory of Dance Instruction*, which deals mostly with European salon dances and only a handful of Greek folk ones. In it, though, he declares that he is interested in achieving the "renaissance" of Greek dances, and in initiating future performers into their "authentic reproduction" (Loutzaki 1992, 162). Andreopoulos's book was reissued in 1932 by the Lyceum Club of Greek Women (Lykeion Hellinidon) when he joined the club as dance instructor.

The Lyceum Club of Greek Women has played (and is still playing) an important role in the preservation of the Greek folk tradition. Founded through the efforts of Callirhoe Parren and other society women in 1910, its main objectives were "the amelioration of the position of women in society and the protection of the illiterate mother and children" and "the study, recording, and spreading of popular tradition, especially in the realms of costume, music and dance" (Loutzaki 1992, 162).

One might ask how illiterate mothers and their offspring might improve their lot in life through the study of folk tradition. The answer comes in a book that Anna Krestinitou, an associate of the Lyceum, published in 1914. Krestinitou envisioned these mothers becoming trained and then taking on the role of teaching others, once the folk tradition became an obligatory part of the curriculum in public and private schools. It is important to note here that the Lyceum succeeded in making the teaching of this tradition part of school curriculum, but in the process they lost the profession of teaching to men once the training became part of the university system. What the women of the Lyceum saw as the "national task"—that is, the teaching and perpetuation of the *Meghali Idea* (Great Idea), properly belonging to the mothers of Greece, was unceremoniously appropriated by the intelligentsia and the ruling parties of Athens. During the first quarter of this century, the popular tradition of costume, music, and dance passed from the hands of the women of the fledgling bourgeoisie to the hands of their menfolk.

Anna Krestinitou, Argyrios Andreopoulos, and Nikolaos Politis, the man who is seen as the father of Greek folklore studies, were all caught up during the first part of the twentieth century in the materialization of the Great Idea³² and in the irredentist dream of uniting all areas of Greek settlements to the north and east of Greece under the empire, with its capital in Constantinople once again. All realistic aspirations toward this end were shattered with the defeat of the Greeks in Asia Minor in 1922. But to this day, one finds many Greeks yearning for such an eventuality.

In her review Rena Loutzaki follows the influences that Andreopoulos has had on the discipline—mostly negative, in her opinion. She laments the fact that an article published by Dimitrios Loukatos fell through the disciplinary cracks, and examines the effect that American folklorists had in the 1960s—mostly in creating a new professional category, that of the Greek folk instructor (Loutzaki 1992, 162). She is very critical of the effect that the teaching methods and personal temperament of Haralambos Sakellariou had on the discipline of folk dance studies. According to Loutzaki, Sakellariou, who eventually became known as the "Teacher," arbitrarily chose a

given interpretation of a dance, then taught it as *the* method, thus legitimating a discourse and methodology that simply suited his authoritarian temperament and physical build. Loutzaki finds the following contributions by Sakellariou detrimental to the study of traditional dances:

- (a) the simplification and simultaneously the standardization of the basic motif;
- (b) the removal from the dance's basic motif of the figures made by the dances and of the lead dancer's deviations from these;
- (c) the occasional introduction of new steps into the basic motif;
- (d) the embellishment of the movements (sometimes in affected manner), which he applied to their performance;
- (e) the adaptation of the dance movement and steps to the music transcribed into scores strongly influenced by western conventions; and
- (f) the selection of only one way of performance, though there are many to choose from. (163)

A more detailed discussion of Loutzaki's review would be relevant only to anthropologists specializing in dance. But for the purposes of this essay, I want to draw attention to the following: that the fathers, stars, and heretics of the tradition of folk dance in Greece are all men of conservative bent, authoritarian in manner and disciplinarian by training; almost all were physical education teachers. Work is still needed to examine the when and how of men taking over, in view of the fact that the original legitimating institution, the Lyceum, was an institution run by women for women. And we do not get much help from Loutzaki: she dismisses Anna Krestinitou for following Andreopoulos's misguided methodology. She also makes passing reference to another woman author, Lady Domini Crosfield, and her book *Dances of Greece*, a book described as another practical guide which includes some anthropological details and for which she "studied the dance as local phenomenon"—a

rather forward-looking approach, I might add, for someone writing in 1948. Maria Kynigou's book *I Love, I Learn, I Dance Greek Dances* (1988) is quickly dismissed by Loutzaki as "a book for kids."

Now back to Dora Stratou. Since the authoritarian male gymnast had taken over the academic discourse of Greek folk dance, how did she manage to come to symbolize—at least for those outside the academy—the renaissance of folk dance? As I have already mentioned, the key answers can be found in the vortex of events that took place in Greece during the 1960s: political unrest with successive, short-lived governments, assassinations such as that of Grigoris Lambrakis, and, to top it all, the military junta of 1967 and the ensuing turn toward conservative values and, yes, the resurrection once again of the Great Idea. But, I believe, the catalyst that allowed the so-called renaissance to take root was the discovery of Greece as a prime destination by the new tourists—not the Byronic types of eras past, but the members of the newly affluent lower-middle classes of western Europe and the United States, going to Greece in search of . . . Zorba the Greek!

To ignore or even underestimate the primacy of economic aspects in exchanges of cultures and artifacts involved in tourism is to ignore the success of the tourist industry to appropriate the previous value exchanges based on properly putting "value on propertyless itself. Look, there are no fences around their fields. That's worth a picture!" (MacCannell 1994, 102). Dean MacCannell, the author who has demystified contemporary tourism, in his latest foray into the sociological interactions of tourist encounters, "Cannibal Tours" (1994), observes that tourism—the latest in the family of human institutions—has developed the "special genius" of presenting the encounter between tourists and the "other" as a moment of "a shared utopian vision of profit without exploitation" (102); "[there] is so much mutual complicity in the overall definition of the interaction between the postmodern tourist and the ex-primitive that the system comes close to producing the impossible economic ideal" (103).

The "utopian moment" for Greece came in 1965, with the commercially successful and much-awarded film *Zorba the Greek*,

released at the Cannes Film Festival. The film was directed by Mihalis Cacoyiannis, starred Anthony Quinn and Alan Bates, and featured music written by Mikis Theodorakis. The screenplay was an adaptation of Nikos Kazantzakis's *The Fantastic Life of Alexis Zorbas*, a story unfolding around events in the life of a bigger-than-life Greek *Man*, in the midst of the rough-hewn life of a backward Cretan village, and cinematically presented in an almost documentary manner. Alexis Zorbas, a.k.a. Anthony Quinn, doing his dance—a rather minute scene as films go—took such hold in the minds of foreigners and what they thought of as the Greek spirit that to this day “the ‘Zorba wave’ has been, and still is, good for the promotion of the ‘Greek Spirit’ as a tourist attraction” (Torp 1992, 209).

What Lisbet Torp writes about in her article “Zorba’s Dance: The Story of a Dance Illusion—and Its Touristic Value” (Torp 1992, 209) is exactly what every Greek person who saw the film knew instantly: that there has never existed a dance such as Zorba’s—later to become known as *syrtaki*—and that both Quinn and Bates made lousy dancers! Something else that the Greeks did not miss in the aftermath of the film’s commercial success was the economic opportunities that opened up with tourists flocking to the Greek islands, wanting to learn Zorba’s dance! The Alan Bates character’s heartfelt request to Zorba, “Teach me to dance, will you?” was answered by many entrepreneurial Greeks. To wit, two instances Lisbet Torp documents in her article:

“Learn Greek Folk Dances from Vassilis Giakoumis—Zorba’s Father!” We have built a dance centre on the beautiful Greek Island, Naxos, suitable for groups of 15-25 (-40) people. In this place, we organize workshops on traditional Greek folk dance. Our teacher is **Vassilis Giakoumis** himself! He is the one who choreographed Anthony Quinn in the film *Zorba the Greek* and also himself performed the most demanding parts! On top of being a skilled pedagogue, Vassilis is fascinating to be with due to his sense of humour and ability to relate the dance to Greek mythology and tradition. You will learn *hasapikos*, *ballos*, *syrtos*, and

rebetiko, and possibly other dances. . . . *To dance here while the sun sets in the Aegean Sea is a fantastic experience.* [Emphasis in the original; travel ad, Denmark, December 1990]

Giannis Mastorides is not just any man of 92 years. He is the Greek dance teacher who, in 1957, taught Anthony Quinn the famous Zorba-steps, also known as *syrtaki*, in the film *Zorba the Greek*—Giannis Mastorides has no doubt that it is the dance that has given him his high age and young mind. Tonight we find him at the Nykterida Restaurant in the village of Korakies (Crete). It is Zorba-evening with Scandinavian tourists and local Cretans in a wonderful unison. [Published in March 1990 by Sterling Airways, Copenhagen]

The potency of Zorba's image is manifested in the fact that two men claim to be his father in two different but equally popular island destinations, and no one sees any need to get to the bottom of it! (Or to question the fact that Mastorides started teaching Anthony Quinn in 1957 for a film shot six years later.) As long as the dance is presented as "the living link with antiquity," and as long as Zorba's fathers have a sense of humor and mingle with the tourists in "wonderful unison," why should anyone complain? Profit without exploitation, right?

What Cacoyiannis's film offered to the new tourist classes of the packaged tours was an opening to a culture that was exotic enough to be seen as "other," and approachable enough to be a safe diversion from everyday life, which did not require the educational capital of the early travelers to Greece, those who went in search of Homer, the tragic playwrights, and the philosophers and orators of the European Renaissance. To the new tourists, Dora Stratou's Dancers in their theater in Philopapou—a stone's throw from the Parthenon and the Ancient Agora—offered easily digestible spectacular images of colorful costumes and dazzling footwork of an "other" that was exotic enough to desire and accessible enough to immerse oneself in without

fear. Cacoyiannis's film had touched a social nerve that was neither foreseen nor could be really understood by those involved with it. Mikis Theodorakis had this to say in 1990:

When I innocently entered the cogwheels of this monstrous system on the international scale with the *syrtaki* from *Zorba*, all the record companies commissioned the composers to produce *syrtaki* tunes. Discotheques were ordered to brainwash people with the *syrtaki*. The company which controlled the original music for the film *Zorba* penetrated the biggest discotheques and music centers of Europe with percentage. It fabricated small groups of dancers who would "spontaneously" dance the new dance every night. The disc-jockey, i.e., the one who puts on the records, had orders to continuously interject the music from *Zorba* at well chosen points. They invited me to Paris to follow the process. The public screamed, applauded, and raved frantically every time the *syrtaki* began. The music had been turned into a myth. It worked with those means which excite the group instinct. The world [music] industry made a fortune. (Quoted in Torp 1992, 210)

The world music industry made a fortune, and many men in Greece and North America made a living teaching Zorba's dance—and other Greek folk dances, first on American university campuses, then in Greek restaurants in cities such as San Francisco, Philadelphia, and New York, and much later in Greek communities. As Rena Loutzaki has previously documented, it was American folklorists such as Ted Petrides and Rickey Holden during the 1960s who legitimized the new professional category of "teacher of Greek folk dances"; it was they who first brought the fad and its legitimators to American campuses. And it was there that Greek male university students learned the *syrtaki*; later they danced it in Greek restaurants, and by the late 1970s they took over the legitimators' function as the carriers of the "authentic" folkloric tradition back to the Greek communities. I believe it is appropriate—and not only as rhetorical strategy—to finish this section with Maria Rombou-Levidi's com-

ment that "tradition is comprehensible only if there is something alive today to be handed on..."

IV

What is at issue then, is the exploration of questions of historical agency and social temporality that constitute the borderposts and frontiers of cultural production. By focusing on "events", "scenes", "memories that flash up in a moment of danger" we hope to maintain a sense of the enactment of meanings and practices involved in the regulation of policy and the formation of politics, antagonistic or affiliative, that become the insignia of the interstices. . . . Indeed, a more productive discussion of the "event" is one that neither subsumes into "theory" nor appropriates it by "practice", but allows it to maintain its own performative authority and interrogates the conditions under which knowledges, images, and discourses are socially and pedagogically authorized. By examining these agencies and ideologies of authentication, through such a notion of the event we might be able to attend to the various thematics and technologies that create the "public" sphere or dimension of a historical event.

— BHABHA, 1994

The telling of the preceding story about the ethnic identity construction of a small group of Greek women points toward the need to open up the discourses about both ethnicity and the body in ways that allow for "subject positions" which stem from the coexistence and continuous negotiation of oral/mimetic/semiliterate/precapitalist traditions with textual/interpretive/capitalist ones, since such mixtures are found in multi-ethnic and constantly changing societies such as Canada's. During my writing up of the research, the subject/object categories had collapsed, and there was nothing I could do about it. I have come to believe that the most fruitful way to account for the individual or group trajectories that have brought the women of this story (and all other immigrant women and children) to the present subject and group positions is by "transgression," "stepping across" disciplinary barriers, transforming the limits,

pushing one's work to the "borderlines" (Minh-ha 1992, 116, 188).

Any critical reading of the discourse on multiculturalism in Canada, from John Murray Gibbon to Jean Burnet to Neil Bissoondath, will reveal that all efforts at inclusion have been guided by a wish to preserve the ideological status quo of Anglo superiority. The concept of multiculturalism is strictly associated with Western superiority, and its analytical focus is supported by colonialism's taxonomic binarisms of us versus them, modern versus primitive, and similarly paired categories. Greece's turn toward an idealized and idyllic countryside during the years of the military junta exhibited the same commitment to sustaining the status quo, agrarian values—conservative/traditionalist in nature—since whatever political support the generals might have gathered had its basis in rural Greece, the same social strata that provided Canada with the majority of its Greek immigrants. The Murray Gibbons and the Dora Stratous can only thrive on their misrecognized colonialism, a belief that sustains them as actually doing something good for the "homeland." Tourism took over as the field where the struggle for symbolic and material gains surrounding ethnics/ethnicity/authenticity has been played out for the last twenty-five years. Opportunist politicians, ethnic community leaders, and the various brokers of "authenticity"—almost always male—have become the dominant actors controlling Heritage Festivals, folkloramas, and other festivities celebrating Canadian heritage, and which are shrines to the premodern ritual acts of the display, mostly of women, and the consumption of ethnic food increasingly westernized in the name of expediency and economic gain, without ever affecting the real politico-social power balance, since the "other" is safely kept in the past.

It was not until a year or so ago, after I had used Bourdieu's concept of the field in considering a number of art-world issues, that I slowly allowed myself to be factored into my research of ethnic women. It was a subconscious feeling of not liking what I was doing, of leaving part of my research out, part of the story I was committed to telling, that led to this decision.

Pierre Bourdieu has never had much to say about women—his agents are almost always male—immigrants, or ethnic dance.

I found a short reference to dance, "bourgeois dance" to be exact, in an essay on sports. He writes:

... dancing is, of all the social uses of the body, the one which, treating the body as a sign, a sign of one's own ease, i.e., one's own mastery, represents the most accomplished realization of the bourgeois uses of the body: if this way of comporting the body is most successfully affirmed in dancing, this is perhaps because it is recognizable above all by its tempo, i.e., by the measured, self-assured slowness which also characterizes bourgeois use of language, in contrast to working-class abruptness and pretty-bourgeois eagerness. (Bourdieu 1993, 355)

The dance he refers to is the learned dance of the salon, a dance not unlike the spectacles I produced with the group, based on aesthetic decisions and bodily mastery far removed from the mythico-ritual sites of the Greek countryside where dance events were part of institutional processes for maintenance of the symbolic order, an order that had the function of symbolizing a whole set of moral and aesthetic values—and allowing, at the same time, women opportunities to transgress through song or comportment. The "legitimate use of the body" in the village (Bourdieu 1993, 344) allowed women a latitude of motions, effects, or social profits which were "instrumental" in nature; that is, they showed or protected the family's "honor," got a woman a husband, and so on, as opposed to the valuelessness, for them, of their bodies used as "bodies-for-others" (Bourdieu 1993, 354) in heritage celebration spectacles.

When Bourdieu speaks of peasant societies, he speaks mostly about the Kabyle of Algeria; when he speaks of the body, it is mostly the male body in motion. But when he speaks of power, its structures and maintenance, he comes so close to the contemporary reality of Canada that he might as well be talking about our here and now. His essay on "Structures, Habitus and Power: Basis for a Theory of Symbolic Power" especially becomes a blueprint for analysis of the social profits

of multicultural policies (for newcomers and mainstream alike), policies which are becoming undone because

... [as] strategies to establish or maintain lasting relations of a dependence are generally very expensive in terms of material goods (as in the potlatch or in charitable acts), services, or simply *time*, which is why, by a paradox constitute of this mode of domination, the means eat up the end, and the actions necessary to the continuation of power themselves help to weaken it. (Bourdieu 1993, 179)

As we all know, the dominance of multicultural ideas and policies are increasingly coming under attack from many quarters and for different reasons.

Although Pierre Bourdieu has given me the scaffolding on which to map out the political struggles surrounding ethnic identity and otherness in multicultural Canada, and authors from within the feminist/subaltern discourse have given me inspiration and certainty about the timeliness and necessity to "push borders," however hard I have tried I could not find much of substance/assistance regarding ethnic-female dancing bodies.³³ As for the discourses on the body—in the social sciences, feminism, psychoanalysis, art, and a host of other areas—they have been growing at a rate that precludes me from presenting any sort of reference list or summary that might be called adequate. I would like to note, though, two points of particular importance to this essay: (a) there is nothing on able-bodied ethnic females, and (b) it is almost obsessed, one might say, with the bourgeois body, focusing exclusively on sex, decay, disease, death—in other words, social "takes" on the biological body but not ethnographic identity and its bodily praxes.

It was my tactical understanding of the field that allowed me to recognize the differential specificity of the actors in terms of the significance of the symbolic, and of economic capital as well as one's own disposition. Because I was an educated city person, with a nominal knowledge of rural Greece, I, too, acted from a dominant position in introducing textual information into the space of possible strategies, a space ruled

by precapitalist issues of kinship and nonmaterial capital such as family, "honor," and localist memories. The textual solutions—my library-going habit—for filling in my blanks vis-à-vis their embodied memories of the homeland, was that which was despised most. It was never said to my face, but, looking back, I see this was the part of my efforts that the group steadfastly sidestepped while I was with them, and it is the part that has been abandoned since my departure. Our positions structurally and our dispositions qualitatively were invariably opposed, even though our need and commitment to realizing the need of getting hold of a piece of the homeland was the same. Every time I could not understand the community's reactions to my decisions, I went to the place I knew and trusted: the library. It was there that I discovered a substantial number of ethnographic and theoretical works dealing with contemporary Greece—mostly the countryside, the part of Greece I knew so little about, the part that most of the Greek women I was involved with originated from.³⁴

Most of the authors I discovered, but especially Jill Dubisch, made clear the misguided practices of most academics writing about contemporary Greece (anthropologists-ethnologists-folklorists). They take to the Greek countryside theoretical schemata from the West and simply write how they play out in the field. Dubisch in her work convincingly makes clear that the notions of private and public spaces in precapitalist patriarchal societies, and in rural Greece, are inversely valuable: the private space is the space that counts, and it is in this space that the women can exercise power in material ways through the wealth of their dowry and through the acquisition of prestige and honor by assuming the role of the mistress of the house, of the *noikokyra*, by demonstrating their ability to control the "gates" to the interior of the house, keeping pollution—material and spiritual—under control, thus redeeming themselves for having been born women. Even religion, which from a Western European perspective might be seen as restrictive, on the contrary serves to provide status, worth, because the religious dimension that counts in Greece is the public manifestation—keeping the churches clean, preparing for religious festivals, participating in celebrations that always include a feast (even for funerals, and always

prepared by the women), and women always actively participate in the celebrations. Because in the Greek countryside the socially constructed interpretation of gender, age, and status are represented in and through the body, they produce and reproduce the values and norms of the community by being carriers of the tradition as well as by being "authors" of interventions in the form of verbal complaints and transgressions where women protest the social and religious status quo. In dance, costume, comportment, and song is the language for the expression of the women's social and emotional state and status.³⁵

In the village, during community dance events like the *paniyiria* or *glendia*, the majority of those joining the dance are women, almost all the young single ones, married women, and then the elderly. And most of the censoring rules apply to women: which dances, in what order, or at what occasions a woman might join the dance depends on her marital status—single, married, widowed, a mother who has given birth within forty days of the dance event . . . and the list goes on. But in the same village and within the above restrictions, the young girls and women get many opportunities to make points, since they are involved directly in making their own costumes: they can show off their talents in dressmaking, embroidery, and choice of fabrics, as well as color combinations. They get to show off their dancing technique when they take turns to dance at the front of the dance line, show off their knowledge of the song repertory—which along with the repertory of dance steps and etiquette carries a lot of symbolic capital, both for the women and their families. The voices of singing women have had a persistent fascination in folk tradition; to be able to sing well and imaginatively according to the occasion and subject of gathering is to have sexual and cultural power. Women who sing well are invited to weddings to sing the praises of the bride, to the *paniyiria* to sing the praises of the community, and even to funerals and wakes, where, more often than not, the women doing the lament use it as an opportunity to sing (speak publicly) not only about the unfairness of death but about the oppression of the social system as well.³⁶ They occupy an active subject-object position, with a wide latitude on how to use/present their bodies for the highest gain—material as they

become sought-after brides, and symbolic by bringing pride to their families.

In Canada a pared-down version of the above takes place during the community celebrations away from the eye of official multiculturalism. Even though the women do not wear traditional costumes, they take care of what they will wear, they inquire who will be attending the event, and there, as in Greece, it is the women who dance and the men who gaze. Everyone is aware of the impression they want to make, aware of what people might say if, for example, a young unmarried girl were to dance a *tsifteteli*, an openly sexually suggestive dance, with a young man to whom she was not related. And even though the vigilance of the community centers around the behavior of young women, at these events everybody has a good time dancing the night away with *kalamatianos*, *syrtos*, *tsamikos*, and *rebetika*. But when Greeks go "out" into the "multicultural," we take with us dances from places in Greece we know little about, we put on costumes sewn not by us the dancers, and we do dances of alien traditions in the manner decided upon by an artistic director whose sole purpose is to present a "tradition" borrowed from the archives of a discourse born of the marriage of aging colonialism to the young upstart of tourism. The embodied woman of the countryside—her voice, her skills, her comportment—have been replaced by a voiceless (literally and metaphorically) dance troupe, a mute sign, a tiny tile in Canada's multicultural mosaic.

Dance, folksongs, and lamentations, with their emphasis on bodies and bodily presentation and the latter's association with aspects of prestige and reputation, are the social capital, "the sum of the resources actual or virtual, that accrue to an individual or a group by virtue of possessing a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 119), capital that has no value once transplanted to Canada. The bodies lose their history, their language loses its resonance, and their habitus endlessly reproduces the structure and useless dispositions of the precapitalist marginal space of ethnic communities and Heritage Festivals. However reassuring it might be to locate some similarities in the literature regarding disposi-

tions in the Greek countryside and the Greek communities in Canada, the most relevant and interesting aspect analytically, and, in terms of injecting some urgency and reality into the discourses of ethnicity or the body, is the need to study the changes in habitus (individual or group) that take place because of immigration and, after each immigration cohort arrives, within the diaspora community.

The cultural heritage "fields" in Greece and Canada have their ideological roots in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century bourgeoisie: married, learned, and with time to travel or save the unfortunate ones. John Murray Gibbon, Callirhoe Parren, and Dora Stratou might have been steeped in romantic ideas about classical antiquity and about the preservation of idyllic peasant life, if for no other sinister reason than to preserve progress and modernity for their own class, but when their brainchild was successfully adopted by the institution of mass tourism with hardly any struggle, the positions were irrevocably struck in favor of the status quo. Successive governments, along with the ethnic political elite, have promised the wonders of sharing our cultural heritages and have allowed a symbolic capital to circulate among the ethnic communities than can almost never be translated into material/economic/political success for the majority of those communities. The "field of forces" is so polarized and onesided in favor of the status quo that for a group or community, let alone a person, to declare heresy is to be thrown out into obscurity. Ethnic communities and individuals within them are thus forced to revive a tradition that was hardly theirs, and to recreate a museum-like archival past, in an effort that consumes so much time, money, and emotion as to leave no time to participate in real life, to negotiate real memories, or to acquire skills that when marketed will allow ethnic individuals in general and ethnic women in particular—since they make up the majority of heritage workers—to leave *their* mark on Canada. How will they ever develop a "sense of the game" of ethnicity in Canada, when the *habitus* they acquired in Greece—a *habitus* so connected to the *choros* (topos, habitat, locality) and its habits—cannot be transplanted after immigration, *chorismos* (separation)? Why are we forced to live a forked existence, one way

among our own, another within multicultural Canada? Ever since my involvement with the game of multiculturalism in Canada, I have been watching dance groups and attending community events in different Greek communities, and I have yet to see, when the *kefi* takes over, the dance group members do *Gaida*, *Beratis*, *Kotsaggeli*, *Sperveri*, and a host of other dances from the repertory acquired at workshops offered by "professional dance instructors," our "living link with antiquity." Instead, the dancers, along with their parents and friends, have the best of times dancing the night away doing the dances that all self-respecting Greeks are expected to do, *isamikos*, *kalamatianos*, *syrtos*, and *rebetika*, and when enough persons from the same village are present, they will dazzle all by performing intricate steps of their local dances,³⁷ bringing tears to Terpsichore's eyes. I believe it is time for this side of Greekness to come out of the multicultural closet.

A slide/rift of sorts takes place, a vertical sorting out of the various orders of meaning construction, habitus formation and re-formation take place in a diaspora which requires a close examination across many cohorts and communities. Especially in view of the fact that a large number of ethnic Canadians have come of age in multicultural Canada and, further, in view of the fact that multicultural policies increasingly are coming under attack because they are too costly and chip away at the "true" Canadian identity (read Anglo-conformist), a turn toward new theoretical directions is well overdue. What will happen to the ethnic communities when the multicultural base is taken from under their feet? It will all depend upon the strength, the roots that the "field" of the multicultural workers have grown over the last quarter of a century. The way that things stand now, it does not bode well for ethnic women.

The women in my sample—young and old—exhibited psychic resistance and ambivalence toward the so-called "heritage," reactions that collectively call into question this fictional idea by which the Greek folk dance tradition has been arbitrarily—through a mundane sort of *symbolic violence*—unified and disseminated so that certain political agendas can be served. I believe that Pierre Bourdieu's notion of the field as a framework of differential analysis and a primary way of signifying

relationships of power, and that of *habitus*, a gendered habitus, with memories and desires, will not only show the constitutive ambiguities of the relationship between *chorós* and *chóros* in the case of Greek dancers, but, equally important, it will show that women and bodies ought not to be seen as simple effects of discourse, as simple effects of discursive regimes, but ought to be considered in more complex and intimate relations with our psychic reality. An embodied *habitus* is the key.

As Greek women move away from their preliterate/precapitalist/oral/doxic communities and into the literate/capitalist/textual/heterodoxic communities, they become increasingly more marginalized as a community in general, with the women becoming even more marginalized as a result of their lost status within the diaspora family and through the loss of the networks of support that they left behind. At the crux of the disruption resulting from immigration and regarding the symbolic-expressive aspects of identity is the fact that a living, complex, and fluid oral tradition of folk culture in Greece has been taken over by an intelligentsia that recorded it, made it into a tradition to be authenticated, protected, and argued over by the professionals of cultural anthropology, multiculturalism, folkloristics, and tourism, without ever giving a thought to the fact that actual memories, habits, and aspirations of real persons are at stake.

The multicultural identity of Canada and the idyllic folk Greek countryside are professionally constructed understandings which have become the symbolic capital of those in power—dominant groups of men within and outside the ethnic communities—a capital so colorfully embellished or “euphemized” (Bourdieu 1994, 185) that it successfully conceals its colonial ethnocentricity through the apolitical glorification of the nostalgia of the various heritage celebrations. Its contemporary upkeep requires a huge bureaucracy which, alongside the heritage cottage industries—which alone absorb large sums of public and private money—of dance training, costume making, and event production, ensures that the real aspects of multiethnicity, with its structural unevenness, remain below the surface. The real multiethnicity is exploited under the banner of cultural diversity in action, of “us” celebrating with “them,” thus forever

reproducing the colonial diversity and effectively depoliticizing difference by allowing an ethnic identity that consists of spectacles, food, political bantering, and leisurely time out in the park, where a sense of "unity" and/or "community" can be both maintained and kept under control.

What I proposed in the opening of this essay and have attempted to do—by opening up the theoretical models of ethnicity that have dominated research recently—is to develop a grounded, commonsense approach to analysis that lays emphasis on patterns of bodily praxis and embodied memories within the immediate social field and material world of diaspora groups. I have attempted to provide an autobiography-cum-ethnography which stands between postmodernism's emphasis on authorial self-expression and Pierre Bourdieu's "reflexivity by proxy," approaches that can only be accomplished by those occupying a secured position within the field. Drawing on Bourdieu's concepts of habitus and field will permit interpretations of the ethnicity discourse, by making us aware of the simultaneous existence of the different orders of meaning construction, communication, and appropriation, orders which produce competing habituses, always in the process of forming and reforming bodies and ethnic identities. But questions still remain: if bodies and identities are in constant formation and re-formation, how are we to represent them in the disciplinary discourses? When the ethnic context is in flux, what will become of the written text(s) of ethnic identity? Will crossing disciplines be as challenging as crossing ethnic borders? And what about dance and/or dancing ethnic/female bodies? Before borders can be pushed or crossed, a lot more ground must be covered. This essay is offered as a modest beginning.

NOTES

¹A few that have directly or indirectly influenced the present essay: Jackson 1983a, 1983b; Turner 1984; Suleiman 1985; Zeitlin 1985; Berger, Jr. 1987; Feher et al. 1989; Gaines and Herzog 1990; Featherstone et al. 1991; Miles, 1991; Butler 1993; Shilling 1993; Falk 1994; and Grosz 1994.

²The centrality and importance of the dances in rural Greek communities as a ritual of social reproduction and sustenance should not be underestimated. To wit: the common etymological roots of the Greek words *chorós* = dance, *chóros* = place, and *chorismós* = separation (removal from place) are extremely telling. Discussions of ritual round dances recreating, reenacting the original hermeneutic event of clearing and delimiting land to create a *chóra* = settlement can be found in Homer, Pindar, and other writers of Greek antiquity. Terpsichore was one of the nine Muses, and she was the patron of dance. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 10th Anniversary Conference of *Theory, Culture and Society* at Champion, Pennsylvania, August 18, 1992.

³Dance somehow has not caught up with the academic imagination. For an interesting review of the literature and some explanations why this has been the case, see Robert C. Bennett's "Why is the Romance of Dance so Absent from Academic Discourse?" in *Body Matters: Leisure and Images and Lifestyles* (1993: 207-17). Another interesting article in the same publication is by Alan Clarke, "Everybody Loves Somebody: Significant Signs in Leisure and Tourism": 218-24.

⁴A festival is a public ritual where everyday activities and normal rules of behavior are suspended. It becomes an occasion for time out, for staging performances and spectacles, for the "entertainment of a community and the reification of its social structure. Because they celebrate important commodities, manipulate symbols and mirror social structures and values, festivals can be powerful vehicles for the expression of the group priorities" (Esman 1982, 199). Further, a festival as ritual belongs to a communication system which dramatizes certain issues and silences others. Usually, the contradictions of social order are glossed over and emphasis is placed on the ideal and harmonious. This selective nature of ritual celebration makes it a powerful mechanism in controlling what one thinks about oneself and the society at large. In their structure and content festivals can reflect shifting priorities, internal conflict, and other varieties of cultural discourse. (Esman 1982, 199)

⁵Ethnicity is understood as a political rather than a cultural phenomenon. "Ethnicity is a special social product... Ethnicity is produced in the ongoing activities which organize and accomplish social reality. It is a relation of social and economic inequality. At the center of this inequality is the day to day production and attribution of difference; a process of producing the difference that counts" (Cassin and Griffith 1981, 109-10).

⁶See Pierre Bourdieu (1990, 63). He defines habitus as "a system of acquired dispositions functioning on the practical level as categories of perception and assessment or as classificatory principles as well as being the organizing principles of action meant constituting the social agent in his true role as the practical operator of the construction of

objects." The reader might want to read the following works discussing Bourdieu's habitus: "Physical Activities, Body *Habitus*, and Lifestyles" by Suzanne Laberge and David Saukoff, in *Not Just a Game: Essays in Canadian Sport Sociology*, ed. Jean Harvey and Hart Cautelon (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1988) 267-286; "The Politics of the Body in the Context of Modernity" by Jean Harvey and Robert Sparks, *Quest* 43 (1991) 164-189; *The Body in Social Theory*, by Chris Shilling, especially chapters 6 and 7 (London, Newbury Park, New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1993). The concept of habitus contains the meanings of habitat, habitant, the process of habitation, and habits of thought. A habitat is a social environment in which we live: it is both a product of its position in the social space and of the practices of the social beings who inhabit it.

⁷The majority of Greek immigrants to Canada arrived in two waves—after the 1946 civil war in Greece and during the military junta of 1967-74; most Greeks who came to western Canada came in the post-WWII era and were from rural Greece. They entered, and have remained in, for the most part, marginal labor-intensive industries—unskilled or semiskilled—and are mostly illiterate in both of Canada's official languages and their own. Another, earlier, wave of Greek immigrants, the pioneers, came to western Canada early in this century. They were single men who came from rural Greece to work as laborers, living in groups in boarding houses and spending their time in *kafeneia* (coffee shops). Once settled, they sent home for other relatives and wives from their villages, a habit of sponsorship which accounts for the rather uniform nature of most of the early Greek communities in Canada. As soon as they had settled into married life, they organized themselves into various fraternal groups and women's auxiliaries, built churches, and started Greek schools. The family in the diaspora became, as in Greece, the bedrock of the community, and the women—also as in Greece—became the carriers and keepers of values, tradition, and language. Everyone celebrated the religious festivals, participated in the historical holidays and attended weddings, baptisms, funerals, and all other communal activities. In 1987 I was invited to present a paper as a sociologist about the Greeks in Canada at the First International Congress of the Hellenic Diaspora in Athens in the spring of 1988. Having accepted the invitation, I set out to do library research on the subject. There was hardly any material published on Greeks in Canada; most of what there was comprised statistical information on immigration rates and related government data. Prior to undertaking the research, I had been an active, elected member of a Greek community board, and I knew most of the pioneer women of the community—seven widows varying in age from their late seventies to late eighties. I spent long hours with a tape recorder collecting their stories about life in Greece, immigration, marriage and family in Canada, their role in the community, and their relationship with the women

who joined the community during the subsequent waves of immigration to Edmonton. For more information see Pizanias 1989, 1991, 1993, and 1995.

⁸Michael P. Smith, "Postmodernism, Urban Ethnography, and the New Social Space of Ethnic Identity," *Theory and Society* 21 (1992): 493-531 (quotation from 508).

⁹Support for this decision comes from other women writers, such as Trinh T. Minh-ha, Pratibha Parmar, Rey Chow, and Gayatri Chakrovorti, Spivak, and some men such as Edward Said and Kobena Mercer. As a cultural sociologist who studies contemporary issues in order to locate the data I need for my work, I have ended up collecting oral histories because that is the only way to get most of the information I need. In the process of collecting "data," I became fascinated with the writing strategies of classical ethnography: according to the maneuverings (i.e., methodological strategies) which were deemed appropriate, all traces of myself and the person I am writing about must be extricated from the text. I have to produce objective texts that say nothing much about the subjects of my study, my experiences with them, and other such subjective pollutants. I am expected to repeat received theories, so that I can come up with some more abstractions that either screen or cover up the interesting stuff from the unpublished field notes—"take theory and apply it to the text. If you do this, you will be regarded as a serious, what is called professional, person." I cannot locate this quotation; I read it a few years ago in an art review and it has stayed with me. For further discussion of the contradictions and paradoxes of academic writing, see Pizanias, "Women's Words and Sociology's Representations: Who Gets Sold Out in the End?" (unpublished paper presented at the Learned Societies Conference at Carleton University in Ottawa, June 4, 1993, in the session on Oral History: Research in Progress).

¹⁰My encounter and involvement with, and subsequent commitment to tell part of the story of, Greek women in the diaspora has evolved into an ongoing academic project both to position myself in the "game of culture" (Bourdieu 1984, 12) and to understand the why, the desire to keep participating in the discourse of ethnic identity in the diaspora.

¹¹Ward Jouve writes:

White woman speaks with forked tongue: this writer wants to find out, through writing, why she writes. She writes fiction as well as criticism. The two seep into each other. She writes as academic, straining towards theory, and as a woman. Sometimes she allows everything she is to filter through into writing, and then she becomes frightened of what she's done, and she pushes it under. And the voice that grapples with reality oozes into the texts that try to be one remove, the structure that the critical voice has erected. (1991, viii-ix)

¹²Pierre Bourdieu, quoted in Derek Robbins, *The Work of Pierre Bourdieu* (Boulder, Co.: Westview Press, 1991): 4.

¹³The reader might want to look into the following exceptions: Jackson 1983a; and Csordas 1990.

¹⁴For excellent discussions of the constructedness of identity and of the necessity of pushing the disciplinary boundaries if we are to describe/make sense of/and theorize our postcolonial experience, see *After Colonialism: Imperial Histories and Postcolonial Displacements*, ed. Gyan Prakash (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), and *Displacements: Cultural Identities in Question*, ed. Angelika Bammer (Bloomington/Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994).

¹⁵Bourdieu has written mostly about "artistic fields." What follows is a lengthy but merely schematic summary/description of the "field" and how it operates synchronically and diachronically. The artistic field is populated by agents (artists, actors, authors, writers, dealers, critics, directors, publishers, etc.) and institutions (galleries, museums, academies, etc.). It is a site of artistic *prise de position* (position takings or stances) that are possible at any given period in any given art world/artistic field (genres, schools, styles, subjects, manners, etc.); the position takings or stances arise from the encounter between particular agents' dispositions, that is, their *habitus*, which refers to a system of acquired schemes that become practically effective as categories of perception and evaluation, as principles of classification, and also as principles of organizing social action. The artistic field is a *field of forces*, but also a *field of struggles*, between the two principles of hierarchization: the *heteronomous* principle, favorable to those who dominate the field, and the *autonomous* principle, favorable to those least endowed with specific capital (symbolic, economic, cultural, or social). The artistic field is, then, a space of contestation for distinction, that is, there are constant efforts (a) to define position, (b) to defend against it, and (c) to distinguish it from those below. In order to understand the practices of artists and their products, one needs to understand that they are the result of the meeting of two histories: the history of the positions they occupy and the history of their dispositions. In order for that to be accomplished one must understand the *strategies* employed by the agents of the artistic field; strategies are understood as the orientation of practice, which is neither conscious nor calculative, nor mechanically determined, but rather the product of a "sense" for this particular game (the production and consumption of art). Finally, the art object is both merchandise and meaning, the latter being necessarily collective and existing solely by virtue of the collective belief which knows and acknowledges it as a work of art.

I constructed this summary description of Pierre Bourdieu's use of the artistic field from the following sources: "The Historical Genesis of Pure Aesthetic," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 46 (1987-88): 201-210; "The Field of Cultural Production, or, The Economic

World Reversed," *Poetics* 12 (1983): 311-356; "The Market of Symbolic Goods," *Poetics* 14 (1985): 13-44; "Flaubert's Point of View," *Critical Inquiry* 14 (1988): 539-562. For those who do not want to follow Bourdieu's applications of habitus in any organized manner, see chapter 2, section 4 in Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc J.D. Wacquant (1992, 115-140) for a thorough recapitulation and references to the detractors as well as the supporters of the concept and its author.

¹⁶*Rebetika* generally refer to the dances—*basapikos*, *zeibekikos*, and *tsifteteli*—originally danced by the *rebetes*, men of the urban underclass—sailors, ex-convicts, soldiers, drug users, and various sympathizers and wannabes from the working class. These dances are slow, with intricate, mostly improvisational steps, danced solo or in pairs; to this day, these dances are seen as symbolizing the unbridled masculinity of the outlaw *rebetes*. *Rebetika* entered the mainstream society during the 1950s and 1960s in popular films made by directors Nikos Koundouros, Mihalis Cacoyiannis, and Jules Dassin, with *rebetika*-influenced musical scores written by composers such as Manos Hadjidakis, Mikis Theodorakis, and Stavros Xarhakos. Jules Dassin's *Never On Sunday*, starring his wife, the late Melina Mercouri, not only introduced *basapiko* and *zeibekiko* to an international audience, but made it acceptable for women to do these dances.

¹⁷See Caterina Pizani, "Greek Families in Canada: Fragile Truths, Fragmented Stories," in *Voices: Essays on Canadian Families*, ed. Marion Lynn (Toronto: Nelson Canada, 1995): 329-360.

¹⁸Bourdieu in his essay, "Structures, Habitus, Power: Basis for a Theory of Symbolic Power" writes about domination in doxic communities:

Thus the system contains only two ways (and they prove in the end to be just one way) of getting and keeping a lasting hold over someone: gifts or debts, the overtly economic obligations of debt, or the "moral" or "affective" obligations created and maintained by exchange, in short, overt (physical or economic) violence, or symbolic violence—*censored, euphemized, i.e. unrecognizable, socially recognized violence*... [when] domination can only be exercised in its *elementary form*, i.e. directly between one person and another, it cannot take place overtly and must be disguised under the veil of enchanted relationships, the official model of which is presented by relations between kinsmen; in order to be socially recognized it must get itself misrecognized.

In *Culture/Power/History: A Reader in Contemporary Social Theory*, ed. Nicholas B. Dirks, Geoff Eley, and Sherry B. Ortner (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994): 185.

¹⁹Quoted in Audrey Kobayashi's "Multiculturalism: Representing a Canadian Institution," in *Place/Culture/Representation*, ed. James Duncan and David Ley (London and New York: Routledge, 1993): 212.

²⁰The rise of multiculturalism in Canada can be related to a series of events taking place during the 1960s both within and outside Canada. Within Canada, the unrest in Quebec following the rise of the separatist FLQ and Charles de Gaulle's declaration in Montreal, "Vive le Québec libre," coupled with Native American unrest and an increased immigration flow from countries other than the traditional western and northern European nations, created an atmosphere of urgency about Canada as a political federation with a cultural identity distinct from that of the United States. In 1963, the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism was established with the express mandate to study the status of and interrelationships between the French- and English-speaking groups. Shortly thereafter, the Commission received reports, complaints, and requests from almost all other groups in Canada, who wanted to clarify their part in Canada's history and status quo. Their response was so extensive and loud that the Commission came up with the solution of celebrating Canada as a "multicultural mosaic" within a bilingual framework. The Commission's recommendations were accepted by the government and were approved as the basis for a policy of multiculturalism in October 1971. The government succeeded in diffusing for a time some of the polarization endemic to the Quebec independence movement, while at the same time providing a basis on which the rising Anglo-Canadian intelligentsia could identify itself as something neither French nor American. As for the "other" ethnic groups in Canada, they received varying degrees of attention and/or privileges, depending on their numbers.

²¹Canada has been in the midst of a protracted constitutional debate being waged among its "chartered" peoples—French and English—and its "native" populations. All the others, who usually fall under the rubric of "multicultural" groups, decided to enter the fray rather belatedly—during the summer of 1992, the summer of the Meech Lake Accord—and have failed to secure a position around the constitutional debate table. That year's banners in Calgary advertising the Heritage Day (August 6, 1992) festivities (Referendum Day was October 26, 1992) proclaimed: "Unity on Heritage Fest's Menu: Forget the Constitution—we can all enjoy good things to eat!" The way to the nation's heart once again was through its stomach! For the latest on the debate, see *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*, ed. Amy Gutmann (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995).

²²See Hart, 1985; Choko 1988; and Tippet 1990.

²³Gibbon, in his book *Canadian Mosaic: The Making of a Northern Nation* (1938, ix) reports that he first saw Canada described as a "mosaic" in a travelogue, *Romantic Canada* (1922), by an American writer, Victoria Hayward, who described the Canadian prairie as "a mosaic of vast dimensions and great breadth." Another writer, Kate A. Foster, published a book under the title *Our Canadian Mosaic*

(1926), a book that was, according to Gibbon, "a manual of information for social workers" about "foreign-born New Canadians" (Gibbon 1938, ix).

²⁴Carole Carpenter (1985) explains this affinity for the quaint as going back to the first English settlers, who came in small numbers and who lived in relative isolation in central Canada except for the occasional contacts with various government/army personnel and merchants. These settlers, fearful of the extreme climatic conditions and unforgiving geography, built their homes within forts, filled them with treasures from the homeland, and seldom ventured outside their small civilized garrisons. But when it became necessary to import large numbers of immigrants to build the railroad and to populate the west during the second half of the nineteenth century, the only Europeans willing to come were peasants from continental Europe escaping famines and political and religious persecution. Once they arrived by boat in the eastern ports, they were put on trains and shipped to the western provinces without any opportunity to become acquainted with the cultural patterns and temperaments of the "garrison" mentality.

²⁵Following is a sampling of politicians' statements during opening ceremonies in Edmonton's Heritage Festivals for the years I kept field notes. All the quotations come from program notes for the years indicated; all emphasis is mine. "It is personally gratifying to know that a festival of our *cultural mosaic* is so popular that it continually attracts these large crowds. To me, this is yet a further evidence of Edmonton's unique and truly rich character" (C. J. Purves, mayor, 1983). "Each year on Heritage Day, Albertans come together with a unity of purpose to reflect on and share in the various historical and ethnocultural contributions made by our *global community*" (Dennis L. Anderson, minister of culture, 1986). "Heritage Days is more than a festival of song, dance, costumes and traditional foods of the participating communities. It is a *celebration of our freedom* to express our rich heritage and share with others the values we hold" (Laurence Decore, mayor, 1987). "The sharing and retention of the many diverse cultures, languages and traditions that make up our multicultural society is essential to maintaining a *harmonious* and vibrant Canada" (David Crombie, minister of multiculturalism, 1987). "With many different ethnocultural groups sharing the enjoyment of this day through music and dancing, traditional costumes and a tremendous variety of foods, it is a great summertime occasion" (Alberta Premier Don Getty, 1987). "The people of Alberta, a *colourful mosaic* of what makes this province strong" (Doug Martin, NDP leader of the provincial opposition, 1987).

²⁶Kobena Mercer, *Welcome to the Jungle: New Positions in Black Cultural Studies* (New York and London: Routledge, 1994): 6.

²⁷See Kobayashi 1993. See also Peter 1981, Moodley 1981, 1993; Carpenter 1985; Hart 1985; Nourbese-Philip 1987; and Cohnstaedt 1990.

²⁸See Mouzelis 1978, 78-81; Alivizatos 1986, 602-72; Clogg 1993; and Petrides 1994.

²⁹Dora Stratou was born in 1903 in Athens of a well-to-do family—her father, Nicolaos Stratos, was a minister in the Greek parliament and her maternal grandfather was popular novelist Dimitris Koromilas. She received lessons in piano, dance, and theater, and in 1953 founded a Greek folklore group which was based in Piraeus. In 1971 it was transferred to Athens, where it was given a permanent theater space, and to date it remains a major tourist attraction. Most of what we know about her efforts and research is from her own, somewhat self-aggrandizing, book, *A Tradition, An Adventure* (1963). In the English translation (1966), which consists of the main points of the original, Christian Zervos in his foreword writes: "The spectacle Dora Stratou has offered us these past many years embraces only those dances whose *authenticity* is absolutely *guaranteed*. For Dora Stratou is interested only in the dances for which *she* finds crystal clear evidence. These dances as they are still danced today are precious, for they have preserved their *original* movements in their *entirety*. And the tremendous value of Dora Stratou is that *she* has succeeded in showing us this choreography absolutely *unaltered*, with all its archaic elements intact" (8; emphasis is mine).

³⁰If Dora Stratou's work has attracted only male interpreters—choreographers and dancers alike—another woman's pioneering research in the area of traditional women's dress has had a different effect. The work of Angeliki Hatzimihali, author and folklorist, has become the basis of meticulous and extensive research by a number of women scholars that is unprecedented in Greek folklorists. See for example Hatzimihali 1977, Papantoniou 1973 and Zora 1981. Also see the occasional monographs published by a work collective under the general title *Greek Folklore Culture* (Athens: Gnosi Publishers). All are in Greek. Another excellent source for folklore scholarship is the publication (mostly in Greek and occasionally in English) *Ethnographica* by the Peloponnesian Folklore Foundation, Nafplion, 1 Vasileos Alexandrou Street, Greece.

³¹R. Loutzaki, "The Dances of Megara," *Ethnographica* 3 (1981-82): 81-112; "Wedding as a Dance Event," 1983-85 Special Publication of the Peloponnesian Folklore Foundation; "Traditional Dance in Greece," 1985 special publication of Hellexpo, Thessaloniki.

³²See Gerasimos Avgustinos, *The Greeks of Asia Minor: Confession, Community and Ethnicity in the Nineteenth Century* (Kent: Kent State University Press, 1994).

³³Recently there has been a flurry of publications in an emerging critical discourse on dance, most notably the work of Sally Banes, where some references on ethnic dance appear in relation to the aesthetic of the 1980s' cultural pluralism, which characterized some of the choreographic sensibilities, where "the alternative techniques plundered by

various choreographers and producers—from Capoeira, Salsa, and break-dancing to tapdancing and juggling—showed the postmodern proclivity not only for traditions for other cultures, but also for those despised or overlooked from American subcultures and popular culture” (Banes 1994, 308). In Bourdieusian terms, she is speaking about dancing born of truly popular or ethnic roots that has been appropriated, choreographed, that is, has become property of the “learned” few, and returned to the people in the form of spectacle. Nothing much about the “ethnic” bodies in motion. Regardless of its shortcomings—from my vantage point at the moment—her book from which the above quote was excerpted, *Writing Dancing in the Age of Postmodernism*, includes a wealth of information stemming from Banes’s approach of seeing ethnography and dance criticism as being similar, sharing a role and problematic, a role which “is that of a translator of sorts, one who translates, not between two languages, but between experience and language, between experience and (by and large) the page” (Banes 1994, 17). How true indeed, and how much more fieldwork needs to be done among ethnic folklore dance groups! Other sources include “Viewing Women: The Display of the Female Body in Dance” by Christy Adair, in *Body Matters: Leisure, Images and Lifestyles* (LSA Publication No. 47) (Brighton, U.K.: Leisure Studies Association, University of Brighton, 1993): 39-44. In the same issue, see also “Adolescent Girls and Disco Dancing” by Deidre Brennan (6-11). Also see Sally Banes, *Terpsichore in Sneakers: Post-Modern Dance* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1981) and *Writing Dancing in the Age of Postmodernism* (Hanover: Wesleyan University Press, 1994).

³⁴See J. Dubisch, “The Domestic Power of Women in a Greek Island Village,” *Studies in European Society* 1 (1974): 23-32; and J. Dubisch, *Gender and Power in Rural Greece* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986). See also P. Loizos and E. Papataxiarchis, *Contested Identities: Gender and Kinship in Modern Greece* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991).

³⁵See Papantoniou 1973 and Zora 1981.

³⁶I strongly recommend the work of C. Nadia Seremetakis, a Greek author and ethnographer whose work centers around women, the body, and rituals of gender/power in contemporary rural Greece. See Seremetakis 1984, 1990, 1991 and 1993. Another interesting work is that of Caraveli, 1982 and 1985.

³⁷Rena Loutzaki, in her literature review (1992, 43-46), counted 322 local folk dances from across Greece and Cyprus being discussed. Not counting Zorba’s dance, *syriaki!*

WORKS CITED

- ADAIR, C. 1993. "Viewing Women: The Display of the Female Body in Dance" in *Body Matters: Leisure Images and Lifestyles*, ed. by Celia Brackenridge, Leisure Studies Association, Publication No. 47: 39-44.
- ALIVIZATOS, N. 1986. *Political Institutions in Crisis 1922-1974: Aspects of the Greek Experience*. Athens: Themelio Publishers. (In Greek)
- AVGUSTINOS, G. 1994. *The Greeks of Asia Minor: Confession, Community and Ethnicity in the Nineteenth Century*. Kent: Kent State University Press.
- BAMMER, A. 1994. *Displacements: Cultural Identities in Question*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- BANES, S. 1994. *Writing Dancing in the Age of Postmodernism*. Hanover and London: University Press of New England.
- BENNETT, R. C. 1993. "Why is the Romance of Dance so Absent from Academic Discourse?" in *Body Matters: Leisure Images and Lifestyles*, ed. by Celia Brackenridge, Leisure Studies Association, Publication No. 47: 207-217.
- BERGER, B. JR. 1987. "Bodies and Texts," *Representations* 17: 44-66.
- BHABHA, H. K. 1994. "Frontlines/Borderposts" in *Displacements: Cultural Identities in Question*, ed. by Angelika Bammer. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press: 269-272.
- BOURDIEU, P. 1977. *Outline of A Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1983. "The Field of Cultural Production, or, The Economic World Revisited," *Poetics* 12: 311-356.
- _____. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- _____. 1985. "The Market of Symbolic Goods," *Poetics* 14: 13-44.
- _____. 1987-88. "The Historical Genesis of Pure Aesthetic," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 46: 201-210.
- _____. 1988. "Flaubert's Point of View," *Critical Inquiry* 14: 539-562.
- _____. 1990. *In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- _____. and L.J.D. Wacquant. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1993. "How can one be a sports fan?" in *The Cultural Studies Reader*, ed. by Simon During. London and New York: Routledge: 339-356.
- _____. 1994. "Structures, Habitus, Power: Basis for a Theory of Symbolic Power" in *Culture/Power/History*, ed. by N. B. Dirks, G. Eley and S. B. Ortner. Princeton: Princeton University Press: 155-199.

- BRACKENRIDGE, C. 1993. ed. *Body Matters: Leisure Images and Lifestyles*. Leisure Studies Association. Eastbourne: University of Brighton. Publication Number 47.
- BRENNAN, D. 1993. "Adolescent Girls and Disco Dancing" in *Body Matters: Leisure Images and Lifestyles*, ed. by Celia Brackenridge, Leisure Studies Association, Publication No. 47: 6-11.
- BURNET, J. 1976. "Ethnicity: Canadian Experience and Policy," *Sociological Focus* 9(2): 199-207.
- BUTLER, J. 1993. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex."* New York and London: Routledge.
- CARAVELI, A. 1982. "The Song Beyond the Song: Aesthetics and Social Interaction in Greek Folksong." *Journal of American Folklore* 95: 129-158.
- _____. 1985. "The Symbolic Village: Community Born in Performance." *Journal of American Folklore* 98: 259-286.
- CARPENTER, C. H. 1985. "The Ethnicity Factor in Anglo-Canadian Folkloristics" in *Explorations in Canadian Folklore*, ed. by Edith Fouke and Carole H. Carpenter. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- CASSIN, A. H. AND GRIFFIN, A. I. 1981. "Class and Ethnicity: Producing the Difference That Counts." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 132: 109-129.
- CHOKO, M. H. AND D. JONES. 1988. *Canadian Pacific Posters 1883-1963*. Montreal: Meridian Press.
- CLARKE, A. 1993. "Everybody Loves Somebody: Significant Signs in Leisure and Tourism" in *Body Matters: Leisure Images and Lifestyles*, ed. by Celia Brackenridge, Leisure Studies Association, Publication No. 47: 218-224.
- CLOGG, R. 1993. *Concise History of Greece 1770-1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- COHNSTAEDT, J. 1990. "Human Rights and Canadian Cultural Policy" in *Practicing the Arts in Canada, Canadian Issues* 12: 51-63.
- COWAN, J. K. *Dance and the Body Politic in Northern Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- CSORDAS, T. J. 1990. "Embodiment on a Paradigm for Anthropology." *Ethos* 18: 5-47.
- DIRKS, N. B., G. ELEY AND S. B. ORTNER eds. 1994. *Culture|Power|History: A Reader in Contemporary Social Theory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- DUBISCH, J. 1974. "The Domestic Power of Women in a Greek Island Village" in *Studies in European Society* 1(1): 23-33.
- _____. 1986. "Introduction" in *Gender and Power in Rural Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press: 3-41.
- DURING, S. ed. 1993. *The Cultural Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.
- ESMAN, M. R. 1982. "Festivals, Change and Unity: The Celebration of

- Ethnic Identity Among Louisiana Cajuns." *Anthropology Quarterly*, Vol. 55: 199-210.
- FALK, P. 1994. *The Consuming Body*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- FEATHERSTONE, M., M. HEPWORTH, AND B. S. TURNER eds. 1991. *The Body: Social Process and Cultural Theory*. London, Newbury Park, New Delhi: Sage Publications Ltd.
- FEHER, M. 1989. ed. with R. Naddaff and N. Tazi. *Fragments for a History of the Human Body: Part One*. New York: Zone Books.
- FOUCAULT, M. 1979. *Discipline and Punish*. New York: Vintage Books.
- GAINES, J. AND C. HERZOG eds. 1990. *Fabrications: Costume and the Female Body*. New York and London: Routledge.
- GIBBON, J. M. 1938. *Canadian Mosaic: The Making of a Northern Nation*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd.
- GROSZ, E. 1994. *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- GUTMANN, A. ed. 1995. *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- HART, E. J. 1985. *The Selling of Canada: The CPR and the Beginnings of Canadian Tourism*. Banff: Altitude Publishing Inc.
- HARVEY, J. AND R. SPARKS. 1991. "The Politics of the Body in the Context of Modernity," *Quest* 43: 163-189.
- HATZIMIHALI, A. 1977. *The Greek Traditional Dress: Costumes with Sigouni*. Athens: Melissa Publishers in collaboration with the Benaki Museum. (In Greek)
- JACKSON, M. 1983a. "Knowledge of the Body," *Man* 18: 327-345.
- . 1983b. "Thinking Through the Body: An Essay on Understanding Metaphor," *Social Analysis* 14: 127-149.
- KAVOURAS, P. 1992. "Dance at Olymbos, Karpathos: Cultural Change and Political Confrontations." *Ethnographica* 8: 173-190.
- KOBAYASHI, A. 1993. "Multiculturalism: Representing a Canadian Institution" in *Place/Culture/Representation*, ed. by James Duncan and David Ley. London and New York: Routledge: 205-231.
- KOURIA, A. 1992. "Thoughts on Some Dance Themes in Modern Greek Painting." *Ethnographica* 8: 211-214.
- LABERGE, S. AND D. SANKOFF. 1988. "Physical Activities, Body Habitus, and Lifestyles" in *Not Just a Game: Essays in Canadian Sport Sociology*, ed. by J. Harvey and H. Cantelon. Ottawa: Ottawa University Press: 267-286.
- LOIZOS, P. AND E. PAPTAXIARCHIS. 1991. *Contested Identities: Gender and Kinship in Modern Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- LOUTZAKI, R. 1981-82. "The Dances of Megara." *Ethnographica* 3: 81-112.
- . 1983-85. "Wedding as a Dance Event." *Ethnographica*. Special Publication of the Peloponnesian Folklore Foundation.

-
- _____. 1985. "Traditional Dance in Greece." Special Publication of Helleexpo, Thessaloniki.
- _____. 1992. "Greek Dances: A Critical Review of Books Relating to the Traditional Dances." *Ethnographica* 8: 159-172.
- MACCANNELL, D. 1994. "Cannibal Tours" in *Visualizing Theory: Selected Essays from V.A.R. 1990-1994*, ed. by Lucien Taylor. New York and London: Routledge: 99-114.
- MILES, M. R. 1991. *Carnal Knowing: Female Nakedness and Religious Meaning in the Christian West*. New York: Vintage Books, a division of Random House, Inc.
- MINH-HA, T. T. 1992. *Framer Framed*. New York: Routledge.
- MOODLEY, K. 1983. "Canadian Multiculturalism as Ideology," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 63: 320-331.
- MOUZELIS, N. P. 1978. *Modern Greece: Facets of Underdevelopment*. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan Press Ltd.: 3-55.
- NOURBESE, P. AND M. NOURBESE. 1987. "The Multicultural White Wash: Racism in Ontario's Arts Funding System." *FUSE*: Fall Issue.
- PAPANTONIOU, I. 1973. *Greek Costumes*. Athens. Aspiotiki. (In Greek, English and French).
- PETER, K. 1981. "The Myth of Multiculturalism and Other Political Fables" in *Ethnicity, Power and Politics in Canada*, ed. by Jorgen Dahlie and Trissa Fernando. Toronto: Methuen: 56-67.
- PETRIDES, P. 1994. *Lambrakis' Murder: Unpublished Documents 1963-66*. Athens: Sideratos Publishers. (In Greek)
- PIZANIAS, C. 1989. "Penelope Then and Now: Some Aspects of the Social Position of Women in the Greek Diaspora," unpublished paper presented to the Committee on Scholarship Events and Presentations, Sociology Department, University of Calgary.
- _____. 1991. "After the Odyssey Babylon: The Social Construction of Ethnicity in the Hellenic Diaspora." *Proceedings to the First International Congress on the Hellenic Diaspora from Antiquity to Modern Times*, Vol. 2, ed. by John Fossey. Amsterdam, Netherlands: J. C. Gieben Publishers: 379-390.
- _____. 1992. "Centering on Changing Communities: Multiculturalism as Meaning and Message." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 24(3): 87-98.
- _____. 1993. "Women's Words and Sociology's Representations: Who Gets Sold Out in the End?" Unpublished paper presented at the Learned Societies Conference, Carleton University, Ottawa, June 4, 1993, in the session on Oral History: Research in Progress.
- _____. 1995. "Greek Families in Canada: Fragile Truths, Fragmented Stories": in *Voices: Essays on Canadian Families*, ed. by Marion Lynn. Toronto: Nelson Canada: 329-360.
- PRAKASH, G. 1995. ed. *After Colonialism: Imperial Histories and Postcolonial Displacements*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
-

- ROBBINS, D. 1991. *The Work of Pierre Bourdieu: Recognizing Society*. Boulder and San Francisco: Westview Press.
- ROMBOU-LEVIDI, M. 1992. "Thoughts on the Relationship Between Folk Dance and Modern Dance in Greece Today." *Ethnographica* 8: 215-218.
- SALAMONE, S. D. AND J. B. STANTON. 1986. "Introducing the Nikokyra: Ideality and Reality in Social Process" in Dubish, J. (ed.) *Gender and Power in Rural Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press: 97-120.
- SEREMETAKIS, C. N. 1984. "The Eye of the Other" *Journal of Modern Hellenism* 1(1): 63-67.
- _____. 1990. "The Ethics of Antiphony: The Social Construction of Pain, Gender and Power in Southern Peloponnese," *Ethos* 18(4): 481-511.
- _____. 1991. *The Last Word: Women, Death, and Divination in Inner Mani*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1993. *Ritual, Power and the Body: Historical Perspectives on the Representation of Greek Women*. New York: Pella Publishing Company.
- _____. 1994. "The Memory of the Senses, Historical Exchange, and Modernity" in *Visualizing Theory: Selected Essays from V.A.R. 1990-1994*, ed. by Lucien Taylor. New York and London: Routledge: 214-229.
- SHILLING, C. 1993. *The Body and Social Theory*. London, Newbury Park, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- SMITH, M. P. 1992. "Postmodernism, Urban Ethnography, and the New Social Space of Ethnic Identity," *Theory and Society* 21: 493-531.
- STRATOU, D. 1966. *The Greek Dances: Our Living Link with Antiquity*. Translation by Amy Mims-Argrakakis. Athens: Dora Stratou.
- _____. 1969. *A Tradition... An Adventure: The Greek Folk Dances*. Athens: Goni Publishers. (In Greek)
- SULEIMAN, S. R. 1985. *The Female Body in Western Culture*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.
- TAYLOR, L. 1994. ed. *Visualizing Theory: Selected Essays from V.A.R. 1990-1994*. New York and London: Routledge.
- TIPPETT, M. 1990. *Making Culture: English-Canadian Institutions and the Arts Before the Massey Commission*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- TORP, L. 1992. "Zorba's Dance: The Story of a Dance Illusion and Its Touristic Value." *Ethnographica* 8: 207-210.
- TURNER, B. S. 1984. *The Body and Society: Explorations in Social Theory*. Oxford and New York: Basil Blackwell.
- WARD JOUVE, N. 1991. *White Woman Speaks with Forked Tongue: Criticism as Autobiography*. London and New York: Routledge.

- ZEITLIN, F. I. 1985a. "The Power of Aphrodite: Eros and the Boundaries of the Self in the Hippolytus" in *Directions in Euripidean Criticism: A Collection of Essays*, ed. by Peter Curian. Durham: Duke University Press: 53-111.
- _____. 1985b. "Playing the Other: Theatre, Theatricality, and the Feminine in Greek Drama," *Representations* 11: 63-94.
- ZORA, P. 1981. *Embroideries and Jewelry for Greek Folk Costumes*. Athens: The Museum of Greek Folklore Art. (In Greek)

Demetrios Capetanakis: A Greek Poet in England*

by DAVID RICKS

Many English readers will have read Capetanakis's poems "Abel" and "The Isles of Greece" in the fifth book appended to Palgrave's *Golden Treasury*, by John Press in 1964.¹ Although a number of the most eminent Greek men of letters settled permanently in England—here one might single out the classic figures of demoticism, Pallis, Eftaliotis, and Vlasto—it's a surprise to be reading through a standard anthology of English verse and to come across a Greek name.² Some readers have then gone on to discover the posthumous book on which Capetanakis's English reputation rests. This slim and elegant volume, *Demetrios Capetanakis: A Greek Poet in England*, appeared in 1947, three years after the poet's death, edited and published by his friend John Lehmann. It must have enjoyed reasonable sales at the time, for it was reprinted in a New York edition in 1949 with the title *The Shores of Darkness*.³ It would be fair, however, to say that the success of the dead poet was rather *d' estime*, and he is today little known as a poet in England. Indeed, the 1944 edition of Press's anthology has squeezed Capetanakis out.⁴

Where, then, does Capetanakis's interest as an English poet lie? For the poet's own friends, whether Greek or British, there was, in the first place, a sense that his efforts in the exploration and the practice of an adopted literature—conducted

*This essay is based on a lecture given at the British Council in Athens at a commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of Capetanakis's death, and later in a revised form at the Council's Thessaloniki branch.

DAVID RICKS is Lecturer in Modern Greek at King's College London. He has published widely on Modern Greek and Byzantine literature.

under conditions of world war and mortally worsening health—constituted more than a psychological curiosity (though that too, perhaps).⁵ Capetanakis had a restless and searching mind, which seized on a newly adopted culture as it had earlier embraced and then rejected that of Germany. So conscious was this choice that it not only has the force of a serious moral decision but may also shed some light on the permeable barriers between literary cultures, where Greeks often find themselves.

The story of Capetanakis's years in England is easily told in the sense that they were outwardly uneventful. Arriving in 1939, he worked steadily to acquire a knowledge of what was to him a new—but excitingly new—language and literature. (His impressions of what that literature meant to him are full of interest, as we shall see.) Soon associated with a dominant literary circle, the personal impression Capetanakis made on English writers is clear both from the act of piety that led to the publication of his English work and from the tributes by Lehmann, Edith Sitwell, and William Plomer included in the volume with a memoir by Panagiotis Kanellopoulos. All of the above set down a strong sense of the man's character and capacities; but would we be right to infer that this was a case where one might say, with Cavafy, *Χάσσομεν... τὸ πρὸ τίμιον—τὴν μορφή του*, and leave it at that?

On his death, Capetanakis left a small English *oeuvre*, but still an impressive result of under five years' work in a new language: 148 pages were considered publishable by Lehmann. These include the poems on which Capetanakis's reputation rests, and an essay called "A View of English Poetry," both of which I shall turn to later, but the bulk of the work consists of a truly cosmopolitan set of essays: on Rimbaud, Dostoevsky, Proust, Charlotte Brontë, Stefan George. The essays are, like Capetanakis's Greek ones, dense, suggestive, sometimes obscure, always deeply felt, and self-consciously indebted to his revered Kierkegaard.

The title Capetanakis was to have given to a prospective book of essays was *The Shores of Darkness*, and the image pervades his treatment of his chosen authors.⁶ It also has clear enough relevance to the state of the world in which he knew

England—perhaps especially at the time when Britain and Greece alone stood against the menace of the Axis—and to his own imperiled health. But we need to recall the poem from which Capetanakis took the phrase in order fully to appreciate its central place in his work. In his sonnet, "To Homer" (1818), Keats, speaking of Homer's blindness as a source of insight, says, "Aye, on the shores of darkness there is light." Unable to read Homer in Greek but eager to learn, the English poet seeks the Greek example as an escape from his predicament: in comparable fashion, but by an inversion, Capetanakis seeks escape from his Greekness to find insight through the poetry of an adopted culture, in which he can move free of inhibitions.⁷

The inhibitions are partly those he feels as a Greek burdened by the past, as we shall see from his poem, "The Isles of Greece"; but they are also those resulting from an ultimately stultifying encounter with another adopted culture, that of Germany. In his essay on Stefan George, Capetanakis sets out his definition of what he considers to be the foundations—and, for him, the attractions—of English poetry in contradistinction to that of Germany and of George in particular. While recognizing that George never showed any sympathy for the Nazis and died outside Germany in 1933, Capetanakis considers that he was, nonetheless, "undoubtedly one of Hitler's forerunners."⁸ The reason is that George is, in the Greek poet's view, "the most typical example of a pure state poet in modern times"—something unknown to England. Capetanakis goes on to say, in an important passage:

By all this we do not mean that English poetry is a power dissolving the reality of man. On the contrary, we find a strong tendency in the tradition of English poetry to make man conscious of himself and his fate—that is, to make him more solid and more real. But the means English poetry uses to achieve this are different from the means used by state poetry. Instead of reconciling man with the world, the great English poets reveal to him the terrifying abyss of human destiny, they lead him to the verge of the precipice,

and it is by the terror before nothingness that they make man more solid. The threat of utter destruction makes man gather all his forces in order to assert himself, his reality, his solidity, against the powers of nothingness. The reader of English poetry may be re-begot
Of absence, darkness, death: things which are not.⁹

Capetanakis's culminating quotation from Donne's "A Nocturnal upon S. Lucy's Day" is significant, quite apart from the fact that the quotation, there in its full-form beginning, "I am re-begot," appears on his tombstone in London.¹⁰ In acquainting himself with the tradition of English poetry, and at the same time attempting—how consciously at first, we cannot know—to make himself part of this tradition, Capetanakis makes the above lines his key. "A View of English Poetry," the English reader can see how a Greek freshly interprets his tradition. The essay begins with some characteristically bold generalizations:

If one could explain why the English are the gentlest and at the same time the most stubborn people of the world, one could also explain why the English language is the poetic language *par excellence*.

The English are gentle and stubborn at the same time because they are neither too gentle nor too stubborn. Balance is the secret of the English genius.¹¹

The essay, it is evident, is the sketching of a poetic Capetanakis admires and aspires to take further in his own poetry rather than a potted history of English verse. In no particular order, but with the true essayist's gift for quotation, Capetanakis moves from poet to poet: Drayton, Ben Johnson, Blake, Chaucer, Henryson, Marlowe, Keats, Collins, Spenser, Vaughan, Shakespeare. These are anthology pieces, to be sure, but internalized by a new sensibility: Capetanakis evidently feels close to the English tradition.¹²

But Capetanakis did not seek to abandon his Greek identity. He worked for the Greek embassy in London, giving two

short talks on modern Greece and publishing translations from Prevelakis and Elytis. On the strength of these, he was invited to lecture at the University of London (I presume for the Koraeis Chair at King's College London) after the war. Yet the poet's dwindling energies seem mainly to have been invested in his customary voracious reading, now from English sources such as Dickens and Dryden. Interestingly, so English a critic as Geoffrey Grigson wrote of Capetanakis that "The poems he wrote would have pleased so English a critic as Dryden in their directness and muscular simplicity"—for Capetanakis was now attempting his own contribution to English poetry.¹²

Capetanakis came to England at twenty-seven, published his first English poem at thirty, and died at thirty-two. His first poem, published under the name D. Capetanakis, appeared in *Penguin New Writing* in 1942 and was sufficient of a success that he published a number of other poems, despite the advance of ill-health.¹⁴ It is worth trying to reconstruct the first poem's effect by looking at it in a little detail, but before we do so we should outline Capetanakis's poetic legacy.

Capetanakis's poetic *oeuvre* is almost unbelievably slender, even compared to Gatsos's strictly poetic work; yet, as Grigson observed, it is a "work rich in nourishment despite its tragically meagre extent."¹⁵ We have a mere seventeen poems, several of which appeared in well-known magazines like *The Listener* and *Time and Tide*, but none longer than a page or 32 lines.¹⁶ Yet if we think of the case, familiar to Capetanakis, of Cavafy's first fascicule of poems in 1904, we shall be aware that the most modest-looking collection might have far-reaching consequences for the craft. As with Solomos's and Kalvos's aspirations to write in Greek, Capetanakis's decision to write in English is of interest to the comparative student of poetry. A. R. Rangavis wrote a few little pieces in English, but the meeting of the two poetic languages that we find in Capetanakis is indeed an unusual one, which perhaps inspired the late C. A. Trypanis to write his well-regarded English poems.¹⁷ At any rate, "Detective Story" was a characteristically inconspicuous beginning:

The stranger left the house in the small hours;
A neighbour heard his steps between two dreams;

The body was discovered strewn with flowers;
Their evenings were too passionate, it seems.

They used to be together quite a lot;
The friend was dressed in black, distinguished looking
The porter said; his wife had always thought
They were so nice and interested in cooking.

And this was true perhaps. The other night
They made a soup that was a great success;
They drank some lager too and all was right,
The talk, the kisses and last the chess.

"It was great fun!" they said; yet their true love
Throbbled in their breasts like pus that must be freed.
The porter found the weapon and the glove,
But only our despair can find the creed.¹⁸

This, like all of Capetanakis's poems, is written in fluent and flexible iambs; like all but five of them, it is in quatrains. If, as seems to be the case, Capetanakis's first deep experience of the English language was through the rhythms of ordinary speech and not from a book knowledge of English poetry, one of the important consequences of this was that his poems exert no strain on the rhythms of the language.¹⁹ The poem's title clearly indicates, on the one hand, a feigning adherence to the conventions of a humdrum, paraliterary genre, and on the other a puzzle to be made out. But what we have is not a "whodunnit," for the lurid paper covers of the plot conceal a preoccupation with the "whatdunnit."²⁰ Yet the precise nature of the crime, let alone its motivation, is concealed from the reader in a way which is surprising as original poetry is surprising: the burden is transferred squarely to us by the last line, which perhaps echoes a famous line of William Empson, "And learn a style from a despair."²¹

If one had a single word to characterize this poem even now it would indeed be: *surprising*. (That is, apart from the author's exotic-looking name, which might almost have been taken for a pseudonym on the lines of Mr. Eugenides.) The

transitions are surprising, and the final word most of all; so too the incongruity between banal, everyday phrases accurately recorded and some lurking and deadly philosophical anxiety. But, above all, the fact that the poem is by a Greek is a surprise. The poem is about risk, but is also a poem which takes risks itself; and I think that what attracted Capetanakis to writing poems in English was precisely this element of risk.²² Robert Frost famously theorized about how a good poem could not be a thought set to words as a poem may in turn be set to music, but must be something much more exploratory, in which the final destination and *dénouement* is unknown even to the poet at its inception.²³ This is the most distinctive characteristic of Capetanakis's poetry in general. Sometimes his powers of composition may be running out of step with his technical command of the language, generating mild grecisms ("My brother Cain, the wounded"), but these are as significant a part of his originality as Kalvos's solecisms are in Greek.²⁴ The risk he takes is not just that of expressing his deepest thoughts in an acquired language, but that of trying to compress a vast learning into everyday settings. The price to be paid may be obscurity; the gain is a remarkable freedom from the conventionally poetical.²⁵

In his essay on English poetry, Capetanakis epigrammatically stated his own poetics: "Power in poetry begins with anxiety."²⁶ If anxiety is one sort of excitement, then poetry is another, its antidote. It is here that Capetanakis's motivation for writing in English may be explained. Samuel Beckett commented on his writing in French: "It was a different experience from writing in English. It was more exciting for me." Again, Leonard Forster, in his classic study of bilingualism in poetry, *The Poet's Tongues*, remarks that "it sometimes happens that the poet can express his feelings more freely in the foreign language than in his own. It is as if the use of the foreign language removes certain inhibitions."²⁷

The ease and muscularity of Capetanakis's meter as it contains his idiomatic sentences is remarked on by the critics in his posthumous volume, and his deep study of the masters of English verse did not preclude a natural speaking voice. As Grigson observes, "All of his poems have this Grecian directness. They all reject inessential ornament."²⁸ Here Edith Sitwell characteris-

tically got the thing quite wrong when she remarked that "sometimes, a colloquialism found its way into the verse: this is the only sign that he was not writing in his native language, for these exceedingly rare intrusions were there in order to give an impression of ease."²⁹ In fact, the colloquialisms are rather a sign of an escape from poeticisms into what Frost called the sound of sense.³⁰ That is not to say that they are invariably successful, but everyday phrases such as "Mind the steps" or "How are you?" are given a central role in these very philosophical poems.³¹

Furthermore, despite his relish for experimentation, Capetanakis has a clear consciousness of the fallen nature of language. The poem "Angel" begins with a strong enjambment to stress this:

An angel comes bringing a smile as token
Of love, eternal love that fears no danger,
But when we need him most, he says in broken
Language "I cannot help, I am a stranger."³²

The phrase "broken/language" is particularly interesting in view of Capetanakis's own position—and when we consider that the phrase itself exemplifies broken language. (We can normally say "broken English," not "broken language.") The language of a fallen world indeed pervades Capetanakis's poetry, as it does that of an earlier bilingual Greek poet, Solomos.³³ This Fall is associated with confinement, itself emphasized in almost all the poems, and again exemplified in their brevity and tight forms. Though Capetanakis started work on two long poems in English, it is hard to believe that his allusive method would have worked on a large scale.³⁴ It is this sense of confinement conquered by agile expression that his most memorable lines and stanzas contain—there are many such—and they are no less impressive for being hard to figure out.

These qualities are visible in Capetanakis's two best-known poems. First, "Abel," which appeared in 1943:

My brother Cain, the wounded, liked to sit
Brushing my shoulder, by the staring water

Of life, or death, in cinemas half-lit
By scenes of peace that always turned to slaughter.

He liked to talk to me. His eager voice
Whispered the puzzle of his bleeding thirst,
Or prayed to me not to make my final choice
Unless we had a chat about it first.

And then he chose the final pain for me.
I do not blame his nature: he's my brother;
Now what you call the times: our love was free,
Would be at any time; but rather

The ageless ambiguity of things
Which makes life mean death, our love be hate.
My blood that streams across the bedroom sings:
"I am my brother opening the gate!"³⁵

The poem is a study in ambiguity: an undefined yet clearly risky relationship ends in disaster, but also in reconciliation; a Biblical theme has a modern setting and a range of linguistic registers, as well as a little (somehow arresting) awkwardness.³⁶ The poem of course ends with the murder of Abel (with an allusion, perhaps, to Rimbaud's attempt on Verlaine's life); but where is the resolution? The first point to note here is that where Adam in Genesis says, "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto thee from the ground," here the blood sings, creating some kind of work of art. Furthermore, the last line can only be understood through the Bible's other famous story of brotherly rivalry, that of the prodigal son (Luke 15.11-32): it is as if, alluding to the prodigal's return, the speaker Abel hints at a typology whereby crimes in a fallen world of the Old Testament will be corrected by the Messiah of the New. Whether the quarrel is actually resolved like that is no clearer than it is in the parable told by Jesus, but the opening of the gate is an impressive way to preserve this openness at the end of the poem.

Capetanakis's most celebrated poem, however, is "The Isles of Greece" (1944):

The sun is not in love with us,
Nor the corrosive sea;
Yet both will burn our dried-up flesh
In deep intimacy

With stubborn tongues of briny death
And heavy snakes of fir,
Which writhe and hiss and crack the Greek
Myth of the singing lyre.

The dusty fig-tree cries for help,
Two peasants kill one snake,
While in our rocky heart the gods
Of marble hush and break.

After long ages all our love
Became a barren fever,
Which makes us glow in martyrdom
More beautiful than ever.

Yet when the burning horses force
Apollo to dismount
And rest with us at last, he says
That beauty does not count.³⁷

The poem's title is of course an allusion to Byron's famous lyric in *Don Juan*, against which Greek poets since Solomos have reacted, and the project is a more concise and tragic version of Capetanakis's talk, "The Greeks Are Human Beings."³⁸ Tragic not least in that it echoes the penultimate sentence of Nietzsche's *Birth of Tragedy*: "But consider this, too, wonderful stranger: how much did this people have to suffer to become so beautiful."³⁹ Capetanakis, Grigson writes, uses this poem to "reject the commonplace attitudes to his country with classical severity in stanzas the control of which Dryden (again) would have admired."⁴⁰

Yet the poem, though in English, is in dialogue with modern Greek poetry too. Its style and imagery are akin to those of Seferis's quatrains in *Στροφή*, and possess a compara-

ble irony. In its refusal of heroic pretensions, in particular, the poem may be compared to Οἱ σύντροφοὶ στὸν Ἄδη, and the "Greek/myth of the singing lyre" so evocatively cracked by the enjambment from lines 7 to 8 is the Byronic myth.⁴¹ The surdness of the environment is well expressed by phrases yoked in extreme compression—"the gods of marble/hush and break"—yet the poem seems plain sailing up to the last stanza (the penultimate one refers indirectly to the war): what is going on here?

I believe we should read this as a response to another Greek poet who lived in England and whom Capetanakis greatly valued: Kalvos. In his fifth ode, Εἰς Μοῦσας (κδ'), Kalvos imagined the return of the Muses to Greece, and conjured up an image of Apollo's steeds in the West.⁴² Capetanakis has not only brought the horses back east (not west as we'd expect), but has added to the idea of their refreshing bath a more burning sensation which suggests Phaethon's mishandling of Apollo's chariot. Moreover, the Apollo who arrives in Greece to tell the Greeks that their whole ideal of τὸ καλὸν is, in fact, meaningless is as untrustworthy as the Apollo of Cavafy's poem Ἄπιστία.⁴³ Capetanakis's poem is a bleak one, in which the subtle cumulative references to modern Greek poetry, essential for putting forward the Greek way of thinking, are compressed into a new form and a new language. Before Seferis's Ὁ Βασιλιάς τῆς Ἀσίνης appeared in translation in 1948, it would have been the most powerful poetic corrective to a naive Western view of Greece.⁴⁴

So powerful that I believe it to have had an influence on a much better known poet, and I shall end with this as an indication that Capetanakis's English work not only rewards reading in itself—as an experiment by a Greek in the laboratory of poetic bilingualism—but may also have had wider ramifications.

There can be little doubt that Capetanakis's phrase "the corrosive sea" derives from "corrosive seas" in Auden and Isherwood's play, *The Dog Beneath the Skin* (1935).⁴⁵ Yet not all the poetic traffic goes that way. In "The Shield of Achilles" (1952), Auden presents a desolate world in which Hephaestus has depicted for Thetis in Achilles's shield the world as it is, not as it ideally would be.⁴⁶ Rejecting especially the picture of Keats's *Grecian*

Urn, Auden tells us in matter-of-fact language about, for example, an urchin who tries to kill a bird, going on:

That girls are raped, that two boys knife a third,
Were axioms to him, who'd never heard
Of any world where promises were kept.

I've spoken about Apollo's breach of promise (which Auden might have known from Cavafy); more vividly, however, we have two dangerous people ganging up on a third much as we do in Capetanakis's phrase, "Two peasants kill one snake."⁴⁷ It seems to me that the Greek poet's subversive and comfortless poem just might have put the germ in Auden's mind.⁴⁸ This alone would show that there is still much to be said and learned, just after fifty years since his death, about Demetrios Capetanakis and his aspiration to be part of the tradition of English poetry.⁴⁹

NOTES

¹John Press (ed.), *The Golden Treasury* (Book V) (London 1964), pp. 523-4. This is the only anthology listed in the *Columbia-Granger's Index to Poetry* (10th ed., New York 1994) in which Capetanakis appears. But Capetanakis was selected for inclusion in Geoffrey Grigson (ed.), *The Concise Encyclopaedia of Modern World Literature* (London 1963), p. 106.

²See briefly the catalogue for the British Council exhibition, *Land of Eloquence: Literary Links Between Greece and Britain* (London 1995). English influences on Greek poets other than Cavafy and Seferis have been somewhat neglected; see now David Ricks, "Solomos and Milton, Μαντάτοφόρος, forthcoming.

³*Demetrios Capetanakis: A Greek Poet in England* (ed. John Lehmann, London 1947) [hereafter *GPE*], reprinted as *The Shores of Darkness* (New York 1949). Capetanakis's poems have been reprinted (with one more poem; see n. 16 below), with a new foreword by Philip Sherrard, as *The Isles of Greece and Other Poems* (2nd edition, Athens 1987) and (with Greek translations by Nanos Valaoritis and Manolis Markakis) in *Μυθολογία του Ώραίου* (Limni and Athens 1988).

⁴John Press (ed.), *Palgrave's Golden Treasury* (6th ed., Oxford 1994).

⁵See the essays at the back of *GPE*, where biographical information may be sought; to avoid cluttering this paper with notes, I do not document every piece of information taken from this work. The reason for Capetanakis's departure for England, incidentally, is not mentioned in the volume: it may have been out of pessimism over his prospects for a post at the University of Athens (personal communication of Professor K. Despotoulos).

⁶*GPE*, p. 10.

⁷Keats, *Poetical Works* (ed. H. W. Garrod, Oxford 1972), p. 366. Keats's response to Homer, there and in "On First Looking Into Chapman's Homer" had in turn been responded to by a poet Capetanakis admired, Sikelianos (*GPE*, p. 171), in the poem "Γιόννης Κήτης"; see David Ricks, *The Shade of Homer* (Cambridge 1989), 65-74.

⁸On this point, see *GPE*, p. 181.

⁹*GPE*, pp. 85-6.

¹⁰I owe this information to William Facey.

¹¹*GPE*, p. 125.

¹²If there is a lack of sureness of touch, it concerns, not surprisingly, contemporary developments: see, e.g., the startling judgment of Edith Sitwell's superiority to Eliot (*GPE*, p. 134).

¹³Grigson, "Capetanakis."

¹⁴*Penguin New Writing* 13 (April-June 1942), 98.

¹⁵Grigson, "Capetanakis." It might also be said of Capetanakis, as of his American contemporary Weldon Kees, that his poetry "makes its deepest impression when read as a body of work rather than as a collection of isolated moments of brilliance... no single poem perhaps is perfect" (Donald Justice, introduction to Weldon Kees, *Collected Poems* (London 1993), p. viii).

¹⁶In this number I include one poem, "Lines" (probably written in 1942), included in *The Isles of Greece* but not in *GPE*.

¹⁷Rangavis's English poems are mere *jeux d'esprit*; see his "Ἀπαντα vol. 1 (Athens 1874), pp. 499-500. A more significant connection may be with the well-known English poems of C. A. Trypanis, written after his arrival in England in 1947, which may have been inspired by Capetanakis's example.

¹⁸*GPE*, p. 19.

¹⁹*GPE*, p. 174.

²⁰The setting, with its satire on conventional life, recalls much poetry of the 1930s and that of Auden in particular (see n. 38 below). There is also a barely concealed indication that the protagonists are adherents of the *ἐργονη ἀγάπη* κι *ἀποδοκιμασμένη*. (Capetanakis's poem "Experienced by Two Stones" might be compared with Thom Gunn's "The Bed" in *Collected Poems* (London 1993), p. 229.)

²¹William Empson, "This Last Pain" (1935), *Collected Poems* (London 1977), pp. 32-3. Capetanakis had lived in Cambridge, where Empson was still a legend.

²²See *GPE*, p. 161.

²³Robert Frost, "The Figure a Poem Makes" (1939), in *Collected Poems, Prose, and Plays* (ed. Richard Poirier and Mark Richardson, New York 1995), pp. 776-8.

²⁴"Abel," *GPE*, p. 24.

²⁵This tends to emerge, rather, in Capetanakis's translations from Solomos: *GPE*, pp. 166-7.

²⁶*GPE*, p. 126.

²⁷Leonard Forster, *The Poet's Tongues* (Cambridge 1970), pp. 87 (Beckett) and 48. On the question of inhibitions, see further William Arrowsmith, "Eros in Terre Haute: T. S. Eliot's 'Lune de Miel,'" *The New Criterion* 1.2 (Oct. 1982), 22-41. Such considerations would strikingly apply to Cavafy (of whom Capetanakis was an admirer: *GPE*, p. 160) and his personal notes written in English. On the phenomenon of bilingualism in modern Greek poets more generally, see G. P. Savidis, Γιά την πολυγλωσσία κάποιων νεότερων Έλλήνων ποιητών, Τò Δέντρο 33-4 (1987), 3-12. Dr. Stathis Gourgouris informs me that Greek poems by Capetanakis survive.

²⁸Grigson, "Capetanakis."

²⁹*GPE*, p. 36.

³⁰Frost, *Collected Poems, Prose and Plays*, p. 664 and *passim*.

³¹*GPE*, pp. 27, 20.

³²*GPE*, p. 32.

³³See Peter Mackridge, "Dionysios Solomos/Διονύσιος Σολωμός: poetry as a dialogue between languages," *Dialogos* 1 (1994), 59-76.

³⁴*GPE*, p. 17.

³⁵*GPE*, p. 24.

³⁶In Capetanakis's poem, "the final pain" probably echoes Empson's "This Last Pain" (see n. 17 above), especially in view of the latter's book *Seven Types of Ambiguity* (1930).

³⁷*GPE*, p. 33.

³⁸Byron, *Don Juan* III, between octaves 86 and 87; cf. the notes to Solomos's note "Ύμνος εις την Έλευθερία. Capetanakis's talk: *GPE*, pp. 43-7.

³⁹Nietzsche, *The Birth of Tragedy*, ch. 25 (tr. Shaun Whiteside).

⁴⁰Grigson, "Capetanakis."

⁴¹On Seferis's poem, see my *The Shade of Homer*, pp. 119-24. Also worth exploring in relation to Capetanakis's poem are Karyotakis's "Όλοι μαζί (1927) and Palamas's sonnet on Athens from Πατριδες (1895).

⁴²See stanza κδ'; for Capetanakis's interest in Kalvos, see *GPE*, pp. 168-71.

⁴³See David Ricks, "Cavafy the poet-historian," *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 12 (1988), 169-83.

⁴⁴George Seferis, *The King of Asine* (tr. Lawrence Durrell, Bernard Spencer, and Nanos Valaoritis, London 1948).

⁴⁵The poem, part of the play written by Auden and Christopher Isherwood, *The Dog Beneath the Skin* (1935), is to be found in *The English Auden* (ed. Edward Mendelson, London 1977), p. 114.

⁴⁶W. H. Auden, *Collected Poems* (ed. Edward Mendelson, London 1976), pp. 454-5.

⁴⁷For Cavafy's influence on Auden, see the latter's "C. P. Cavafy" in *Forewords and Afterwords* (London 1979), 333-44. A graphic example is to be found in "Rois Fainéants" (*Collected Poems*, p. 603), which is closely based on Ἀλεξανδρινοὶ Βασιλεῖς.

⁴⁸I take the word "comfortless" from Randall Jarrell's review of *The Shield of Achilles* in *Kipling, Auden & Co.* (New York 1980), p. 227.

⁴⁹Arrowsmith, "Eros in Terre Haute," p. 23, does not wish to judge whether Eliot's "Lune de Miel" is "a French poem" or "a poem in French." But William Plomer had no doubt in the case of Capetanakis: "a real poet is lost and an English poet"; cf. Peter F. Alexander, *William Plomer. A Biography* (Oxford 1989), p. 243.

Approaches to Nationalism: Basic Theoretical Considerations in the Study of the Greek-Cypriot Case and a Historical Overview

by CAESAR MAVRATSAS

With the advent of British colonial rule in 1878, Greek-Cypriot irredentist nationalism, embodied in the demand for union (*enosis*) with Greece, began to be transformed into a mass movement. In reaction to Greek-Cypriot nationalist agitation, there gradually arose an opposing Turkish-Cypriot nationalism, which in the 1950s called for the partition (*taksim*) of Cyprus along ethnic lines. The "Cyprus problem," as we understand it today, emerged out of the clash between the two opposing nationalisms and, perhaps more importantly, out of the manipulation of this clash by the British administration. Independence, in 1960, essentially imposed upon the Cypriots by Britain, Greece and Turkey, was certainly an unorthodox solution to the problem and did not meet the genuine aspirations of those who had fought for union with Greece. Notwithstanding that independence became a way of life, with a Cypriot elite in control—and whereas Greek irredentism certainly lost its mass appeal during the military regime in Greece (1967-74)—*enosis* continued to be the dominant Greek-Cypriot ideological orientation from 1960 to 1974. In conjunction with Turkish-Cypriot nationalist extremism, as well as the intervention of foreign interests, Greek-Cypriot nationalism fueled intra- and intercommunal strife, culminating in the Turkish invasion of 1974.¹ Following the events of the summer of 1974,

CAESAR MAVRATSAS is Lecturer at the Department of Social and Political Science of the University of Cyprus and specializes in the study of ethnicity and nationalism.

Cyprus is a divided island, having experienced "ethnic cleansing" long before it became a way of solving ethnic differences in the republics of former Yugoslavia. As a result of the disaster of 1974 and until about the mid-1980s, Greek-Cypriot nationalism was suppressed at the expense of "Cypriotism," an ideology that pledged support to the political independence of the island. The retreat of nationalism, however, was only temporary and it soon resurfaced as a dominant ideology, albeit in a changed form. What Greek-Cypriot nationalists aspire to in the 1990s is not union with Greece but the reaffirmation of Greek identity in the context of an independent polity which is organically tied to Greek culture and is politically anchored to the Greek state. The new Greek-Cypriot nationalism, however, does not go unopposed. Whereas the ideological clash between Greek nationalism and "Cypriotism" is by no means a recent phenomenon—it was already evident from the early phases of Greek-Cypriot nationalism and the opposition it engendered—it has acquired a greater intensity in the post-'74 years and it constitutes the major element in the social construction of Greek-Cypriot political and cultural identity.

Political, but also academic, discussions of Greek-Cypriot nationalism often suffer from four serious—and clearly inter-related, even if analytically distinct—flaws: The use of inadequate or inconsistent concepts; an ignorance of the findings of recent academic work on nationalism in other contexts; an "eclipsed" view of the past, along with a parallel unwillingness to learn from the "lessons" of history;² and, finally, a tendency to overlook the ways in which Greek nationalism in Cyprus has interacted with other social forces and dynamics in Cypriot society. The aim of this essay is twofold. First, to relate the Greek-Cypriot case to broader theoretical issues in the analysis of nationalism by drawing upon the general literature, and thus offering certain conceptual and methodological principles which can guide the empirical investigation and analysis of the Greek-Cypriot case, in terms of its history and its current morphology. And secondly, to provide a brief historical overview of the social and ideological evolution of Greek-Cypriot nationalism and the opposition it has engendered within the Greek-Cypriot community.

A. Conceptual Difficulties and the Complexity of the Issues

As almost every theorist of nationalism quickly points out, "nation" and "nationalism" have been among the most difficult and elusive concepts in the social sciences. Nationalism has been associated with a wide spectrum of other political ideologies, economic interests and cultural forces, from the most progressive to the most reactionary (Attalides 1979; Gellner 1994a, 1994b; Kellas 1991; Lekkas 1992; Smith 1983, 1986, 1991, 1994). The complexity of the issues, moreover, is enhanced by the fact that the categories and symbols of nationalism are almost always morally, emotionally and politically charged (Anderson 1991; Connor 1994; Gellner 1994a, 1994b; Kellas 1991; Lekkas 1992; Smith 1983, 1986, 1991); as a result, a cool and detached analysis becomes extremely difficult, requiring repeated exercises in what Weber called value-freedom.

There exists great disagreement over what is a nation, which are the first nations, what is nationalism, and over when did nationalism become a major political force, to mention only the most significant of the contested issues (Anderson 1991; Bryant 1995; Gellner 1994a, 1994b; Kellas 1991; Lekkas 1992; Ra'anani 1991; Smith 1983, 1986, 1991, 1994). One major dispute has involved those who view the nation as an objective category and those who stress processes of subjective identification. Among the allegedly objective criteria that delineate a nation, one finds ethnicity, language, cultural tradition, religion, common history or some combination of these elements. The "objectivity" of some of these may be easily questioned, and, moreover which of these is salient varies enormously from case to case. Some of the factors that seem to be crucial in one context being strikingly absent from another. The criterion of subjective identification, thus, appears to be more promising but it is not entirely unproblematic, especially in light of the fact that modern men and women have multiple and variable identities concerning not only nationality, but also family, religion, city, gender, occupation and so forth.

Nationalism has been a polymorphous phenomenon, which manifests itself on a variety of levels—from political organiza-

tion and collective identity to public culture, intergroup and international relations, religion and the economy. (Smith 1991) This is certainly at the core of the theoretical and methodological problems that the researcher encounters. Thus, it is becoming increasingly clear that simple context-free categories will not suffice. For one, nationalism cannot be seen simply as a political ideology which can be studied solely in relation to economic or geopolitical forces. Notwithstanding the importance of "material interests," nationalism must be viewed as a broader cultural discourse for the social construction of world views and identities. In this discourse, common myths, memory, sentiments, symbols, ceremonies, and, more generally the "invention of traditions" are of paramount significance (Appadurai 1981; Bhabba 1990; Burke 1989; Cohen 1989; Cohn 1981; Connerton 1989; Fentress and Wickham 1992; Hobsbawn and Ranger 1983; Sant Cassia 1995; Smith 1991, 1994). As Homi Bhabba (1990) has shown, a central aspect of nationalism is precisely that it produces narratives of a nationalist worldview which is transmitted from generation to generation, "naturalizing," thus, the idea of the nation. Crucial elements in such narratives are the alleged common origins and purity of the nation, as well as its historical space and continuity.

The case of Cyprus, where an irredentist movement has been transformed into a politics of identity, shows that nationalism is an inherently complex political and cultural discourse generating "seemingly inconsistent, strange and paradoxical phenomena" (Peristianis 1995:124). Even though its symbolic content and emotional appeal may remain the same, Greek nationalist ideology in Cyprus often functions differently in specific sociohistorical contexts. Its carriers are often diverse, with groups and key actors displaying variation not only in the intensity of nationalist agitation but also in the image and key key axioms of the nationalist worldview that they promulgate. In the 1990s, for example, Greek-Cypriot nationalism is simultaneously expressed by the extreme and the moderate right, the socialists, an often very vocal and sophisticated group of technocrats and intellectuals, the seemingly postmodern circle—with rather vulgar anarchic, anti-establishment and anti-communist sentiments—around the newspaper *Enosis*, last but not

least, the church hierarchy and its traditional social and economic entourage.³ Notwithstanding some real connection between them, such diverse groups neither share identical interests nor do they articulate the same rhetoric; hence, any attempt to present a unified or monolithic picture of nationalism would display consistently internal inconsistencies and contradictions. Thus, the analyst is forced to proceed on the basis of ideal types and morphological abstractions, aiming at the isolation of prototypical tendencies and the elucidation of dominant ideological currents.

The sociological embeddedness of Greek-Cypriot nationalism must be analyzed in relation to a number of other crucial factors: (a) The vested interests of the carrier groups and the leadership of the national movement; (b) the class structure of Greek-Cypriot society and the historical clash between Right and Left; (c) relations between Greek Cypriots and mainland Greeks; (d) intercommunal relations and the development of Turkish-Cypriot nationalism, and (e) the interference of foreign interests, as well as the international balance of power. An examination of Greek-Cypriot nationalism in light of all the above mentioned factors—simultaneously, in its intracommunal, intercommunal and international dimensions—calls for an interdisciplinary approach which will draw conceptual tools and methods from sociology, history, literary criticism, anthropology, political science and international relations.

The area upon which this essay focuses is what Kitromilides (1981) calls the "internal dimension" of Greek-Cypriot politics and, more specifically, the class structure of Cypriot society and the ways in which it has shaped the logical grammar of Greek-Cypriot nationalism. The emphasis must be placed upon the local dynamics affecting the articulation of nationalist ideology in relative abstraction from a wide range of other forces, especially on the international level, which have undeniably affected the development of Greek-Cypriot nationalism. Precisely because of the dominance of Greek-Cypriot nationalist ideology in the political culture of the island throughout most of this century, the internal aspects of Greek-Cypriot nationalism, and especially those that are associated with class interests, have been generally overlooked by mainstream Greek-Cypriot political

discourse and social analysis. The prevailing tendency is either to fully accept the fundamental axioms of nationalist ideology, viewing, thus, nationalism as a "natural" phenomenon; or, to explain its development by exclusive reference to external intervention—as if the rise of nationalism is merely the result of foreign conspiracy, be it on the part of Britain, NATO, Turkey or Greece. There can be little doubt, however, that particular attitude essentially "mythologizes political analysis and maintains pervasive ideological dogmas" (Kitromilides 1981:449).

B. The Social Construction of National Identity and the Historicity of the Nation

In the analysis of the often confusing empirical landscape of phenomena related to nationalism, one can discern two broad theoretical schools (Smith 1994). First, the perennialist-primordialist school, which views the nation as a natural category which is anthropologically constant. Nations, thus, have always been around and the more important questions concern their "awakening" rather than their formation. The national-awakening assumption is, of course, one of the basic elements of nationalist ideology itself; and there can be little doubt that the greatest problem of the perennialist-primordialists is precisely that they fail to question basic nationalist premises. The second school of thought is the modernist-constructivist. The claim here is that nations only began to emerge in the eighteenth century, primarily as an ideological project of the state and its ideologues. Nationalism, in this view, is strictly associated with the rise of modern society and its political and economic structures. Nations, it is proposed, are created by nationalism, an ideology which is closely connected with the political and economic requirements—or, functional prerequisites—of industrial society (Gellner 1983). A fundamental problem with the modernists is that they often miss some unmistakable continuities between modern nationalism and structures of premodern society and culture—language, religion, political organization, tradition, common myths, and so on.

A concept derived from modernist-constructivist discourse that can prove to be an invaluable analytic tool, both in terms of an interpretive understanding of nationalism and in terms of its causal genealogy ("causal," in a non-positivistic sense) is Benedict Anderson's (1991) "imagined community." There is enough evidence to support the claim that the modern concept of the Greek nation only began to appear gradually and to be "imagined," around the turn of the nineteenth century (Kitromilides 1989; Skopetea 1988). Starting from the period when this particular type of community began to be imagined for the first time, the analyst cannot fail but realize that the idea of the nation not only constituted a novel cultural and political form but also that it had to be cultivated in the minds of the people to whom it was to appeal. Nation building, thus, must be seen as an ideological project—usually of the state or an intelligentsia—embedded in cultural and symbolic discourses which are often fluid and highly malleable (Kitromilides 1989, 1994). The concept of imagined community does not imply that nations are not real; rather, its theoretical function is to show that "the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their community" (Anderson 1996:b). The "imagining"—or, to use a more conventional sociological term, the process of social construction—which is required in the dynamics of collective identification, does not denote that the "imagined" nation is an imaginary, not real, community. In the spirit of W. I. Thomas's famous sociological axiom, we can say that once a nation is defined as real, then it becomes real in its consequences. The concept of the imagined community appears to be particularly useful at the formative stages of nationalism. Once the process of the social construction of the nation is established and once nationalist ideology is internalized, the world-view and identity associated with nationalism begin to act on the level of individual consciousness and with relative independence from centralized agents of collective identification.

A common tendency in the social sciences that hinders a proper understanding of the processes whereby nations are socially constructed, is to conceptualize ethnicity in a thor-

oughly structuralist way, leaving very little space for an examination of what we may call, in the spirit of Peter Berger, the "cultural baggage" of ethnicity. Ethnic culture (values, norms, traditions, world views, mythologies) is generally understood as a mere epiphenomenon which is not significantly consequential and nor does it merit much attention (Steinberg 1989)—neither in the study of ethnic groups nor that of nationalism. This "bias" is especially evident in studies in which ethnicity is taken as an independent variable and is not problematized—in the comparative analysis, for example, of specific political or economic consequences of ethnicity. Thus, for Roger Waldinger, one of the leading theorists of ethnic entrepreneurialism, "ethnicity is a possible outcome of the patterns by which intra- and intergroup interactions are structured" (Waldinger et al 1990:34). Notwithstanding that ethnic identification is almost always a function of concrete "intra- and intergroup interactions" (Waldinger et al 1990:34) i.e., ethnicity is almost always "situational," the analyst who is interested in an interpretive understanding of the phenomenon of nationalism cannot miss the fact that ethnicity also operates on a different level, of everyday practices and cognitive structures of its members. I would like to stress, thus, that in the study of nationalism, the sociology of knowledge, with its emphasis upon "consciousness" and its social embeddedness (Berger 1963; Berger and Luckmann 1967; Schultz 1967) can prove to be an invaluable analytic tool.

Along with the neglect of the role of culture—and the concomitant "unwarranted exaggeration of the influence of materialism upon human affairs" (Connor 1994:74)—there is also the tendency to ignore, underestimate, or simply denounce the emotional power of nationalist ideology. This "failure to reflect the emotional depth of ethnonational identity and the mass sacrifices that have been made in its name may indeed be seen as the cardinal sin in the study of nationalism" (Connor 1994:74). Thus, the social historian of modern Cyprus cannot overlook the fact that elements of Greek-Cypriot nationalist ideology have often acquired a practically "sacred"—in the Durkheimian sense of the term—position in Greek-Cypriot collective consciousness and identity. The overwhelming majority of the publicly ac-

claimed heroes of the Greek-Cypriot community consists of nationalist activists and ideologues. It is of crucial significance for the researcher to understand that, notwithstanding its often irrational, or even catastrophic, implications, Greek-Cypriot nationalism has historically produced martyrdom, as well as other incidents of genuine national heroism. The role of such incidents in social memory merits systematic analysis. One cannot simply dismiss Greek-Cypriot nationalist mythologies as some kind of eastern irrationality or social pathology—as they are often portrayed by the media of Western societies. Thus, in as far as Greek nationalism in Cyprus has historically acquired an almost mystical dimension—clearly resembling the new “divinities” that Emil Durkheim anticipated in the final chapter of *Les Formes Elementaires de la Vie Religieuse* (1967)—the analyst must approach it like an ideology which, to use the Western terms, is characterized by the domination of “charisma” rather than “rationality.”

To return to the previous discussion of the two leading theoretical orientations in the study of nationalism, it is generally accepted that in the battle between the two “schools” the modernist-constructivist comes out as the clear winner (Eller and Coughlin, 1993). On the basis of overwhelming evidence in the social sciences, one can safely assert that the nation is indeed a modern social category. While one may clearly reject the primordialist-perennialist conception of the nation, one must also avoid the extremes to which the modernist understanding of the issue often leads. The researcher must acknowledge that historically nations did not just suddenly appear *ex nihilo*—as, for example, Gellner (1983) often leads us to believe. Smith’s (1991) differentiation between “*ethnie*” and “nation” is extremely useful in that it provides both for the modernity of nationalism and its reliance upon premodern ethnic culture. In as far as nations are understood as politicized *ethnies*, the attention can focus precisely upon the processes whereby ethnicity is being transformed into a political force and identity. The researcher, moreover, must explore the historical fact that nationalism generally has a genuine independent appeal to the masses precisely because it appears to be an almost natural ideology, having a very close affinity with cultural traditions

and ethnic affiliations. The moral appeal of Greek nationalism, for example, was founded fundamentally upon the fact that, though a modern construction, the Greek nation was quickly perceived as immemorial or even eternal, emerging out of the depths of history and pointing towards the national community's destiny.

C. Ethnic and Civic Aspects:

The Historical Dialectic of the Opposition Between Greek Nationalism and Cypriotism

There is no exhaustively systematic classification of nationalisms, and in the available social scientific literature the analyst encounters numerous types of varieties of nationalism: ethnic, civic, ethnonational, secessionist, unificational, irredentist, anti-colonial, colonial, et cetera (Gellner 1983; Kellas 1991; Smith 1983; 1991). There is, however, one two-fold typology which is generally accepted, at least as an ideal type. The first general type of nationalism is "civic" (also called "western") nationalism, which developed first in Western Europe and America in the eighteenth century. In this type: (a) generally speaking, ethnicity is secondary to citizenship which is extended to the inhabitants of a given territory irrespective of their ethnic identification; (b) notwithstanding the relative homogeneity of the population, it is the state that creates a sense of national identity through the bureaucratic incorporation of the masses; (c) capitalist development precedes or coexists with nationalism; and (d), nationalism is conducive to the development of a relative tolerant political culture and "civil society." The second type is "ethnic nationalism" (also called "eastern"), which developed in Central and Southeastern Europe in the nineteenth century and spread throughout the world. In this type: (a) Citizenship is organically tied to ethnicity; (b) even though newly-formed states immediately assume a critical role in the cultivation and consolidation of national identity, nationalism precedes the establishment of the state; (c) nationalism rises in the absence of capitalist development; and (d) nationalism creates a rather intolerant political environment and an "uncivil" society

(Bryant 1995; Gellner 1994a, 1994b; Hall 1995; Kristeva 1993; Mouzelis 1994, 1995; Ra'anani 1991; Smith 1991; 1994). Notwithstanding that most nationalisms exhibit both ethnic and civic elements, the distinction is an essential analytical tool, especially in Cyprus where Greek nationalism has historically developed a strong ethnic orientation which inherently suppresses any serious consideration of civic issues.

Historically, Greek nationalism in Cyprus must be understood as part of Greek irredentism, the prevailing ideology of the Greek state from the 1850s to the 1920s. Cyprus proved to be an especially fertile ground for the transplantation of Greek irredentism to the island (Attalides 1979; Kitromilides 1977, 1979, 1990; Loizos 1974). The Greek Cypriots gradually but firmly began to view themselves as part of the greater community of the Greek nation. Ethnicity, thus, began to be politicized, and to replace religion as the main identifying attribute.

The ideological origins of Greek nationalism in Cyprus can be traced to the period of the Neohellenic Enlightenment when the Greeks began to develop a specific identity which differentiated them from the other Christians of the Ottoman Empire (Kitromilides 1983b, 1989, 1992a, 1994). During the first two decades of the nineteenth century, an awareness of ethnic distinction began to emerge within a small segment of the Greek-Cypriot population thanks to influences emanating not only from Greece but also from the centers of Hellenism in Asia Minor (Attalides 1979; Kitromilides 1979, 1990; Loizos 1974). To claim, however, that before the 1830s this awareness amounted to nationalism, is a-historical and ideologically anachronistic. What we see until then is essentially "a generally conceived national orientation of Greek-Cypriot elites" (Kitromilides 1979:19) which did not appear to have much appeal to the masses, especially in the rural areas. The seeds for the cultivation of nationalist consciousness, however, were planted and there began a gradual but firm process whereby the Greeks of Cyprus would eventually demand political union with Greece.

Despite the preeminence—social, cultural, economic, political—of the ethnically-Greek population in the affairs of the island, Greek nationalism had to be gradually and systematically

cultivated. This was achieved through a process which involved local and external agents and originated from the irredentist ideology of the modern Greek state (Attalides 1979; Kitromilides 1979, 1990; Skopetea 1988). The main mechanisms of nation-building were the educational system—which was in the hands of the Orthodox church—the activities of voluntary associations formed by intellectuals mostly educated in Greece, and the Greek consulate (Attalides 1979; Kitromilides 1979, 1990). This political process, it must be stressed, was in many ways similar to the processes experienced by other Balkan and Southeastern European societies when the latter went through their own national formation (Kitromilides 1989, 1994). However, the analyst cannot miss the importance of the social and cultural history of the island, a history dominated by the ethnically-Greek population. It was precisely this dominance which provided the demographic and cultural substratum for the rise of Greek-Cypriot nationalism as the paramount political ideology in modern Cypriot history (Attalides 1979; Kitromilides 1979, 1990; Loizos 1974; Makrides 1974, 1977). As we approach the twenty-first century—and, having fuelled the enosis movement and the EOKA “liberation” struggle of 1955-59, and undermined Cypriot independence in the period 1960-74—Greek nationalism continues to dominate Greek-Cypriot politics.

The main internal opposition against Greek-Cypriot nationalism has come from what may be broadly called “Cypriotism,” a political ideology and cultural discourse which, by placing the center of attention on Cyprus, rather than the Greek nation, functions as a territorial nationalism with strong civic elements. The clash between nationalism and Cypriotism, thus, may often appear as a contest between an ethnic and a civic nationalism. Given that Greek-Cypriot “ethnonationalism”—to use Connor’s (1994) term—usually defines the parameters of ideological orthodoxy, the Cypriotist opposition has come to be grossly distorted—precisely because it is misrepresented as yet another ethnic nationalism which *ipso facto* denies the Greek ethnicity of the Greek Cypriots. Whereas this attitude characterizes both political and academic discourse in Cyprus, there can be little doubt that in the study of Greek-Cypriot nationalism, an adequate understanding of Cypriotism is of paramount

significance—precisely because the two ideologies are largely formulated in response to each other.⁴

In broad terms, Cypriotism refers to the idea that Cyprus has its own *sui generis* character and, thus, must be viewed as an entity which is independent from both of the motherlands of the two main communities of the island—i.e., Greece and Turkey. This, of course, contrasts sharply from the view that dominates nationalist ideology and views Cyprus as an extension of Greece—or Turkey, in the case of the Turkish Cypriots. For the Cypriotist, the independence or autonomy of Cyprus is manifest on different levels—history, politics, social structure, culture—but it rarely (and only in its more extreme expression) takes the form of a complete disengagement from Greece and Turkey. Cypriotism, thus, does not deny the Greek or Turkish ethnicity of the inhabitants of the island; it stresses, however, that their ethnic identity—and, thus, on a more general level, their culture—has also acquired *sui generis* features which not only differentiate the Greek and the Turkish Cypriots from the Greeks and the Turks but also create some common ground between the two communities of the island (Lanitis 1963; The New Cyprus Association 1975, 1980; Papadakis 1993; Peristianis 1995; Stamatakis 1991). Thus, Cypriotism does not promote the idea that there exists a Cypriot nation—unless “nation” is understood as a strictly political-territorial category.

From the 1920s to the 1940s, elements of Cypriotism can be found in declarations of the Cypriot Communist Party (KKK)—which later became transformed into AKEL—and the newspapers Πυρσός (Torch) and Νέος Ἀνθρώπος (New Man) affiliated with the left. For the early Cypriot communists, the explicit rejection of Greek-Cypriot nationalism emanated from Marxist ideology and its internationalist stress on the primacy of the class struggle; in this view, nationalism was an instance of false consciousness, simply an ideology solidifying the dominance of the bourgeoisie, and the working classes of the two communities ought to unite and promote their common interests. In the 1940s, Cypriotism was passionately expressed by A. Adamantos, the communist mayor of Famagusta, and other leftists—the most eminent of whom were P. Servas and F. Ioannou—who distanced themselves from AKEL on the

grounds of its shift to a pro-enosis stance. Along with the communist version of Cypriotism, however, there also developed a liberal Cypriotism, expressed mainly by N. Lanitis, one of the leading industrialists of the island, who had founded the Party of Progress (Κόμμα Προόδου) in the 1940s. Lanitis' (1963:7) views centered upon the idea that the cooperation between the two communities is the *sine qua non* for economic development—and more generally." Lanitis (1963:8) maintained that "union and only union was essentially a negative policy" and urged the Greek-Cypriots to apply "self-restraint in (their) nationalist aspirations" and to honour their signature on the London-Zurich agreements which established the independent Republic of Cyprus. Despite the latter's limitations, Lanitis (1936:6-8) writes, the agreement "is a good as the men who apply it" and it is primarily the Greek-Cypriot majority's responsibility "to gain the confidence of the Turks."

Following the independence of 1960, Cypriotism began to be articulated as a "de-ethnicized" political ideology, stressing that Cyprus is an independent polity with interests (social, political and economic) which may be different from those of either the Greek or the Turkish state. To view the issue from a different angle, what matters most to the Cypriotists, is not the ethnicity of the inhabitants of Cyprus but their Cypriot citizenship. The most methodical formulation of post-1974 Cypriotism has been provided by the New Cyprus Association (Νεοκυπριακός Σύνδεσμος), an organization which was founded in March 1975, with the aim of promoting and safeguarding Cypriot independence.⁵ The Association's founding was an explicit reaction to the disaster of 1974, an attempt to create an atmosphere in which the mistakes that led to 1974 could not possibly be repeated again. The New Cyprus Association (1975) has no intention to "deny... ethnic origins and cultural links" and makes it clear that "we cannot forget our national descent." It stresses, however, that the inhabitants of Cyprus "must as a people consider themselves as Cypriots first and foremost and then as Greeks, Turks, or others." And this, precisely because "the most significant cause of our present predicament is that the two major communities were living in air-tight separateness without contact and with the wrong con-

ceptions about each other—and that a significant cause for this has been the separate orientations and organization of Cyprus society, and the wrong slogans." In the Association's view, ethnic separation must be overcome through "the rapprochement and continuous cultivation of understanding between the two communities so that our common features will be fully realized and emphasized and our differences confined and alleviated" (The New Cyprus Association, 1975). In the first post-1974 years the Neocypriots—despite the small size of the Association—played a prominent role in pressuring the official Greek-Cypriot leadership to de-nationalize the Republic of Cyprus and to assume an explicit policy of independence (Peristianis 1995).

By the early 1980s, however, the ideology expressed by the New Cyprus Association began to acquire an increasingly marginal position in Greek-Cypriot politics. Given the lack of any progress towards a solution to the Cyprus problem—with Turkish intransigence bearing the greatest responsibility for the stalemate—as well as the continued Turkish military threat, the Greek Cypriots began again to view Greece as their main source of support and protection. A forceful indication of the revival of nationalism in the 1980s, is precisely the meaning that the term "neocypriot" has acquired over the last few years. In the 1980s, "neocypriot" is clearly a pejorative term, meaning someone who not only despises Greece but also denies his Greek roots and genuine cultural endowment. The term, moreover, is interpreted as a national category, denoting a claim for the existence of a different, Cypriot, nation. Most people, it appears, are not even aware of the existence of the Association and think that "neocypriot" is merely an insult—an attribute with which no one would consciously and voluntarily associate oneself. In the discourse of the new Greek-Cypriot nationalism, the Neocypriots are now presented as those who "sold" Cyprus to foreign interests—especially the British—and as bearing the greatest responsibility not only for the political misfortunes of the Greek-Cypriot community but also for a wide array of other cultural problems revolving around the "corruption of our language and traditions" (Peristianis 1995).

In the ideological contest between nationalism and Cyp-

riotism, the former has historically enjoyed a clear advantage (Ioannou 1991; Papadakis 1993). The symbolic ammunition of nationalist ideology—building on the “glorious past and heritage” of Cypriot Hellenism—certainly carries more weight than the cultural capital of those who present a Cypriot-centered understanding of the heritage and identity of the Greek Cypriots. The Cypriot version on the cultural endowment of the Greeks of the island is “more mundane, impure and polluted” (Papadakis 1993:166). Thus, whereas the nationalists focus on a distinguished legacy, the Cypriotists emphasize, along with a rather abstract notion of citizenship, popular culture (λαϊκός πολιτισμός), rural customs and everyday practices which construct a more syncretic, and unquestionably less dignified, view of identity and tradition. Consequently, in the grammar of the battle between nationalism and Cypriotism, the nationalists are usually on the offensive, having both the first and the last word. The Cypriotists are often reduced to passive role and appear to virtually accept the nationalist monopoly on issues of culture, identity and social memory. The opponents of nationalism, it seems, must be always ready to prove their national credentials—they must argue that they are not undermining the Greekness of Cyprus, that they are not distorting the history of the island, and, less often but certainly dramatically, that they are not promoting Turkish propaganda.

Broadly speaking, it may be argued that the contrast between Greek nationalism and Cypriotism corresponds to the political opposition between right and left. Historically, however, the picture concerning the social bases of the two ideologies has been more complex. Until 1960, the main constituency of Greek-Cypriot nationalism had been drawn from the groups dominating Greek-Cypriot politics, the urban bourgeoisie, the clergy and the Greek-educated intelligentsia (Attalides 1979; Kitromilides 1979). In as far as these groups constitute the political right—and notwithstanding that nationalism had a wider appeal to the masses—it can certainly be said that the leadership of nationalism had been monopolized by the right, despite that even the communists, who had feebly expressed some Cypriotist positions, often adhered to an enosist ideology (Attalides 1979; Kakoulli 1990). Following independence, on the other hand,

Cypriotism began to be clearly associated with elites which had vested interests in Cypriot independence, and more specifically in the existence of an independent Cypriot state apparatus something that certainly cannot be placed in the political left. Cypriotism, of course, continued to be expressed by AKEL, even though the communists again reverted to a clear pro-*enosis* position from 1963 to 1966 and did not fully dissociate themselves from an espousal of *enosis* until after the disaster of 1974 (Attalides, 1979; Kakoulli 1990).⁶ Makarios' policy of independence, moreover, definitely drew support from part of the right and the majority of the centrist forces. In the immediate post-74 years, when Cypriotism gained considerable ground and became embodied partially in state ideology, nationalism was confined to the right—and perhaps to its most extreme elements only. With the re-emergence of Greek-Cypriot nationalism in the mid-1980s, Cypriotism begins to be closely associated with the communist left, with the socialist EDEK appearing as one of the most nationalistically-inclined political forces on the island (Peristianis 1995; Stamatakis 1991). It is clear, thus, that the reduction of the contest between nationalism and Cypriotism into a left-right opposition cannot be fully sustained and can only oversimplify the picture.

D. Social Analysis, Social Criticism and Civil Society

Greek-Cypriot nationalism, as is the case with so many other nationalisms, has historically generated a political culture which, to use the Weberian terms, is based on "an ethic of conviction" rather than an "ethic of responsibility" (Weber 1958). The emphasis is upon the pursuit of "ultimate ends"—in this case, the glory or destiny of the nation—often without any deliberation of the possible consequences of one's actions or choices. The historical record, as well as contemporary politics, show that Greek-Cypriot nationalism has often been detrimental to the concrete interests (social, economic and political) of the Greek Cypriots; it has been an irrational force in the simple but powerful Weberian sense (Kalberg 1980; Sica 1988) that

the means it has utilized to promote its ends (i.e., the welfare of the nation) have not only been ineffective but have also produced contrary results (Attalides 1979; Kitromilides 1977, 1979, 1983a, 1990; Loizos 1974, 1988, 1995; Markides 1974, 1977, 1995).

From its early beginnings, Greek-Cypriot nationalism had acquired an intransigence and intolerance which was directed both to the Cypriot-leftist opposition and the British colonial administration—even in the 1940s, when the British gave signs that they were willing to put forward specific proposals for constitutional change (Kitromilides 1979; Markides 1995). The most tragic consequence of the intolerance of Greek-Cypriot nationalism was, of course, its headlong collision with Turkish-Cypriot nationalism. In the dialectical opposition of the two nationalisms there was no room for compromise and functional coexistence. This was because they were externally manipulated (be it by Turkey, Britain, or the Greek junta), and they were reinforced so as to create an ideological atmosphere in which each community insisted on maximizing its own interests at the expense, of course, of those of the other, the demonized historic enemy. A spirit of tolerance, however, is the *sine qua non* of "civilized politics." It should not be surprising, thus, that the modern history of Cyprus is replete with instances of incivility—not only from one community towards the other but also within each of them. As Kitromilides (1979:29) puts it, in discussing the ideological climate of the period from 1960 to 1974, "the dialectic of intolerance was so deeply entrenched in the political culture of independent Cyprus that all timid voices raised against it in the cause of the survival of the Republic were simply stamped out (the dominant irredentist ideology) thriving on the absence of a liberal political culture, was ruthless in discrediting as national betrayals all voices of heretical criticism."

Whereas there can be little doubt that contemporary Greek-Cypriot nationalism is fuelled by Turkish intransigence and the continued military occupation of the northern part of the island, it must still be seen as a continuation of the intolerant nationalism which dominated Greek-Cypriot politics throughout most of the twentieth century. As in the past, Greek-

Cypriot nationalism continues to function as a lever for the suppression of social criticism, especially around debates which concern the modernization of society and focus upon issues such as individual liberty, gender relations and sexual preference. In as far as it promotes an intolerant spirit, Greek-Cypriot nationalism has historically epitomized the underdevelopment of Greek-Cypriot civil society. In the tradition of sociological theory, the concept of civil society points to the presence of "intermediary" structures and institutions whose primary role is to protect the individual from arbitrary and oppressive rule. The existence of such voluntary and spontaneous institutions creates a sphere of "free space," as it were, in which the individual—provided, of course, that he does not interfere with the well-being of his fellow citizens—can pursue his interests, material but also, to use Weberian terminology, "ideational," unrestrained by any centralized agent of authority. The institutions of civil society create a relatively egalitarian and tolerant milieu in which no single social group or ideology can dominate and submerge all others (Bryant 1995; Hall 1995; Mouzelis 1995). It is precisely this tolerance that allows for individual freedom and civilized politics. In the case of Cyprus, the relationship between ethnonationalism—which inescapably stresses the importance of the nation over the individual—and civil society is rather obvious. It can be summarized by saying that Greek-Cypriot nationalism has further weakened the institutions of civil society; or, to put it in even stronger terms, it has promoted an uncivil society .

Given the moral and political intensity that nationalism may acquire, it should be clear that in societies in which nationalism is the sole determinant of political orthodoxy, the mere exposition of nationalist ideology constitutes an act of social criticism. In as far as the first analytical task in the study of Greek ethnonationalism, be it in Greece or in Cyprus, is the deconstruction of a wide range of taken-for-granted mythologies (from the perennialness of the principle of national ontology to the idea of Orthodoxy as the spiritual champion of nationalism), social science can easily be perceived as an opponent of nationalism. Nationalist myths often appear to be immune from rational deliberation and may be easily used to legitimate na-

tionalist aggression or fanaticism, whose targets, of course, do not exclude social scientists.

Concluding Remarks

The social scientist must realize that the espousal of Greek-Cypriot nationalism essentially involves an ethical deliberation and commitment; and that the Greek-Cypriots may chose to proceed along a nationalist path precisely because doing otherwise would necessitate the abandonment of certain values and orientations which may be considered quintessential as far as their identity is concerned. Value-free social science cannot judge this decision. It can, however, analyze its consequences. One of the most profound elements of Weberian sociology is the almost unavoidable realization that value freedom usually leads to a critical attitude and perspective; critical not so much with respect to the past, but more importantly to the present and the future. Recent Cypriot history shows that the destructive consequences of political decisions based upon unexamined convictions can be minimized only if what Weber calls "an ethic of responsibility" is adopted.

NOTES

¹It must be stressed that the emphasis of the paper upon Greek-Cypriot nationalism is analytical and by no means implies that the Greek Cypriots bear the greatest responsibility for the current division of the island. Even though the extremities of Greek-Cypriot nationalism certainly contributed to the creation of the Cyprus problem, it would be naive to disregard the role of Britain and the West, the Greek military regime of 1967-74, Turkish-Cypriot nationalism, and, of course, Turkish expansionism. The paper, it must be made clear, is not intended as a complete history of the Cyprus problem. For more general accounts on the Cyprus problem, as well as on how external factors influenced Cypriot politics, see Attalides 1977; Coufoudakis 1976; Kitromilides 1977, 1979, 1990; Kizilyurek 1993; Markides 1977.

²The notion of an "eclipsed view of history" draws on Eric Voegelin's concept of the "eclipse of reality." In a seminal essay entitled

"The Eclipse of Reality" (1990), Voegelin mounts a powerful attack against the ideological and scientific tendencies that dominate the intellectual climate of our age. The cardinal sin of the various -isms (including, of course, nationalism) that have become the official dogma in most quarters of popular and academic culture is that they "deform" or "eclipse" the empirical realities that they purport to describe (Voegelin 1990:112). In as far as nationalism imposes a homogenization of history and tradition, it is an ideology founded precisely upon an eclipse of the past.

³The nationalization of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus is a historical phenomenon, one which points not to any harmony between Orthodoxy and nationalism—on the contrary, the two are inherently contradictory (Kitromilides 1989)—but to the force of nationalist ideology and the declining ability of the Cypriot Church to assume an autonomous social and ideological role in Cypriot society. In the post-Makarios era—an era of growing secularization in which the Orthodox Church of Cyprus is increasingly reduced to a ceremonial organization—nationalist agitation provides the Church hierarchy with an excellent opportunity to reassert its lost eminence and to act as an agent of national unity.

⁴Analysts who have systematically attempted to conceptualize the internal opposition to Greek-Cypriot nationalism without nationalist prejudice—constituting, thus, an exception to the prevailing tendency among Greek-Cypriot intellectuals—are Attalides (1979), Kitromilides (1977, 1979, 1981, 1983a, 1990), Kizilyurek (1993), Loizos (1974, 1988, 1995), Markides (1974, 1995) and Papadakis (1993).

⁵Some of the key founding or early members of the New Cyprus Association were Jus Payatas, currently the director of the Port Authority of the Republic of Cyprus, Andreas Mourtouvanis, a leading businessman, Takis Konis, a civil servant in the Social Welfare Department, and Leontios Ierodiakonou, an economist and DISY parliamentarian with a moderate political orientation. Despite the fact that they both continue to distance themselves from nationalist circles, Konis and Ierodiakonou are no longer members of the Association. Payatas and Mourtouvanis are still among its leading members.

⁶It is interesting to note that AKEL has recently issued a statement criticizing and renouncing its pro-enosis stance in the 1960s. Admitting past mistakes is a conscious and stated attempt at reappropriating the past—a rare occurrence in Greek-Cypriot political history in which most efforts to rewrite history do not have a self-conscious character and seldom include the admittance of mistakes.

WORKS CITED

- ANDERSON, BENEDICT. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, 2nd ed. London: Verso [1st ed., London: Verso, 1983].
- APPADURAI, ARJUN. 1981. "The Past as a Scarce Resource," *Man* 16, pp. 201-19.
- ATTALIDES, MICHAEL. 1979. *Cyprus: Nationalism and International Politics*, Edinburgh: Q Press.
- BHABHA, HOMI (ed). 1990. *Nation and Narration*, London: Routledge.
- BERGER, PETER AND LUCKMANN, THOMAS. 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality*, Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- BRYANT, CHRISTOPHER G.A. 1995. "Civic Nation, Civil Society, Civil Religion," in John Hall (ed), *Civil Society: Theory, History, Comparison*, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, pp. 136-57.
- BURKE, P. 1989. "History as Social Memory," in T. Butler (ed), *Memory*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, pp. 97-114.
- COHEN, ANTHONY. 1989. *The Symbolic Construction of Community*, London: Routledge.
- COHN, BERNARD S. 1981. "Anthropology and History: The State of the Play," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 198-221.
- CONNETON, P. 1989. *How Societies Remember*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- CONNOR, WALKER. 1994. *Ethnonationalism: The Quest for Understanding*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- COUFOUDAKIS, VAN. 1976. *Essays on the Cyprus Conflict*, New York: Pella Publishing Company, Inc.
- DURKHEIM, EMILE. 1967. *Les Formes Elementaires de la Vie Religieuse* (originally published in 1912). Paris: PUF.
- ELLER, J. AND COUGHLIN, R. 1993. "The Poverty of Primordialism. The Demystification of Ethnic Attachments," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 183-202.
- FENTESS, J. AND WICKHAM, C. 1992. *Social Memory. New Perspectives on the Past*, Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- GELLNER, ERNEST. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*, Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- _____. 1994a *Encounters with Nationalism*, Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- _____. 1994b *Conditions of Liberty: Civil Society and Its Rivals*, New York: Allen Lane, the Penguin Press.
- HALL, JOHN. 1995. "In Search of Civil Society, in John Hall (ed),

- Civil Society: Theory, History, Comparison*, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, pp. 1-31.
- HOBBSAWM, E. AND RANGER, T. (eds). 1983. *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- IOANNOU, YIANNIS. 1991. "Language, Politics, and Identity: An Analysis of the Cyprus Dilemma," *The Cyprus Review*, pp. 15-41.
- KAKOULLI, LOUCAS. 1990. "Η Άριστερά και οι Τουρκοκύπριοι. Τό Κυπριακό από μιὰ "Άλλη Σκοπιὰ (The Left and the Turkish Cypriots. The Cyprus Problem from a Different Perspective). Nicosia: Cassouliides Press.
- KALBERG, STEPHEN. 1980. "Max Weber's Types of Rationality: Cornerstones for the Analysis of Rationalization Processes in History," *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 85, no. 5, pp. 1145-79.
- KELLAS, JAMES G. 1991. *The Politics of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, London: Macmillan.
- KITROMILIDES, PASCHALIS. 1977. "From Coexistence to Confrontation: The Dynamics of Ethnic Conflict in Cyprus," in Michael Attalides (ed), *Cyprus Reviewed*, Nicosia: The Jus Cypri Association, pp. 35-70.
- _____. 1979. "The Dialectic of Intolerance: Ideological Dimensions of Ethnic Conflict," *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora*, vol. 6, no. 4, Pella Publishing Company, Inc., pp. 5-30.
- _____. "Τὸ Τὸ ἰδεολογικὸ πλαίσιο τῆς πολιτικῆς ζωῆς τῆς Κύπρου" (The Ideological Framework of Cypriot Political Life), in G. Tenekides and Y. Kranidiotis (eds) *Κύπρος. Ἱστορία, προβλήματα καὶ ἀγῶνες τοῦ λαοῦ τῆς* (Cyprus. History and the Struggles of Its People), Athens: Estia, pp. 449-71.
- _____. 1983a. "Τὸ ἑλληνικὸ κράτος ὡς ἔθνικὸ κέντρο" (The Greek State as National Center), in D. G. Tsaousis (ed), *Ἑλληνισμός, Ἑλληνικότητα* (Hellenism, Greekness), Athens: Estia, pp. 143-64.
- _____. 1983b. "The Enlightenment East and West: A Comparative Perspective on the Ideological Origins of the Balkan political Traditions," *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 51-70.
- _____. 1989. "Imagined Communities and the Origins of the National Question in the Balkans," *European History Quarterly*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 149-22.
- _____. 1990. "Greek Irredentism in Asia Minor and Cyprus," *Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 3-15.
- _____. 1994. "Preface," in *Enlightenment, Nationalism, Orthodoxy. Studies in the Culture and Political Thought of South-Eastern Europe*, Aldershot, Hampshire, UK: Variorum, pp. xiii-xvi.

- KIZILYUREK, NİYAZI. 1993. *Η Κύπρος Πέραν του "Εθνους* (Cyprus Beyond Nation), Nicosia: Cassoulides Printing Works.
- KRISTEVA, JULIA. 1993. *Nations Without Nationalism*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- LANITIS, NICOS. 1963. *Our Destiny. A Consideration of Some Crucial Problems Pertaining to Cyprus* (based on material incorporated in a series of articles in the *Cyprus Mail*, 3-7 March 1963), Nicosia, n. p.
- LEKKAS, PANTELIS. 1992. *Η Έθνικιστική Ίδεολογία. Πέντε Ύποθέσεις Έργασίας στην Ίστορική Κοινωνιολογία* (Nationalist Ideology. Five Working Hypotheses in Historical Sociology), Athens: E.M.N.E., Nefeli.
- LOIZOS, PETER. 1974. "The Progress of Greek Nationalism in Cyprus: 1878-1970," in J. Davis (ed), *Choice and Change: Essays in Honour of Lucy Mair*, London: Athlone, pp. 114-33.
- _____. 1988. "Intercommunal Killing in Cyprus," *Man* 23, pp. 639-53.
- _____. 1995. "Κατανοώντας τὸ 1974, Κατανοώντας τὸ 1994" (Understanding 1974, Understanding 1994), in N. Peristianis and G. Tsangaras (eds), *Άνατομία μιᾶς Μεταμόρφωσης. Ἡ Κύπρος μετὰ τὸ 1974—Κοινωνία, Οἰκονομία Πολιτική, Πολιτισμὸς* (Anatomy of a Metamorphosis. Cyprus after 1974—Society, Economy, Politics, Culture), Nicosia: Intercollege Press, pp. 105-122.
- MARKIDES, KYRIAKOS. 1974. "Social Change and the Rise and Decline of Social Movements," *American Ethnologist*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 309-30.
- _____. 1977. *The Rise and Fall of the Cyprus Republic*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- _____. 1995. "Ἡ Κύπρος καὶ οἱ Προσπάθειες γιὰ Ὅμοσπονδία" (Cyprus and the Efforts for a Federation), in N. Peristianis and G. Tsangaras (eds), *Άνατομία μιᾶς Μεταμόρφωσης. Ἡ Κύπρος μετὰ τὸ 1974—Κοινωνία, Οἰκονομία, Πολιτική, Πολιτισμὸς* (Anatomy of a Metamorphosis. Cyprus after 1974—Society, Economy, Politics, Culture), Nicosia: Intercollege Press, pp. 331-352.
- MOUZELIS, NICOS. 1994. *Ὁ Ἐθνικισμὸς στὴν "Ὑστερη Ἀνάπτυξη* (Nationalism in Late Development), Athens: Themelio.
- _____. 1995. "Modernity, Late Development and Civil Society," in John Hall (ed), *Civil Society: Theory, History, Comparison*, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, pp. 224-49.
- THE NEW CYPRUS ASSOCIATION. 1975. "Founding Declaration," Nicosia.
- _____. 1980. 13 Ἀπαντήσεις σὲ 13 Ἐρωτήματα (Thirteen Answers to Thirteen Questions), Nicosia.

- PAPADAKIS, IOANNIS. 1993. "Perceptions of History and Collective Identity: A Study of Contemporary Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot Nationalism," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- PERISTIANIS, NICOS. 1995. "Δεξιά-ἀριστερά, ἑλληνοκεντρισμός-κυπροκεντρισμός: Τὸ ἔκκρεμὸς τῶν Συλλογικῶν Ταυτίσεων μετὰ τὸ 1974" (left-right, hellenocentrism- cyprocentrism: The pendulum of collective identifications after 1974), in N. Peristianis and G. Tsangaras (eds), Ἀνατομία μιᾶς Μεταμόρφωσης. Ἡ Κύπρος μετὰ τὸ 1974—Κοινωνία, Οἰκονομία, Πολιτική, Πολιτισμὸς (Anatomy of a Metamorphosis. Cyprus after 1974—Society, Economy, Politics, Culture), Nicosia: Intercollege Press, pp. 123-56.
- RA'ANAN, URI. 1991. "Nation and State: Order Out of Chaos," in Uri Ra'anani et al (eds), *State and Nation in Multi-ethnic Societies. The Breakup of Multinational States*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 3-32.
- SANT CASSIA, PAUL. 1995. "Διαίρεμένο παρελθὸν καὶ ἐνωμένο παρόν: Ἀντιλήψεις τοῦ ἑλληνικοῦ ἐξτρεμιστικοῦ ἔθνικισμοῦ στὴν Κύπρο" (Divided past and united present: Perceptions of extremist nationalism in Cyprus), in N. Peristianis and G. Tsangaras (eds), Ἀνατομία μιᾶς Μεταμόρφωσης. Ἡ Κύπρος μετὰ τὸ 1974—Κοινωνία, Οἰκονομία, Πολιτική, Πολιτισμὸς (Anatomy of a Metamorphosis. Cyprus after 1974—Society, Economy, Politics, Culture), Nicosia: Intercollege Press, pp. 157-88.
- SICA, ALAN. 1988. *Weber, Irrationality and Social Order*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- SKOPETEA, ELLI. 1988. Τὸ Πρότυπο Βασίλειο καὶ ἡ "Μεγάλη Ἰδέα" (The Model Kingdom and the "Great Idea"), Athens: Estia.
- SMITH, ANTHONY D. 1983. *Theories of Nationalism*, London: Duckworth.
- _____. 1986. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- _____. 1991. *National Identity*, Reno, NV: University of Nevada Press.
- _____. 1994. "The Problem of National Identity: Ancient, Medieval and Modern?" *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 375-98.
- SCHULTZ, ALFRED. 1967. *The Phenomenology of the Social World*, Chicago: Northwestern University Press.
- STAMATAKIS, NICOS. 1991. "History and Nationalism: The Cultural Reconstruction of Modern Greek Cypriot Identity," *The Cyprus Review*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 59-86.
- STEINBERG, STEPHEN. 1989. *The Ethnic Myth Race, Ethnicity, and Class in America* (updated and expanded edition), Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

- WEBER, MAX. 1958. "Politics as a Vocation," in *From Max Weber*.
- WALDINGER, ROGER, ET AL. 1990. *Ethnic Entrepreneurs. Immigrant Business in Industrial Societies*, Newzury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- WEBER, MAX. 1958. "Politics as a Vocation," in *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, translated and edited by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, New York: Oxford University Press.
- VOGELIN, ERIC. 1990. "The Eclipse of Reality," in *The Collected Works of Eric Voegelin, Vol. 28, What is History and Other Late Unpublished Writings*, Thomas Hollweck and Paul Caringella, (eds), Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.

NOTES

In Memoriam
ODYSSEUS ELYTIS
1911-1996

Odysseus Elytis
and the Thirties Generation
in Modern Greek Poetry

by KOSTAS MYRSIADES

I have conceived my figure between a sea that comes to view right behind the whitewashed little wall of a chapel and a barefoot girl with the wind lifting her dress, a chance moment I struggle to capture, and I waylay it with Greek words.

If I spoke at the beginning about a girl and a chapel, at the risk of sounding less than serious, I had my reasons. I would have liked to draw that girl into the chapel and make her my own, not to scandalize anyone, but to confess that Eros is one, and also to make more dense the poem I wish to make out of the days of my life.

KOSTAS MYRSIADES is Professor of Comparative Literature at West Chester University and author, with Linda S. Myrsiades of the forthcoming *Writing the Resistance; Guerrilla Theater in WW II Greece*.

.....

If there is, I think, for each one of us a different, a personal Paradise, mine should irreparably be inhabited by trees of words that the wind dresses in silver, like poplars, by men who see the rights of which they have been deprived returning to them, and by birds that even the midst of the truth of death insist on singing in Greek and on saying, "Eros, Eros," Eros!"¹ (39-42)

It is in this way that Odysseus Elytis who died on March 18, 1996 describes his poetry in his collected prose work *Anihita Hartia*, published in 1974. And it is as a poet of Eros (love), erotic love, girls, sunlight, and the Paradise of the imaginative intellect that he will be remembered and admired. Uncomfortable with the title, Elytis was known as the poet of the Aegean, a title bestowed to honor the wealth of images and associations in his poetry which he largely derived from the Aegean islands.

Perhaps what Kimon Friar said of Kazantzakis's *Odyssey* best describes Elytis's poetry: "The sun, flame, fire, and light compose the chief imagery of the *Odyssey*, flowing in a dazzling current throughout the poem, just as the sun in Greece itself pulses throughout the clarity of its azure atmosphere, blazing on rocks, mountains, and the deviously tortured coastlines and islands of that sun-washed country." (Kazantzakis xxxii)

Odysseus Elytis was born Odysseus Alepoudhelis, whose father was the son of a wealthy landowner on the island of Lesbos. His father, however, left his island home in early youth and settled on the island of Crete. Having founded a successful soap factory, the father revisited Lesbos to marry and again returned to Iraklion, Crete, where the poet was born on November 2, 1911, the youngest of six children. In 1914 the family left Crete to settle permanently in Athens where the poet resided until his death.

Alepoudhelis chose his pseudonym Elytis to reflect the themes of his poetry. It is derived from the prefixes *Ellas* (Greece), *elpidha* (hope), *eleftheria* (freedom), and *Eleni*

(Helen of Troy). The suffix *iays* he claimed, is a general and common Greek ending which does not limit him to any particular section of Greece.

Of the poets of his generation, that period of Greek literature known as the Generation of the Thirties which was to produce George Seferis, Andreas Embiricos, Nikos Engonopoulos, Nikos Gatsos, Yannis Ritsos, and Nikiforos Vrettakos, among the best known, Elytis admired most the new poetry of George Seferis even if he could not accept the world of ruin and desolation it so mercilessly delineated. It was surrealism which was just beginning to make itself known in Greece which gave Elytis the key to a forbidden world whose existence he had dimly suspected but had not dared confess to himself. In 1929, at the age of 18, he chanced upon a book by Paul Eluard which was to greatly influence his writing. His first attempts at poetry occurred between 1930-35 while attending the School of Law at the University of Athens. In 1935 Elytis left the university without getting a degree when he met Andreas Embiricos who had just published *Ypsikaminos (Blast Furnace)*, the first book of surrealist automatic writing in Greece. Whereas he was to use automatic writing of more or less unrelated images and tropes in a few of his poems, Elytis had by this time found his voice, a voice which rejected a purely uncontrolled onrush of associations, extravagant and far-fetched comparisons; for equally strong in him, though still latent, was a sense of composition which he admired, even then, in the neoclassical constructions of the poems of Andreas Kalvos (1792-1869).

What seems to have drawn Elytis to surrealism was not its negative discarding of traditional meters and patterns but its insistence in particular that feeling, intuition, and the subconscious had a logic of their own utterly distinct from that of the conscious mind. For him poetry needed no longer to unfold in a development of themes encased in previously adapted forms. He felt that surrealism heralded a return to magical sources which years of rationalization had calcified; it represented a plunge into the wellsprings of fantasy and dream, a free-flowing clustering of images creating its own shapes. This view of surrealism was greatly to influence the course of subsequent poetry in Greece.

At the same time, however, the poet could not completely divorce himself from the symbols and myths of Classical and Hellenistic times, a living heritage that appears over and again in the poetry of his contemporaries Cavafy, Kazantzakis, and Seferis. But Elytis yielded to these influences sparingly, preferring to create his own personal mythology out of his evolving experience; out of the Greek landscape and mores; out of the Greek historic consciousness in its long struggle for freedom; out of the development of the Greek language as one integral whole, out of the liturgy of Byzantine hymnology and the Orthodox Church, with its sublimations of Dionysian and Eleusinian mysteries; and primarily out of the sea, sky, rock, and whitewash of the Aegean world that surrounded him.

In order to understand Elytis's poetry more fully, however, this paper will do two things: first it will place the poet in the context of the period in which he wrote and second, it will draw parallels between his work and that of the only other Greek poet to win the Nobel Prize, George Seferis (1963).

Although modern Greek poetry begins with the vernacular Akritic epic cycle composed between the ninth and tenth centuries, it was not until the poet Kostis Palamas (1859-1943) that a completely new kind of life was infused into Greek poetry. It was Palamas who rejected the Romantics and the "Purist" form of Greek (*katharevousa*) to lead his contemporaries and such younger poets as Elytis and Seferis into a fresh world of literature in which the full possibilities of the modern Greek language and its rhythms were explored. And yet, the proper beginning of modern Greek poetry as we understand it today can be said to have occurred in the early 1930s. It was during this period that George Seferis's first book of poetry, perceptively titled *Turning Point*, was published (1931) to mark the beginning of the strongest wave of Symbolism to enter Greece; it was also the key moment for Greek Surrealist poetry, with the founding of the periodical *Ta Nea Grammata* in 1935. In March of the same year there appeared two more seminal texts of modern Greek poetry—George Seferis's *Mythistorema* and Andreas Embiricos's *Ypsikaminos*—while in November of the same year *Ta Nea Grammata* published the first poems of Odysseus Elytis. Just a year earlier in 1930 Yannis

Ritsos's first book of poetry, *Tractor*, appeared, as did Takis Papatonis's *Selection I*.

In this new poetry of the thirties, which clearly and definitely turned from old Greek forms to the more avant-garde techniques of western Europe, in particular to French Symbolism and Surrealism, modern Greek poets were to create a poetry so heavily imbued with the past of that nation that the body of their work cannot be seriously discussed without some consideration of the past.

Modern Greek poetry of the thirties was caught in the great debate over Greek identity—a debate on-going since before the Greek Revolution of 1821. It involved two strains: one strain followed the European or foreign view of Greek identity which I shall refer to as the Hellenic view characterized by a long-term love affair with the distant classical past, as a source of the values that informed European culture. This strain maintained a distinct distaste for post-Byzantium modern Greece as an ethnically mixed grab-bag of largely oriental attitudes. The European view was shared by intellectual Greeks of the Diaspora who were to provide the new leaders of what they regarded as a backward native population. In opposition to the Hellenic view was the second strain, which I shall refer to as the Romeic view. Adopted by the autochthonous or indigenous native Greeks who populated the Turkish lands, it accepted the mixed demography of Greek lands that resulted from the variety of invasions and migrations that afflicted Greece across its history; the Romeic view defined itself as a pluralistic, largely lower class oral culture whose origins could be effectively traced to the Byzantine and Ottoman empires.

It was this unresolved debate that we find reflected in the poetry of the generation of the thirties. Preoccupation with the past as opposed to insistence on living in the present became a dominant theme which was shared by the poets of this period. Attempts to define Greek identity are torn between the Europeanized approach, exemplified by the poetry of George Seferis with its reliance on the classical past for modern meaning and the internal, subconscious view of Odysseus Elytis which finds its direction by indirection, effectively resolving the issue by avoiding it.

Let us first consider Seferis. Using the Homeric hero Odysseus as a continuing figure throughout his poetry, Seferis finds for his modern Greek audience a persona at home in the global world, a man of action who, certain of his eventual return to Ithaca, does not know despair. Seferis takes this very liberal Odysseus and transforms him into an exile, a fatherly-sea-captain, a pilgrim. His Odysseus, unlike Homer's, cannot return to the world of social and physical reality—to Ithaca—for he is incapable of communication with the dead who alone hold the secret of his return. The secret of how he is to return home is withheld from Seferis's Odysseus, a pathetic sufferer who bends to his fate, unlike his ancestor Homer's Odysseus, the man of action, who wrestles old Proteus as he transforms into various beasts until, at the end, exhausted, Proteus is compelled to reveal Odysseus's future. Again in the underworld Homer's Odysseus approaches the dead to learn from the prophet Teresias the fate that awaits him in Ithaca. Seferis's modern Odysseus, by contrast, unable to return home, must persist in his never-ending quest, without issue, overwhelmed by the memories of lost friends and relatives, weak companions submerged or dying. Seferis reminds us that in modern times Homeric Odysseus has become a shadow of regret, a ghost which haunts us "with eyes reddened by the salt of the sea." This twentieth century Odysseus conveys the inadequacy of the present-day Greek in equaling the feats of his forefathers; he serves as a voice for all men tormented by alienation and the futile search for a Paradise which is no more. A surrogate for the poet himself, he is cut off from his homeland by two world wars and a lifetime career in the foreign diplomatic corps.

If a counterpart to his Odysseus exists in Homer's world, Seferis suggests, then Elpenor—a common sailor in Odysseus's crew—must be he. It is Elpenor who succumbs to the fatal charms of the goddess Circe. Trapped by Homer in a foreign mythic landscape which he does not understand, Elpenor, at a loss in heroic times, is very much at home in Seferis's world. "Sentimental, mediocre, wasted," in Seferis's words, Elpenor is the "poor devil" that modern man has become, while the Classical Odysseus is only the shadow of what modern man "should be."

Coordinate with Seferis's groping hero of resignation and defeat, the landscape of this poet's world is one of mutilated statues and altars, hulks of ships coated with rust and brine, a harsh and ruined legacy. These echoes of the past torment the dislocated,

What then are they looking for, our souls that travel
On rotting sea-timbers
From one harbour to another harbour?

Shifting broken stones, breathing in
Each day less easily the pine trees' coolness
Swimming now in the waters of this sea
And now of that one,
Without the sense of touch,
Without men,
In a country that is no longer our own country
And is not yours either. (Seferis 19)

Seferis retreats to the past in his own life as well as in the life of his poetry. Going back into his childhood to create an individual mythology, he becomes himself a lonely island in time. In a letter written in 1941, he refers to the conditions of creation which feed into his poetry: "There are nights," he says, "when I wake with the feeling that I am a golden fish in a bottle of electric liquid. It is an atmosphere of sick childhood; stimulating with dryness, stimulating in a bad way." This childhood world, this past, this source of his own creativity, as well as the creativity of his people, becomes identified in Seferis's mind with the world of the dead, a world he finds more real than that of the living. Past and present become confused, fragments of history floating like memories of waking life in our dreams:

I awoke with this marble head between my hands
Which tires my elbows out. Where can I put it down?
It was falling into the dream as I rose from the dream
And so our lives grew one, hard now to be separated.
(Seferis 12)

And only in death does the possibility exist that the past might become present again, the "appearance" of the former fusing with the "reality" of the latter. Perhaps the ruins will become full again, in "the hour of death" Seferis muses in one of his poems (Memory II).

Thus in Seferis, where the echo of the past is constant, one can never be certain whether he is in the company of the living or the dead. The quest is for the past, for an end to the perennial dislocation in time. It is a persistent search for the lost world of the now-dead which somehow is yet-alive; for an insistent and yet anonymous racial memory which at the same time is now a part of past history. Memory leads to disorientation and to interiorization of the external event, it leads to fatalism and to a sense of the unreliability of real time. It is the interpenetration of the inherited past and time-present removed from the accident of time that represents, for Seferis, essential reality.

Seferis's view is a tragically paradoxical one; there can be no hope of an end, save in cessation of the search, no likelihood of a resolution, save in catastrophe. The sense of present loss and of imminent failure is constant. Seferis's hero in conclusion is a passive figure, his *Odyssey* a resigned event which merely poses fatalistically the question of deliverance. The poet's final answer to the quest comes in his poem, "The Thrush." Here he paraphrases from Plato's *Apology* Socrates's response at his trial:

And then there came that old man's voice, this one
I felt
Drop to the heart of the day
Calm, changeless, still:
"If you sentence me to drink poison, I thank you.
Your law shall be made my law. And where should I go
Running about in foreign lands, a rolling stone?
I choose death rather.
Which of us goes to the better fate God knows."
(Seferis 99)

Such a reduction in stature of the man of action to acquiescence in his own death—the only end to his quest in modern times—leads in Seferis to pathos. Through Socrates's response, Odysseus is reduced to an Elpenor.

As we now move our discussion to consider Elytis, our starting point is the poet's rejection of literal uses of myth that seek identity with the Classical past. "I have reacted against this, often quite consciously," he says, "because I thought all this was a bit too facile, yes, even in the theater. Many French and other European writers have, as you know, adapted the Electra myth, among others. Since my chief interest was to find the *sources* of the Neo-Hellenic world, I kept the mechanism of mythmaking but not the figures of mythology" (Elytis, "Interview" 639). Elytis, thus, references mythical characters in his poetry but leaves them nameless. He personifies abstract objects and apprehends the world, as did the surrealists, through his senses.

Elytis's perception of the world through the senses is conditioned by the sanctified aura he ascribes to all he perceives. "I have tried to harmonize these two terms," he says; "that is, whenever I speak of the most sensuous matters, I conceive of them as being in a state of purity and sanctity. I aim at the union of these two currents. I am not a Christian in the strict sense of the word, but Christianity's idea of sanctification I do adapt to the world of the senses" (Elytis, "Interview" 631-632). Through the senses, Elytis seeks to find in the description of the Greek landscape an "analogy" in the world of spiritual values. Each image he describes possesses for him an ethical or moral equivalent. "Once you accept this theory," he says, "you will be able to see that my fondness of the Greek landscape is not a form of nationalism, but rather an effort at transposition" (632). The poem, "The Girl the North Wind Brought" is illustrative of this method and Elytis's poetry in general:

At a great distance within the fragrance of mint I
pondered where
I was going and I said that I might not be at the
mercy of the

wilderness I shall find a small church to speak to

The roar of the sea ate up the darkness within me like
a goat and

left me an opening that beckoned more and more to
the Felicities But there was nothing no one

Only the divination of the wild olive tree became
incandescent around me

And all the mountain slope along the length of the
sea spray and high

above my head spoke oracularly in susurrations with
myriads of

mauve quiverings and small insects like cherubim Yes
yes I agreed

these seas will be avenged *One day these seas will be
avenged*

And then up there breaking away from her ruined
shelter gaining in

height and as beautiful as can be with all the whimsies
of birds in

her movements the girl the North Wind brought
appeared and I waited

And as she proceeded a few lengths ahead by leaning
her small breasts for

the wind to withstand a terrified joy within me mounted
to my eyelids and fluttered there

Ah the rages and the insanities of my country!

Kindled orbs of light burst behind her and left in the
sky something like the elusive sign of Paradise

I was in time to see for a moment the forks between
her legs grown wide

and all of the place inside with even the little saliva
of the sea
Afterwards her odor reached me like fresh bread and
wild mountain licorice

I pushed open the small wooden door and lit a candle
Because one of my ideas had become immortal.

(Elytis, *Sovereign* 141-142)

Elytis focuses on the ideal of virtue, represented for the Romans by *Virtus* and for the Greeks by *Arete*, figures appear that to beam rays of light into darkness. In Elytis's search for identity in the Greek past, the idea of virtue, the ray of hope, is personified in the girl the north wind brought. The Greek spirit in the poetry of Elytis inevitably assumes the shape of a winged girl, she who comes from the Byzantine north, Constantinople, so that "one day these seas"—the Aegean Sea, heir to the Hellenic tradition, which possesses all that is valued in the Aegean World—"will be avenged."

Passing "within the fragrance of mint," the poet is guided across the Greek landscape to seek his identity in the past. Through his senses again in "the roar of the sea" which "ate up the darkness within me like a goat," he finds himself able to penetrate the dark wilderness which surrounds him in search of a church which, found, elevates the sensibly experienced world to a plane of sanctity and happiness: "and all the mountain slope along the length of the sea spray and/high above my head spoke oracularly in susurrations with myriads/ of mauve quiverings and small insects like cherubim."

Elytis's evocation of the past is instantaneous, experienced at the moment he begins to open the church door. The instant itself holds not only the fullness of the moment, but the essence of every moment. Suspended in time, the whole poem embraces that moment, leaving the poet at the end where he began entering to light a candle: "I pushed open the small wooden door and lit a candle because one of my ideas had become immortal."

Elytis's search for the past occurs outside the boundlessness of clarity: "I am not," he says, "for the clarity of intel-

ligence, that which the French call "La belle clarte," he tells us, "No, I think that even the most irrational thing can be limpid." This limpidity or transparency which finds behind each comment another and different comment and behind that still another is for Elytis, essential to Greekness, a quality characteristic of events understood in the context of the Greek landscape. Nature's own limpidity in the intense Greek sun and in the sun's refraction as it bounces back against the sea brings up things that appear other than they are. The limpid is thus, at times, irrational, irrational and surreal.

From his earliest poetry what drew Elytis to the surreal was its insistence that feeling, intuition, the subconscious express a logic distinct from that of the conscious mind. Elytis deserted thematic development to immerse himself in the free flow of fantasy and dream, images whose clustering created their own unique shapes. Through he surreal, Elytis infused spirit into the material world. Through personification he molded the abstract into concrete forms as we see in his poem "Body of Summer":

A long time has passed since the last rainfall was heard
Above the ants and the lizards
Now the sky burns endlessly
The fruit trees paint their mouths
The pores of the earth very slowly open
And beside the trickling and syllabic waters
A huge plant stares straight into the sun.

Who is this who sprawls on the far beaches
Stretched on his back, smoking the smokesilver olive
leaves
Crickets warm themselves in his ears
Ants scurry to work on his chest
Lizards glide in the long grasses of his armpits
And through the seaweed of his feet a wave lightly
passes
Sent by that small siren who sang. . . .

(Elytis, *Sovereign*, 75)

The animate inanimate is found in fruit which paint their mouths in the summer heat and transform into earth's swelling pores. Summer itself is a boy stretched out on the shore while "crickets warm themselves in his ears/Ants scurry to work on his chest/and lizards glide in the long grasses of his arm-pits." And through summer's seaweed feet "a wave lightly passes." Infused with light and idyllic joy, these are images of hope, joy, and sensuality, bathed in the light that has become the trademark of a poetry free of the sentimentality made popular in Greek poetry by the earlier work of Kostas Karyotakis.

Elytis, unlike Seferis, felt that the true face of Greece was not to be found in the Classical past which, as he had come to know it, was a past created by Post-Renaissance northern Europe. Elytis searched for identity with the Greek world from a Greek perspective. But to find it, he had to return to the European sensibility. "In order to achieve this task," he states,

we [who adopted surrealism] had to destroy the tradition of rationalism which lay heavily on the Western world. Hence, the great appeal of surrealism for us, from the moment it appeared on the literary scene. Many facets of surrealism I cannot accept such as its paradoxical side, its championing of automatic writing, but after all, it was the only school of poetry—and, I believe, the last in Europe—which aimed at spiritual health and reacted against the rationalist currents which had filled most Western minds. Since surrealism had destroyed this rationalism like a hurricane, it had cleared the ground in front of us, enabling us to link ourselves physiologically with our soil and to regard Greek reality without the prejudices that have reigned since the Renaissance. The Western world always conceives of Greece in the image created by the Renaissance. But this image is not true. Surrealism, with its anti-rationalistic character, helped us to make a sort of revolution by perceiving the Greek truth. At the same time, surrealism contained a supernatural element, and this enabled us to form a kind of alpha-

bet out of purely Greek elements with which to express ourselves. (Elytis, "Interview" 631).

Elytis found his "purely Greek elements" in the Byzantine past, the modern Greek folk tradition, and the demotic tradition from the Cretan Renaissance through the nineteenth century, echoes of which, while they reverberate throughout Elytis's poetry are especially heard in his major work, *The Axion Esti* (1959):

Then he spoke and the sea was born
And I saw and marveled
And in its midst he sowed small worlds in my image
and likeness:
 Steeds of stone with names erect
 and amphorae serene
 and the slanting backs of dolphins
Ios Seriphos Sikinos Milos
"Every word a swallow
to fetch you spring in the midst of summer," he said
And ample the olive trees
 to sift the light through their fingers
 as it spreads softly over your sleep
and so ample the cicadas
 that you do not heed them
 as you do not heed the pulse in your hand
.....
and broad the sky above
 that you may read the infinite yourself

THIS
small, this great world! (Elytis, *Sovereign* 101)

This long work in three parts, Genesis, The Passions, and the Gloria, from which I have just quoted, the poet's autobiography figures forth the life of all poets. Together with the poet is born "THIS small, this great world" which is both Greece the microcosm and the universal macrocosm. Composed mostly in demotic, *The Axion Esti* includes elements linking the

great periods of Greek literature—from the Septuagint, the Byzantine *troparia*, Demotic songs and folk legends of the medieval period, from *Erotocritos*, Makriyannis, Solomos, Kalvos, Sikelianos, Palamas, and Papadiamandis.

Into the riches of this poem, Elytis pours the figures of his earlier poetry, raising them from a physical to an ethical plane. In a trance and transported high above the physical world, the poet finds himself present at the moment of creation. That which first comes into being is the sea, Greece, himself, by extension "This small this great world," our earth and the entire universe. He has become the landscape in which he lives and the landscape is himself, "And in its midst he sowed small worlds in my image and likeness." He is Greece from its creation to the present. His landscape becomes human as olive trees shift the light through their fingers and he unites and becomes one with the sounds and images of Greece's landscape, "so ample the cicadas that you do not heed them as you do not heed the pulse in your hand." In this intensely personal and physical vision, the poet has himself become his past.

The 1930s, in sum, provided a pivotal point in modern Greek poetry. It was clear by this time that Greece's dream of a future return to its former greatness would never be realized. The Smyrna disaster of 1922 and World War I put an end to Greece's "Great Idea" of an empire extending once again to Constantinople. Greece was now a small, somewhat insignificant country in the European community, a land of refugees and displaced people seeking an identity. Another world war, more horrible than the first was already imminent a war that was to leave Greece completely defeated. The highly romantic and sentimental poetry which had its roots not in Greece but in the poetry of Europe was no longer adequate. Poets, thus, turned to new forms and to their country's past to seek their identity and to discover the meaning of their existence.

George Seferis was able to bring to Greek poetry the sense of displacement and dissatisfaction he felt in the contemporary Greek after World War I and the Smyrna disaster of 1922; what he found there was an unbearable burden which the con-

temporary Greek, aware of his unequal standing in the face of the greatness of the past, could not shoulder.

Odysseus Elytis, on the other hand, rejected Seferis's aristocratic and pessimistic view. Elytis considered the Classical past he inherited a construct created by foreigners; searching that past could not produce an identity. He turned then to Greece's other pasts—the Byzantine past, the Turkish Occupation, and the Greek War of Independence. But even there, truth escaped him; these pasts too were the constructs of others. Truth had to be sought in oneself. Elytis thus used these pasts as a source of inspiration to lead to a personal and meditative state that reached deep into the subconscious for true identity.

The fullest understanding of Elytis's poetry is perhaps best expressed in the poet's Nobel acceptance speech:

Poetry—which stands erect at that point where rationalism puts down its arms—takes up the task of advancing into the forbidden zone, thus proving itself to be that which is least corroded by usury. It assures, in the purity of their form, the safety of the permanent givens by which life remains a viable labor. Without poetry, and its vigilance, these givens would be lost in the obscurity of consciousness, just as algae become indistinct in the depths of the sea.

This is why we have a great need for transparency: to perceive clearly the knots of this thread, which is stretched across the centuries and which helps us remain upright on the earth. We perceive these knots, these ties, distinctly, from Heraclitus to Plato and from Plato to Jesus. Brought to us in diverse forms, they acutely tell us the same thing: that it is in the interior of this world that the other world is contained, that it is with the elements of this world that the other world is composed—the beyond, that second reality which is situated above the one that we live against nature. It is a matter of a reality to which we have a total right, and of which only our incapacity makes us unworthy.

Whether it is Apollo or Venus, Christ or the

Virgin, who incarnates and personifies our need to see materialized that which we experience as intuition, is of no importance. What is important is this breath of immortality that penetrates us. And in my humble opinion, Poetry must, beyond all doctrinal arguments, allow us to breathe this breath. (Elytis, "Nobel" 100)

⁴Translated by Andonis Decavalles (Decavalles 11-12).

WORKS CITED

- DECAVALLES, ANDONIS. *Odysseus Elytis: From the Golden to the Silver Poem*. New York: Pella Publishing Company, Inc., 1994.
- ELYTIS, ODYSSEUS. *Anihta Hartia* [Open Book]. Athens: Asterias, 1974.
- . Interview. "Odysseus Elytis on His Poetry." By Ivar Ivask. Trans. by Ivar and Astrid Ivask. *Books Abroad* 49.4 (Autumn, 1975), 631-43.
- . "Nobel Lecture, 8 December 1979." Trans. Ronald L. Bogue. *The Georgia Review* 49.1 (Spring, 1995), 99-104.
- . *The Sovereign Sun*. Trans. Kimon Friar. Philadelphia: Temple UP, 1974.
- KAZANTZAKIS, NIKOS. *The Odyssey: A Modern Sequel*. Trans. Kimon Friar. New York: Siman and Schuster, 1958.
- SEFERIS, GEORGE. *Poems*. Trans. Rex Warner, Boston: Little, Brown, 1960.

BOOK REVIEWS

Book Reviews

LOUISE BRUIT ZAIMAN AND PAULINE SCHMITT PANDEL, *Religion in the Ancient Greek City*. Translated by Paul Cartledge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1992, xxiii+278 pp.

The aim of this book, originally published in French in 1989, is to offer to students and to interested nonspecialists an introduction to Greek religion based on current interpretative models. In this field of scholarship monographs dedicated to specific aspects of the religious practices of the Greeks abound, but reliable handbooks for nonspecialists are a rarity. This handy volume undoubtedly meets this demand, at the same time presenting to the specialist a refreshing approach to old questions.

In his intriguing and witty introduction, P. Cartledge, whose contribution goes far beyond offering a good translation of the French, sketches the differences between religion(s) of today and the religion of the Greek *polis*, illustrating with several interesting examples the "otherness" of the Greek approach to religious matters (women serving as priestesses, the lack of doctrinally authoritative sacred books, the lack of vocationally recruited priests, the acceptance of nudity, the lack of a religious education). Cartledge and the book's authors advocate an emancipation from the "Christianizing assumptions" which tantalized earlier research, stressing the necessity of a "cultural estrangement" for the study of Greek religion. In terms of method, the new book follows the French school of a sociohistorical approach to religion that has offered significant contributions, especially to the interpretation of myths and divinities. Consequently, the works of this school's representatives (e.g., L. Gernet, J.-P. Vernant, M. Detienne) occupy a prominent (perhaps too prominent) position in the bibliography. The book's chronological limits (750-330 B.C.) are perhaps somewhat narrow, leaving out the Hellenistic age, which not only provides reliable documentary material but also presents, in many cases, the culmination of religious trends rooted in the classical period.

In the introduction the authors argue for the necessity of cultural estrangement in Greek religion, offer excellent definitions of fundamental religious notions (the sacred, purity-pollution, piety-impiety), and present the basic sources of evidence (literary texts, inscriptions, archeological data). I would have expected a much more detailed discussion of the sources from an introduction aimed to be read by students, one that would focus on the *problems* the source material

for the archaic and classical period presents (one-sided interest in mythology, limited reliability of later sources, polemic character of the information given by the patristic sources, etc.). Knowing the deficiencies of the source material, a student of Greek religion is better prepared to understand the problems of reconstruction and interpretation presented in the rest of the book. The extreme conciseness of this part will probably make an excessive demand on the student and non-specialist, who could ask what might late lexicographers, whose names and works are not mentioned, contribute to the study of Greek religion.¹ A serious difficulty faced especially by students and interested non-specialists is finding additional and *new* bibliographical material. Only in the three years since the publication of the book, the bibliography has been enriched with numerous monographs dealing with central aspects of this book.² References to the existing resources of keeping track of the new research would have been welcome.³ The authors included three texts written by J. Rudhardt and J.-P. Vernant in the introduction which illustrate modern approaches to Greek religion. Since quotations from the works of the Cambridge School,⁴ M. P. Nilsson, or W. Burkert are not given, the contrast to other approaches remains somewhat indistinct.

The core of the book is its second part, devoted to cult practices. The most important rituals (sacrifice, libation, prayer), the duties and the mode of selection of religious personnel, the places of cult and their equipment, the various rites of passage (birth rites, rites related to the entry into the worlds of the adult and the citizen, initiation rituals of young girls, marriage, death, afterlife), the settings of religious life (households, *demoi*, tribes, religious associations), some aspects of the interaction between religious and political life (patron deities, foundation of cities, oracles, space organization), the celebration of festivals (sacred calendars, procession, sacrifice, *agon*, theater), and the major Panhellenic cults (Olympia, Delphi, Asklepieion at Epidaurus, Eleusis) are presented here with clarity and a good sense of selectivity. The authors always focus on the social and political contexts of cult practices. This is particularly clear in the chapter about the Greek "rites of passage," which encompasses the rituals performed in crucial moments in the life-cycle of free Greek men and women. By replacing the common notion of "popular religion" with the notion of "rites of passage" (p. 63), the authors enable the reader to understand the significance of these rituals. We should also mention here the excellent selection of sources in translation, which invigorate the presentation. An introductory book for a general audience has to be selective, and so the exclusion of various aspects of cult practices, which one might wish in this volume (e.g., short discussions of the prayer's typical structure,⁵ of ritual gestures,⁶ of oaths, of inventories, of the religious life of slaves, of curse?) can easily be justified. Another result of this selectivity is more disturbing. Despite the book's

declared aim to avoid "Athenocentricity" (p. xv), Athens receives more space here, even in chapters for which other Greek cities provide an abundance of very often reliable documentary evidence. In the chapters about festivals, officials, rites of passage, religion, and political life, to mention only the most important examples, the authors missed a unique opportunity to acquaint their readers with evidence outside classical Athens and to show the diversity of Greek religious practices. Crete, for example, provides excellent written and visual evidence for "rites of passage" of young men in the period under study;⁸ sacred magistracies are particularly well known, for example, in Rhodes and several cities of Asia Minor; one of the most detailed descriptions of the duties of a priest is to be found in an inscription from the Amphiaraos sanctuary at Oropos;⁹ the sacred calendar of no other city is so complete as that of Athens, but information about individual festivals comes from other regions, too (e.g., Daidala in Boiotia and Hyakinthia in Sparta); finally, the financial and political weight of sanctuaries is well attested and studied in southern Italy and Sicily.¹⁰ An example of the generalizations to which the exorcised but still latent Athenocentricity may lead can be found in relation to the distribution of the meat of sacrificed animals; the authors underline the correspondence of this practice to the ideological model of *isonomia* (p. 36), which, however, does not apply to every Greek city—and not even to every period of Athenian history.

The third part of this book deals with myths and mythology (cosmogonies, theogonies, the Hesiodic myth of races, myths of sacrifice) and the polytheistic character of Greek religion. It is in these two fields that the authors' mentors, J.-P. Vernant and M. Detienne, have revolutionized modern research, and it is only natural that these chapters are the best in the book. The authors illustrate with several well-chosen examples the French school's approach to the Greek pantheon. Short studies on divinities of marriage and of cunning intelligence, on Apollo and Dionysus, and on the pantheon of an individual city (Mantineia) illustrate the way this methodological approach explores neglected sides of Greek polytheism. However, given the deficiencies, ambiguities, and contradictions of our sources, the almost positivistic confidence to the possibilities of this method¹¹ (or of any method) is not justifiable. This analysis of the Greek pantheon is followed by a discussion of the different ways of representing the divine and the rituals.¹² The book ends, somewhat awkwardly, with a fourth part that consists of conclusions and reflections on the development of the Greek notion of *cuxAE* and on continuity and change in Greek religion. Both subjects are simply too important to be treated in merely four pages, and the discussion remains inadequate.¹³ Two appendices illustrate the basic features of the classical Greek temple and present the monuments on the Athenian Acropolis. A selective, sufficiently representative bibliography (269 titles) and an index conclude the volume.

Admittedly, had the authors treated all the questions a reader interested in Greek religion might ask in their book, they wouldn't have produced this useful, handy, and affordable volume. In general, they have succeeded in their aim to present students and a more general audience all essential features of Greek religion with clarity, accuracy, a good sense of selectivity, and, in certain cases, with originality.¹⁴ The excellent selection of sources in translation and 23 illustrations contribute to the clarity and vividness of the presentation. This volume will not replace W. Burkert's monumental (sometimes idiosyncratic) *Greek Religion* (Cambridge, MA 1985; a second edition is in preparation) as a reference book, but this volume is more suitable as a textbook due its conciseness, clarity, and wealth of illustrative material. If indeed it fulfills that goal, it is to a great extent thanks to the brilliant English translation of Paul Cartledge, who has written an introduction and has adapted the volume to the needs of an English-speaking readership by also making several additions and corrections,¹⁵ rearranging the chapters, and enlarging the bibliography.

— Angelos Chaniotis
Department of Classics
New York University

NOTES

¹In relation to the ancient exegetic literature a reference to the collection of fragments by A. Tresp (*Die Fragmente der griechischen Kultschriftsteller*, Gießen 1914; reprint: New York 1975) and F. Jacoby (*Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, 1927-1957, esp. Part III) would have been useful.

²I mention only a few examples: S. Alcock and R. Osborne (eds), *Placing the Gods: Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece*, Oxford 1994; R. Buxton, *Imaginary Greece: The Contexts of Mythology*, Cambridge 1994; T. H. Carpenter and C. A. Faraone (eds), *Masks of Dionysus*, Ithaca-London 1993; G. Casadio, *Storia del culto di Dioniso in Argolide*, 1994; N. Demand, *Birth, Death, and Motherhood in Classical Greece*, Baltimore 1994; K. Dowden, *The Uses of Greek Mythology*, London 1992; C. A. Faraone, *Talismans and Trojan Horses*, New York-Oxford 1992; R. Garland, *Introducing New Gods, the Politics of Athenian Religion*, London 1992; F. Graf, *Greek Mythology: An Introduction*, Baltimore-London 1993; N. Marinatos and R. Hägg, *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches*, London-New York 1993; A. Moreau (ed.), *L'initiation. Actes du colloque international de Montpellier 11-14 avril 1991*, Montpellier 1992; V. Pirenne-Delforge, *L'Aphrodite grecque. Contribution à l'étude de ses cultes et de sa personnalité dans le panthéon archaïque et classique*, Liège 1994; R. Rehm, *Marriage to Death: The Conflation of Wedding and Funeral Rituals in Greek Tragedy*, Princeton 1994; V. J. Rosivach, *The System of Public Sacrifice in Fourth-Century Athens*, Atlanta 1994; A. Schachter (ed.), *Le sanctuaire grec* (Entretiens Hardt, XXXVII), Genève 1992; H. S. Versnel, *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion*, Leiden 1993.

³I only mention the bibliographical project *Mentor*, whose first volume

(with titles until 1985) was published in 1992 (A. Motte, V. Pirenne-Delforge, and P. Wachtetet (eds), *Mentor, Guide bibliographique de la religion grecque*, Liège 1992) and the two journals dedicated to the study of Greek religion, *Méris* and *Kernos*; the annual issues of the latter periodical contain a lengthy bibliographical part, a survey of recent archeological discoveries, and an epigraphic bulletin for Greek religion.

⁴See now S. Arlen, *The Cambridge Ritualists: An Annotated Bibliography of the Works by and about Jane Ellen Harrison, Gilbert Murray, Francis M. Cornford, and Arthur Bernard Cook*, Metuchen-London 1990.

⁵See, e.g., F. Graf, "Prayer in Magic and Religious Ritual," in C. A. Faraone and D. Obbink (eds), *Magika Hiera*, 1991, 189; D. Aubriot-Sévin, *Prière et conceptions religieuses en Grèce ancienne jusqu'à la fin du Ve siècle av J.-C.*, Lyon 1992.

⁶E.g., E. Brandt, *Gruf und Gebet, Eine Studie zu Gebärden in der minoisch-mykenischen und frühgriechischen Kunst*, 1965.

⁷Cartledge justifies the deliberate exclusion of magic because it "is not a publicly sanctioned religious activity" (p. xv). This doesn't hold true for curses, such as, e.g., the public imprecations of Theos (M. N. Tod, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, Oxford 1948, II, no. 23; for further finds and bibliography see *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum XXXI* 984-985) or the "foundation decree" of Kyrene (R. Meiggs and D. M. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, Oxford 1969, no. 5; for a recent study see F. Létoublon, "Le serment fondateur," *Méris* 4, 1989, 101-115). Curses played a prominent role in Athenian legal and political life, as can be inferred from epigraphic finds (see the survey of defixiones: D. R. Jordan, "A Survey of Greek Defixiones not Included in the Special Corpora," *GRBS* 26, 1985, 151-197; a nice example: A. Chaniotis, *Watching a Lawsuit: A New Curse Tablet from Southern Russia*, *GRBS* 33, 1992, 69-73). For the role of "magic" in the public life of Greek cities, see C. A. Faraone, *Talismans and Trojan Horses*, New York-Oxford 1992.

⁸See A. Lebesse, "Flagellation ou autoflagellation. Données iconographiques pour une tentative d'interprétation," *BCH* 115, 1991, 99-123 (also with the older bibliography); cf. the recent study of D. D. Leitao, "The Perils of Leukippos. Initiatory Transvestism and Male Gender Ideology in the Ekdusia of Phaistos," *Classical Antiquity* 14, 1991, 130-163.

⁹For priesthoods in Asia Minor see, e.g., F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure*, Paris 1955, no. 23, 44-46, 50, 59. *The lex sacra of Oropos*: F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques*, Paris 1969, no. 69 (4th century). The discussion of priesthoods in Asia Minor in this book (pp. 50-51) has several inaccuracies. There is no reference to the fact that both sacred laws cited here are much later than the classical period; the text from Erythrai dates to the middle of the third century B.C., the text from Miletos to the first century A.D.! Relevant sources of the classical period are, e.g., *LSAM* no. 23 (Erythrai, fourth century), 44-46 (Miletos, ca. 400-300 B.C.). Also see B. Le Guen-Pollet, *La rémunération du prêtre en Grèce ancienne (Ve s. av. J.-C.-IIIe s. ap. J.-C.)*, *L'Information Historique* 50, 1988, 149-156. For the text from Erythrai the authors cite the antiquated edition in *Sylloge*³ 600 (1915-1924), and not *LSAM* no. 25 (1955), which includes a fragment found in 1933.

¹⁰See L. Migeotte, "Sur les rapports financiers entre le sanctuaire et la cité de Locres," in D. Knoepfler (ed.), *Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque. Actes du colloque international d'épigraphie tenu à Neuchâtel du 23 au 26 septembre 1986 en l'honneur de Jacques Trébeux*, Neuchâtel-Genève

1988, 191-203; C. Ampolo, "The Economics of the Sanctuaries in Southern Italy and Sicily," in T. Linders and B. Alroth (eds), *The Economics of Cult in the Ancient Greek World*, Uppsala 1992, 25-28; F. Costabile (ed.), *Polis ed Olympieion a Locri Epizefiri. Costituzione economia e finanze di una città della Magna Grecia*, Catanzaro 1992. For treasuries see, e.g., C. Ampolo, "Fra economia, religione e politica: Tesori e offerte nei santuari greci," in G. Bartolini, G. Colonna and C. Grotanelli (eds), *Atti del convegno internazionale "Anabema. Regime delle offerte e vita dei santuari del mediterraneo antico"*, Roma 15-18 Giugno 1989, *Scienze dell'antichità* 3-4, 1989-1990 (1991), 271-279.

¹¹I quote (and underline) several characteristic phrases: "the modern mythologer can decipher its [the myth's] multiple meaning" (p. 145), "when applied to specific works of literature this [Detienne's] method has enabled their underlying mythical content to be deciphered" (p. 150), "in [the myth about Bouthonia] true significance was..." etc.

¹²The views on *xoanon* (p. 215s.) should, however, be updated; see A. A. Donohue, *Xoana and the Origins of Greek Sculpture*, Atlanta 1988.

¹³Also, the bibliography given on psyche is not sufficient. For further bibliography see J. Bremmer, *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul*, Princeton 1983.

¹⁴The only typographical error I could discover is "Theogones" of Thasos (instead of Theagenes, p. 115). And in a book which advocates "cultural estrangement" for the study of ancient Greece, the phrase "the dictatorship of Peisistratos" is certainly out of place.

¹⁵Cartledge should also be praised for remaining faithful to the original form of Greek personal and place names and terms, rejecting the often misleading Latin transliteration (e.g., Andokides, not Andocides). Unfortunately, this rule was not applied consistently; see, e.g., Socrates (p. 94) and Thucydides (the historian, p. 42), but Alkibiades (p. 94) and Thoukydides (the politician, p. 19), Macedon, but Lakonia (map 1b), Rhodes, but Khios, etc.



R. B. RUTHERFORD, *The Art of Plato: Ten Essays in Platonic Interpretation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995, pp. 335.

In *The Art of Plato*, a new and quite welcome addition to the canon of Platonic interpretation, R. B. Rutherford advances the enjoyment and understanding of Plato's work by devoting much needed attention to the form of the work and its relationship to content. Rutherford provides an interpretive strategy that will enhance the literary understanding of Plato as a writer, without losing sight of the appropriate historical context or philosophical content of his work. Rutherford affords the reader a more holistic interpretation of Plato's works; that is, by devoting attention to the form of each dialogue, as well as its relationship to content, Rutherford's critical method permits a greater appreciation of the very aspects of Plato's writings that are the hallmarks of his style. While anyone who believes the stylistic

qualities of Plato's dialogues simple or irrelevant "is advised to... leave it alone," *The Art of Plato* is well worth the attention of those readers who regard Plato as a master craftsman as much as a philosopher.

The book is, as the title states, divided into ten essays that may be read as independent articles. The first chapter is concerned with laying the conceptual foundations of Rutherford's critical method. In beginning any study of Plato, Rutherford suggests, there are many questions that require attention. This chapter, "Problems and Approaches," attempts briefly to survey existing views on issues such as the authenticity and chronology of Plato's works, the form and origins of the dialogue itself, the relationship between Plato and Socrates, and the unity of Plato's philosophy. Rutherford's own solutions to these questions might not escape criticism, but they are the products of a diligent and faithful consideration of the difficulties that plague the interpreter of Plato.

In order to circumvent the problems of authenticity and chronology, Rutherford deliberately includes only those dialogues that are not typically regarded as spurious. Indeed, of the works he considers, only the *Clitopho* is a serious candidate for the "Spuria." Moreover, he concludes that in the absence of an "absolute chronology" it may be best to regard each dialogue as a self-contained, independent literary work. Nevertheless, he adopts what he calls a "standard" chronology, based upon internal evidence in the dialogues themselves.

Rutherford wrestles with issues such as the origins of the dialogue as a form and why Plato chose to write dialogues in the first place. Rutherford acknowledges that the form of the dialogue would have been known to Plato from drama (especially tragedy), from Sophistic antithetical and antagonistic forms, and from mythical dialogue employed as a means of moral instruction by figures like Prodicus and Hippias. The question for us is: why does Plato choose to adopt dialogue as the form for his writings? Rutherford concludes that there are a number of reasons, but in the end, dialogue may have been Plato's choice because it was most faithful to the historical Socrates' own method. Certainly dialogue conveys a vividness and immediacy to the reader, but more important is the notion that, through dialogue, Plato might more easily invite the reader to participate in the dialectic so crucial to his philosophy. This may be most clearly seen, Rutherford suggests, in the so-called "aporetic" dialogues, which exhort the reader to enter the dialectic.

Naturally, Plato's relation to Socrates immediately presents itself as a challenge to such assumptions. Rutherford rejects the typical solution to this problem, which divides the dialogues into three periods (early, middle, and late). In the early period, it is believed that the dialogues are more influenced by Socrates' actual ideas and dialectical methods. As Plato matures as a philosopher and writer, it is generally conceived, he begins to take a more prominent role by using

Socrates as a mouthpiece for his own views. Thus, in the middle period, a synthesis of Plato and Socrates occurs. By the later period, Socrates is exclusively Platonic in his thinking. Rutherford suggests that his view is problematic. It would be far more profitable (and less "psychologizing") to believe that each dialogue is precisely as Plato wished, and that any changes in theme or style are deliberate on the part of the author.

We see from these considerations that Rutherford's view of Plato's philosophic views departs somewhat from the more traditional views—that Plato's philosophy develops linearly, or that it is fixed from the outset. What is more likely, from Rutherford's point of view, is that Plato's philosophy was not fixed. Indeed, if this were the case, then difficulties and contradictions from dialogue to dialogue would prove quite difficult to resolve. Rather, Plato's views are fluid: inconsistencies and contradiction in various dialogues are deliberate, stylistic developments, which depend upon the particulars created by Plato. Thus "the patronising assumption that Plato committed foolish philosophic blunders without realising it [is] replaced by a more positive approach, which allows that these fallacies may have some role to play in the context of the dialogue" (p. 26). This is the assumption on which Rutherford's method is constructed.

The principles of Rutherford's method essentially amount to a consideration of the literary aspects of Plato's dialogues. First, in order to achieve a fuller understanding of the dialogue form, attention must be devoted to such considerations as style, length of speeches, dramatic framing, and recurrent imagery (p. 27). Such considerations, typically awarded to poetry, are neglected in the interpretation of Plato's work, according to Rutherford. Second, the reader must consider what elements such as setting and character lend to the understanding of the work. Few would argue that these factors are unimportant in the dialogues, e.g., the *Symposium*, the *Phaedrus*, and the *Phaedo*. Finally, the careful reader of Plato must consider tone. According to Rutherford, the view that Plato is always ironic is too simplistic. It is more likely that Plato himself is much like the Alcibiades' depiction of Socrates from the *Symposium*: "outwardly ironic and bantering, but inwardly profound" (p. 28).

Chapters two, three, and four are largely concerned with the character of Socrates. Chapter two surveys much of the literature relevant to the "Socratic question." In the end, the view of Socrates that interests Rutherford most (as an alternative to the Platonic Socrates) comes from none other than Aristotle: "In Aristotle's terse assessments we cannot expect to find any fresh testimony on Socrates the man and the personality, but he offers us a philosopher's judgement on Socrates' place in the history of philosophy" (p. 57). What we see in the *Metaphysics* is a Socrates who was primarily concerned with ethical matters and who first fixed on the problem of definition;

it was Plato who held that the problem pertained not to sensible particulars, but to Ideas. If we regard Aristotle as objective, in a way that Plato or Xenophon are not, then it is clear that the Platonic Socrates differs from the historical person. It seems likely that what we read in Plato is an altered view of Plato's teacher. Since the Socratic question remains insoluble, Rutherford suggests that we must concern ourselves with the Socrates in *Plato*.

Chapters three and four concern, respectively, Socrates' "manners and methods" and his dealings with the sophists. In chapter three Rutherford further describes the relevance of such formal aspects as character, setting, and style. Additionally, he provides interpretations of some of the shorter dialogues, *viz.* the *Laches*, the *Charmides*, and the *Clitopho*, to illustrate these principles of interpretation. What dialogues such as the *Laches* and the *Charmides* depict is that "behavior in dialectical discussion has a moral significance that may be as important as the conclusions actually reached" (p. 85). In the *Laches*, Rutherford points out, we see that the temperament and careers of Nicias and Laches determine their responses to Socrates' remarks, and, to a very real extent, guide Socrates' comments in the first place. Furthermore, the *Clitopho* indicates that Socrates' dialectical methods are not beyond criticism in Plato's dialogues. Rutherford indicates that such criticism advances his view that Plato is inviting his reader to examine Socrates' arguments, and thus join in the dialectic. Chapter four surveys Socrates' encounters with various sophists. Rutherford includes an interpretation of the *Euthydemus* as an illustration of Socrates' polemic against the sophists. Essentially the dialogue demonstrates that

... the sophists' antics are a superficial pretense at philosophy, ingenuous yet sterile... [b]y contrast Socrates' is less showy, more slow-moving, but more valuable, even if it does not reach a firm conclusion: he pursues a serious subject consistently, shares his difficulties with his companion, and (perhaps most important) draws out Cleineas, giving him the confidence to put forth his own ideas (p. 113).

What Socrates achieves is an indication to Crito that he is not an authority figure so much as a guide and influence, somewhat alleviating Crito's concern for the education of his sons.

The remaining chapters of the book deal with particular dialogues in greater detail. Specifically, there are essays devoted to the *Protagoras*, the *Gorgias*, the *Symposium*, the *Republic*, the *Phaedrus*, and one essay concerning the "later" dialogues (*viz.* the *Theaetetus*, the *Timeus*, and the *Laws*). It is not necessary to outline every chapter since each is a detailed application of Rutherford's critical method. Nevertheless, an overview of one or two essays is appropriate to illustrate the sort of insight afforded by Rutherford's approach.

The *Gorgias* illustrates more clearly than any other of Plato's work the importance of the moral character of Socrates' interlocutors. Socrates' approach to dialectic is enformed in each stage of the argument by the nature of his opponent. The tone of the dialogue grows more antagonistic as Socrates is confronted by other figures (*viz.* Polus and finally Callicles). It becomes increasingly clear that Socrates is unable to continue the discussion on his terms. In the end, Socrates makes a rather uncharacteristic shift from dialectic to rhetoric, and Rutherford asserts that this is a final attempt by Socrates to "bridge the gap" between Callicles and himself. Callicles does not reply, suggesting that Socrates has failed to persuade. Socrates is forced to end the discussion, as it is clear that Callicles' indignation and crossness will not permit further dialogue. As in the *Euthyphro*, the dialectic must end without resolution due to the moral character of Socrates' interlocutor. Unlike the *Euthyphro*, however, the tone here is considerably dark. Rutherford posits that Plato is anticipating Socrates' eventual trial and death.

Like most readers, Rutherford is quite taken with the *Symposium*, and his careful examination of dramatic framing reveals that the dialogue features the "strangeness" of Socrates. In one sense the attention devoted to the peculiar figure of the philosopher anticipates the speech delivered by Alcibiades later in the dialogue. In another sense this framing centers Socrates as the subject of the dialogue. It is not only Socrates' attitude toward love that is central here, but also the extraordinary character of the man himself (p. 203). It is fair to suggest that Rutherford could be more forthright here regarding the precise nature of Socrates' *strangeness*—Socrates is unique in his more complete participation in the Good. Such an explanation would more fully develop the relationship of the literary style of the dialogue to its philosophic content. However, Rutherford reserves comment. To a certain extent, it is forgivable to devote attention exclusively to literary concerns in a project of this nature; yet this is only one of several instances where Rutherford falls short of creating a synthesis of form and content. Nevertheless, his method reveals a great deal of insight into the dialogues which might otherwise have been neglected.

While Plato's contribution to philosophy cannot be overstated, it remains the case that any interpretation of his works, individually or taken as a whole, is tragically insufficient if it fails to recognize the literary refinement that locates Plato among a select group of figures in the canon of philosophy. What is evident from the work of critics such as Rutherford is the richness yet to be savored in the writings of Plato. Moreover, while much of *The Art of Plato* is devoted to the character of Socrates, what becomes manifest is not so much a new perception of Plato's teacher, but one of Plato himself. The picture that Rutherford paints so poignantly of Plato is that of

an inspired and industrious master dramatist whose contributions to literature shine forth as preeminently now as ever.

— *Anthony M. Valentine*
Department of English
Oklahoma State University



ARTEMIS LEONTIS, *Topographies of Hellenism: Mapping the Homeland*.
Ithaca: Cornell University Press 1995, pp. 257.

"Hellas, you carry the world on your shoulders. You have marked out the way, but you are still searching for your voice." This popular laconic utterance, the refrain of a contemporary Greek song entitled "Petrina Chronia" ("Stone Years,") from the film bearing the same title, echoes some of the central themes of *Topographies of Hellenism*. These are the persistent idea of the universality of Hellenism held by Neohellenes, its spatial inscription on the terrains it has traversed, and the ambivalence of Neohellenism's search for identity. Implicit in this view of Hellenism is its Janus-like visage, one face looking West and the other to Greece as the threshold to the East. The former's gaze is fixed on the image of a completed culture, now idealizing it and now questioning it, but always mesmerized by its specular seductiveness. The latter's eyes, on the other hand, are witnessing a different kind of Hellenism: a moving current, which enriches and in turn is enriched by the new terrain it carves and enfolds within its banks. The first looks at Hellenism as a state of being, multifaceted to be sure, but immobile; the second conceives of it as a process of becoming, of tracing new paths, of speaking with new voices.

Both of these discourses of Hellenism, the Western and the Neohellenic, are conducted as a dialogue between its text or *logos* and its physical dimension or *topos*. For the West the relation of these two constituent parts is an intricate and uneven one. During the Renaissance, when intellectuals began to interweave Hellenism into their own matrix, it was the *logos* of the Greek texts that first made an imprint on written composition through its rhetorical tropes, soon to be followed by its values and ideas. Travel accounts inscribed these texts on the Greek *topos*, which in part became a vessel of textually constructed symbols and metaphors and in part a *heterotopia*, "a place of different order," marked by the postclassical puzzling mosaic. When the pieces of the puzzle did not fit, the European Hellenophile returned to the reassuring text. "Monsieur, never see Greece, except in Homer.

It is the best way," Chateaubriand warned a friend—and summed up the Western logocentric approach.

Western Hellenism is more than a field of scholarly studies, philosophical and political concepts, and artistic and literary ideas. It is also a search for origins, a distant mirror, and a yardstick for measuring success or failure. It has often placed ancient Greece on a Procrustean bed in order to fit the order of the day: formerly seen as a buffer zone fending off the "barbarians," it is now castigated for inventing them; formerly named the "cradle" of everything beautiful and noble, it has now become the displaced bad conscience of the postcolonial West. In this latest critique, the geography of Greece is of paramount importance for the formation of its cultural identity and transcultural relations.

An intense and sustained dialogue between geography and culture has also been the hallmark of Neohellenic Hellenism. Largely a product of its European prototype in the latter part of the eighteenth century, it proceeded to mark its own topography by engraving its collective identity and autochthonous, multilayered text on its space. *Topographies of Hellenism* is a delineation and critical analysis of this scriptive process following its trajectory from the mid-nineteenth century to the present. It is a vigorous examination of Neohellenism's self-assertive and at times defiant responses to the European challenges of derision and condescension. Excluded from this confident progress of *prise de conscience* is the contrapuntal persistence of ambivalence toward the West and its attendant intellectual tensions and debates. More insistently and extensively, however, this book is a probing account of Neohellenism's dialogue with its history in its attempt to define and institute its culture as a group of people with a common past and present and a shared homeland. Its territory was impressed by art and literature and demarcated by diplomacy and war.

Other works have addressed these subjects. But this study examines their interwoven strands with unwavering concentration on the demands of national culture on all expressions of collective life. Within this interpretation, art and literature submit themselves to the strictures of the construction of an aesthetic nationalist ideology because "the artistic expression is an important act of political self-institution; in particular, of nation-building." This is a declaration of a *littérature engagée*, committed not to the construction of the individual self, Camus's "premier homme," but to the mapping of a collective identity.

The book can be divided into three thematic units. In the first unit, the author defines her theoretical approach to the interactive relations between space and text, *topos* and *logos*. Her terrain is topography, or the inscription of cultural productions on geography. Dismissive of what she considers traditional scholarship, she sets out to carve her own domain—"topology." This is a kind of supradiscipline encompassing other humanistic disciplines and claiming "to reshape the field of

cultural studies" by showing how a people repossesses a place by reclaiming its past.

Repossessing a place or a culture is to contest it from those who appropriated it. This is how Neohellenes began to view Western Hellenism after their initial imitation of its classical models. The projection of the Europeans' textual classicism on Greek space is briefly examined in the second thematic unit. The topographical anchoring of their Hellenic visions takes place on the Acropolis, a home away from home.

In the third and longest unit Leontis examines the diverse but confluent paths of the construction of Neohellenic Hellenism. It is a complex, integrative process of tracing origins and mapping continuities, of trying to reconcile the universal values of classicism absorbed by the West with the uniqueness of autochthonous Hellenism. In surveying its edifice, Leontis identifies two main facets: first, the politically directed and ideologically nurtured irredentist thrust of the *Megali Idea* to make the Neohellenic *topos* and *logos* coterminous, resting on the twin pillars of Athens and Constantinople; second, the concerted efforts of critics and poets to give aesthetic validation to the nationalist enterprise. Pericles Yannopoulos, a strident anti-Western critic, was one of the most vociferous exponents of nativist aesthetic Hellenism for whom art and literature had borders. It was only within them, he argued, that they could attain authenticity by recreating the lines and colors of the Greek, mainly Aegean, landscape.

Variations of this endogenous aesthetic nationalism grounded on transcendental geography were expressed in the poetry of Seferis and Elytis, Greece's Nobel prize laureates. Both of them were very much in the stream of modernism with their use of ellipsis, sentence fragments, isolated images, and discontinuous utterances. But unlike European modernist poetry, where language became its own referent, the prismatic lines of the Greek poets reproduced the polyvalence of Neohellenic Hellenism in its broken continuities. Seferis, however, was attracted more to the "broken" part of this equation, while Elytis cultivated the second by transcribing the interplay of time and space in their interpenetrating layers illuminated by the splintered rays of Aegean light.

Topographies of Hellenism is an original treatment of familiar material. Thoroughly researched and strongly argued, it delineates the construction of Neohellenism not as a mere synthesis of its past heritages, but as a living discourse of national self-validation, not as a defensive response to Western denigration, but as a dynamic elaboration of self-assertion. Leontis uses a variety of means to encompass and analyze the material: she elaborates a theoretical framework, defines criteria and terminology with a rigorous and occasionally belabored insistence on accuracy, uses palindromic formulas ("the site of knowledge and

the knowledge of site"), and makes insightful *explications de texte* relating modern and ancient Greek texts.

Since the book is not a dispassionate study of the history of ideas but an ideological critique of cultural transformations, it challenges the reader to consider other issues. What of the presence of non-Hellenic peoples encountered by Neohellenes within the contours of their chartered topographies? Can other ethnic entities engrave their culture on the Greek *topos*? Another issue, the reverse of the first one, is the relation of Greek diaspora culture with geographic settings shared with other ethnic groups, that is, areas where the Greek *logos* was not coterminous with the Greek *topos*.

Finally, the book prompted this reader to respond with three questions to the unfolding topographical self-inscription of Neohellenism. Has the Neohellenic gaze been affixed too long on the Greek landscape? Have Neohellenes become mesmerized by their own elusive image playfully reflected in the Aegean waters? If and when they find their own voice, will they be able to articulate a universal *logos*? These questions, of course, apply equally to intellectuals in other non-dominant cultures engaged in the mapping of their own homeland. Had they been addressed or even stated, they would have made this work a more nuanced study. Nevertheless, their intimation and the penetrating inquiry of the propositions that engender them make this book a valuable contribution to the understanding of the processes of cultural affirmation and validation.

— Olga Augustinos
Columbia, South Carolina



DAVID H. CLOSE, *The Origins of the Greek Civil War*. London and New York: Longman, 1995. Pp. 248, \$11.99.

Despite the fact that 1996 marks the fiftieth anniversary of the outbreak of the "third round" of the Greek civil war, it has only been over the last two decades or so that scholars have begun to adequately analyze and document that conflict. While a number of factors—the restoration of democracy in Greece, the ensuing publication and public discussion of memoirs and personal recollections by the participants, and the accelerated pace of the declassification of archival sources in Britain and the United States—have contributed to this burgeoning interest in the events of the 1940s, numerous questions will remain unanswered. These last two decades, however, have been remarkably productive in terms of scholarship treating the origins

and impact of the Greek civil war, and now, at last, we are on the verge of being able to expect the long-awaited major studies that establish the interpretive groundwork for future inquiries into that tragic conflict.

David Close's new book, which comprises the twelfth volume in Longman's useful series of studies of the "Origins of Modern Wars," ably synthesizes the results of much recent scholarship on the Greek civil war, even while adducing valuable new insights garnered from the author's own extensive—and fruitful—archival work. The result is an original, well balanced and finely nuanced interpretation of the factors that resulted in the transformation of the Greek Communist Party (KKE), that had largely been suppressed and forced underground in the late 1930s, into a major force of political and social influence during the Axis occupation of Greece in the early 1940s. As early as 1943, it was clear to nearly all that the KKE, which effectively controlled the most significant resistance organization, the National Liberation Front (EAM) and its partisan force (ELAS), was fighting not merely for liberation, but rather for the political domination of a liberated Greece. This sudden and unforeseen reversal of the KKE's fortunes led in turn to an ideological conflict as the broad coalition of interests representing the right struggle, with the support of Great Britain, to reassert its control of Greek politics in the waning days and then the aftermath of the second world war. This political realignment was the story across much of liberated Europe, and particularly among those nations that engendered a significant resistance movement. What makes the Greek civil war unusual in its tragic dimensions, however, is that this conflict developed so rapidly and pitilessly into successive waves of open warfare and domestic terrorism, which rocked Greece from 1943 to 1950.

The civil wars fought in this century have tended to be particularly savage affairs, owing in large measure to the manner in which they have placed the tools and resources of modern warfare into the hands of those who are inculcated with a strong sense of an ideological crusade against one deeply rooted evil or another. Certainly, Europe has suffered more than its share of ideological crusading, both against communists and capitalists. Nonetheless, while the political and economic conditions that prevailed at the end of the second world war exacerbated this ideological conflict, violence on the scale of civil war simply did not emerge in the wake of the retreating Axis armies in most of the liberated nations, and particularly in those—such as Italy and France—that fell within the Western sphere of influence. But civil war—and more—broke out in Greece; indeed, it is as though the violence that prevailed in Greece from 1943-1950 epitomized Lucan's memorable formulation, "bella . . . plus quam civilia." One of the tasks that Close sets for himself is to explain not so much why the Communist Party was suppressed in post-war Greece, which he accepts as

over-determined owing to Greece's economic and strategic relations with the maritime powers of Great Britain and the United States, but rather how and why this act of political suppression occurred so violently as it did.

One of the great strengths of this book is that it sketches a convincing picture of the economic, social and political circumstances which induced the principal actors on both the Greek left and right to allow this tragedy to engulf them. In particular, he ably demonstrates that the origins of the Greek civil war lie, ultimately and to a degree that is often under-appreciated, in the political and economic circumstances that prevailed in Greece during and after the first world war. Greece, compelled by weaknesses in its own economy as well as by the often precarious international situation in the Balkans, had sought foreign patronage since its inception as a modern state in the revolutionary conditions of the early nineteenth century. Like so many other small states, Greece was caught up in the international instability that accompanied the first world war, and forced to choose alignment with one or another of its traditional patrons. Since king Constantine inclined strongly toward Germany and the prime minister, Eleftherios Venizelos, toward the Entente, this choice of alignment came at the expense of a revolution in 1916-1917, which resulted in the forced abdication of the king and the opening of the "national schism" which destroyed political consensus and disrupted the machinery of government for the following two decades. Moreover, the territorial gains which Venizelos won for Greece as a result of choosing the victorious side in the war proved to be the setting of a political and military catastrophe of the first order. While Greece managed to incorporate Thrace, it was unable to digest the spoils (Smyrna and Western Anatolia) carved from the Ottoman Empire, as the upstart regime of Kemal Atatürk ejected the Greek army from Asia Minor in 1922. With the retreating Greek soldiers came a mass of Greek Orthodox refugees—many of them Turkish speakers—who ultimately numbered well over one million people. These refugees, many of whom were settled in Thrace and Macedonia, formed the basis of an underprivileged and left-leaning constituency that not only supported Venizelos through most of the remainder of his career and served as a prime source of strength for the KKE and eventually EAM. In this regard, we should note the old KKE saying that some of its leaders were Asia Minor refugees. While not entirely true, this perception still illuminates the profound and lasting impact of the Asia Minor Catastrophe on Greek politics, as well as its role in shaping the social and economic circumstances in which civil war emerged in the 1940s.

The author's analysis of the Ioannis Metaxas dictatorship in the second half of the 1930s is particularly intriguing and, all in all, quite convincing. On the one hand, this change in government resulted in a final pre-war purge of the army and the administration that removed

a great number of liberals and centrists from positions of influence, and replaced them with many of the right-wingers who were to gain prominence during the civil war. Moreover, this dictatorship created a security apparatus which effectively broke the back of the KKE by 1939, placing a majority of the party's leadership and many of the rank and file into either jail or exile. On the other hand, despite this immediate success against the communists, the repressive excesses of the Metaxas regime contributed to initial success which the EAM enjoyed winning over the populace in many parts of Greece, and to the ferocity with which the EAM/ELAS attempted to extirpate the resistance forces aligned with the right beginning in 1943. As to the latter point, the author adduces convincing evidence that the ordeals that the leaders of the KKE suffered under the Metaxas dictatorship produced a cadre of deeply scarred and embittered men, who were convinced that they must wage an all-or-nothing fight to prevent the right from seizing power again after the Axis withdrawal. The author also describes the manner in which the persecutions of the 1930s fostered among certain segments of the populace both a sympathy for the KKE and a resentment of the government, particularly in the venizelist strongholds of Macedonia and Thrace. Still, despite acknowledging the plight of the slavophone and turkophone residents of northern Greece during the Metaxas years, the author does not adequately connect their increasing alienation and indignation to the conditions in which guerrilla fighting broke out against the monarchist regime in 1946.

The central chapters of Close's book, treating the transforming impact of the international events of the 1940s on Greek politics, do a particularly admirable job of making sense of much of the recent scholarship on the origins of the civil war. Although it weathered the initial Italian invasion of 1940, the Greek government collapsed under the weight of the German-Bulgarian invasion in 1941. For our purposes, we may observe that the result of this invasion was an immediate bifurcation of Greek politics. King George II and a new government fled abroad, to spend the remainder of the war under British tutelage as a government-in-exile planning its expected return to the homeland. However, within that homeland the KKE quickly emerged as a leading force in the resistance, establishing both a popular political front (EAM) and a partisan force (ELAS), and thereby implicitly raising a challenge to the moral authority of the government-in-exile. Beginning with a campaign to redistribute economic relief, the EAM eventually erected an elaborate alternate government across those considerable tracts of Greece which its guerrilla activities denied to the occupying forces. In the process, the KKE transformed itself from a political sect into something of a mass movement.

While much of this story has been told before, Close not only retells it well, but he cuts to the quick with an incisive and convincing analysis of the strategic concerns of both sides, particularly of the KKE.

He carefully explains the evolution of KKE policy, from a period of vacillation between revolutionary and reformist lines from at least 1942 to its decision to establish a monopoly on military power within liberated Greece even as it accepted the inevitability of British hegemony and the need to participate in a post-war, coalition government. His disagreements with other scholars, such as Heinz Richter and John Hondros, over the largely peaceful intentions of the KKE in supporting the goal of national unity are well-argued and generally convincing. According to Close, the Greek communists remained intent on establishing a dictatorship in the guise of a peoples' democracy, and began preparing to take measures—remarkably similar to those eventually employed by the right in 1946—to harness the EAM as an instrument of mass mobilization so as to dominate the projected parliamentary elections. Nonetheless, this is not to shift the burden of "guilt" in fomenting the civil war onto the KKE. Close points out at several junctures how the leadership of the party was constrained in its actions by the political and international realities of the emerging post-war order. The author's evaluation of the demobilization crisis in November of 1944 is particularly nuanced, and casts some new light on the manner in which George Papandreou's attempts to placate the EAM and avert crisis were thwarted by mistrust, as well as by the intransigence of rightist officials in his own government and the ill-informed decisions of British authorities. Again, Close's analysis leads one toward the conclusion that the violence of December 1944 was perhaps inevitable, as both the right and the left were unwilling to relinquish their arms, and loathe to allow the other side to determine the structure and composition of the post-war national army.

Even so, the course of the civil war itself unfolded very much as a result of foreign intervention at critical moments. Close points out the role of the Germans in encouraging fighting among the Greeks as they withdrew, and he reviews the role of the British in provoking the showdown between EAM and the right in December of 1944. Indeed, building to a large degree upon his past work on the British police mission, the author provides a fascinating insight into the relationship between British tolerance of the excesses of their Greek clients and the pattern of escalating violence and "white terror" in Athens and elsewhere. Still, the author's treatment of the impact of foreign intervention on the Greek civil war does have certain gaps. In particular, he gives rather short shrift to the role of Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania in fomenting the outbreak of guerrilla warfare in northern Greece, curtly dismissing as a myth the notion that the third round of guerrilla warfare in Greece "depended on support by the Slav countries" (p. 196). We are told in passing that the fighting in northern Greece was dominated by slavophones organized under the rubric of the Macedonian Popular Liberation Front (SNOF) and supported by fellow Slavs in Yugoslav Macedonia. Similarly, we learn

that many—if not the bulk—of the Greek guerrillas involved in the fighting in 1946 were former ELAS partisans who had spent the previous year or so in refugee camps located within the borders of Greece's Communist neighbors to the North. Given the ambiguity in KKE military policy in the first half of 1946, which is well-described by the author, is it possible that Yugoslavia, in rearming and dispatching into Greece bands of SNOF and ELAS guerrillas, played a larger role in accelerating the descent into civil war than is generally acknowledged? Did the KKE directly provide the inspiration and the leadership, not to mention the material and organizational resources, for the fighting in 1946? In this regard, it is disappointing to note that the author does not more fully explore the nuances of cooperation and dissent between Yugoslavia and Bulgaria over the question of Macedonian federation in the critical years of 1945-1946.

In the same spirit, one might have hoped that the author would have more fully explored the impact of the Truman Doctrine on KKE aims and policies in the second half of 1947. It is beyond dispute that the Truman administration, in deciding to embark upon its adventure in Greece, perceived that the threat to that nation was comprised of little more than a half-hearted attempt by Yugoslavia and Bulgaria to sever Macedonia from Greece by sponsoring raids by separatist guerrillas and expatriates, as well as a demoralized and poorly-supplied Communist self-defense effort within Greece itself. But, to follow John Iatrides, it was only after the summer of 1947 that the KKE shifted its stance toward military resistance, from a state of "unplanned insurrection" to a policy of "planned insurrection." Indeed, by the end of 1947 the conflict had escalated to the point that the successor to the EAM—the DSE—attempted to establish a "free" enclave within Greece itself. Is it possible that the Truman Doctrine should not be viewed so much as the capstone to the Greek civil war, but rather as the final round of the periodic international interventions that provoked an escalation of guerrilla fighting? If this is the case, would it profit future historians to more clearly differentiate between the causes and aims of the guerrilla war in northern Greece in 1946 and early 1947, and those of the broader conflict that broke out late in 1947? Certainly, U.S. policy makers in December of 1947 wondered what, exactly, they had gotten themselves into in aiding the Greek government against a putatively feeble guerrilla effort that had suddenly grown to "distressing" proportions.

In sum, this book represents a significant and welcome contribution to the state of scholarship on the events in Greece in the 1940s. What we do not have here, and what has been and continues to be sorely needed, is a magisterial survey that reworks our entire concept of the Greek civil war, and a wide-ranging and inclusive treatment of the roots of this tortuous conflict in both its national and international contexts. Nonetheless, such a balanced and thoughtful work as this shall

certainly serve to shore up the foundations upon which the desired survey must necessarily build.

— *David C. Van Meter*
Boston University



THANOS VEREMIS, *Greece's Balkan Entanglement*. Athens: ELIAMEP, 1995, pp. 134.

By now it is absolutely clear that the early post-Cold War years have been far from easy for the states in the Balkans. Domestic issues and foreign affairs have been difficult and, in the case of Yugoslavia, devastating for the governments in the region. For Greece, a supposed winner in the bipolar standoff in Europe, these have been frustrating times as well.

Thanos Veremis, director of the Hellenic Foundation for European and Foreign Policy, delineates the course of Greece's foreign policy involving the Balkans and relations with European and Atlantic powers. The first two chapters of this short volume survey Greece's position and role in the Balkans from the late nineteenth century to the end of the Cold War. The next two chapters deal with Greek perceptions and reactions to recent developments in the Balkans through the prism of security interests and historically grounded identity. Veremis then proceeds to delve into the development of Greek nationalism.

Three related issues are woven into his account. Two thematic strands deal with the practical side to foreign affairs: the limits and possibilities of Greek foreign policy as shaped by historical conditions and the diplomatic options or mechanisms available to Greece in implementing policy. The third strand, inextricable from the other two, is the formative and formidable presence of collective identity expressed as cultural values.

Entanglement connotes complication or enmeshing, and for much of the past century the Balkans appear in that guise in Veremis's account. As he describes it, two constants have underlain and determined the course of Greek foreign policy relative to Balkan entanglements. First, the great powers have influenced the ability of Greece, and all the neighboring states for that matter, to create an effective—that is, self-generated and beneficial to the country's interests—foreign policy. Second, interstate relations in the Balkans have been in a state of constant fluidity as countries have formed competing, but also changing, alliances while focusing their interest on the geographic core of the peninsula—Macedonia. Implied in these two issues is the un-

remitting importance of space (geostrategic position and territorial interests) that underlies much of the diplomacy of the activist states in the region for nearly a century.

The ethnic complexity and strategic location of Macedonia have made the Balkans not a "powder keg" but a "threshing floor" in Veremis's words. He thus conjures an image of the Balkans as a place where small powers have aggressively competed for territory and where cultures have ground against each other. But was the ethnic, irredentist nationalism that resulted from these conditions the "endowment" of "collapsing empires"? Or was it the conscious creation of political elites in the successor states bent on making their nations "modern," that is, culturally integrated, unitary political structures?

At the end of the First World War, the empires that had controlled the heart of Europe either disappeared or were in the throes of redefinition; therefore, their role was diminished. On the other hand, the idea of the nation state had triumphed in eastern Europe. The price for this achievement, however, was a congeries of small states seeking stability in a world where national frontiers remained contested. For the next seven decades, from the interwar era to the end of the Cold War, Greece sought stability within and without its borders. Veremis sketches the foreign policy options available, multilateralism and bilateralism, and indicates their limitations. Greece's ability to carve out an "autonomous" foreign policy depended on both the interests of the major European powers and the dynamics of national interests among the Balkan states.

The bipolar world and contending blocs during the Cold War clearly limited Greece's foreign policy possibilities. Since the country was bound to one bloc, there is little to be made of the idea that Greece could play the "interlocutor among camps" even when detente developed in the 1970s. What the Cold War standoff did was allow the states in the Balkans to promote contacts, bilateral and multilateral, that encouraged mutually beneficial regime stability and territorial integrity. But in the last two decades of the Cold War, economic difficulties plagued states in both blocs, domestic political divisiveness grew, and Western-supported international organizations were more visibly concerned with individual and group rights. All this spelled serious trouble for state stability in the Balkans.

The instability that developed after the Soviet Union and the communist regimes in eastern Europe collapsed in the early 1990s takes up much of the rest of the book and greatly concerns Veremis. Two complementary trends have become problematic in the Balkans. First, the states in the region have looked to greater linkage with western Europe, which itself is undergoing a process of integration. They are emphasizing linkages to organizations and states outside the region over intraregional cooperation. Second, within the states in southern Europe ethnic issues have triggered nationalist politics, ironically given incentive

in part by the West's interest in the transformation of eastern Europe into politically pluralist, market societies.

At the heart of this Balkan entanglement, the key concern is what Veremis terms the "Macedonian swamp." Perhaps a better term for what a century ago was called the Macedonian question is the Macedonian muddle. At least it has become so for Greece. In dealing with the problem, Veremis is concerned with three matters. First, there is the forgetfulness of the West regarding the now troublesome, but no longer strategically important, Balkans to contend with. The corollary to this has been the unsympathetic and even hostile reaction of Westerners to Greece's concerns on this issue. Second, Veremis offers a critique and criticism of Greek domestic politics and their relation to the Macedonian issue. To argue that the issue has been used by individuals for personal political interests is only to recognize a feature common to politics in many countries. That this has been deleterious to the Greece's national interests goes without saying. Third, Veremis notes the various foreign policy gambits Greece has tried, with little success, in the last few years to deal with the Macedonian muddle.

Macedonia has been Greece's burden in the Balkans, and various foreign-policy scenarios have yielded less than satisfactory results. Using a multilateral approach by relying on the European Union or turning to the United Nations as Yugoslavia disintegrated garnered Greece little support and only a temporizing and unsatisfactory response to its concerns about security and stability in the Balkans linked to the Macedonian issue.

Greece then tried a bilateral gambit, unilaterally imposing an embargo on the former Yugoslav republic in February 1994. But this only brought international reproach. Finally, there was the wager on the strong, that is, looking to the United States to deal with the Balkan muddle. This, at least, has led to negotiations between Athens and Skopje. But Veremis voices concern that Greece's place in U.S. thinking about the region has shifted to its disadvantage. The incident over the isles of Imia no doubt has strengthened this perception among many Greeks.

Finally we come to the nub of the problem. Greece's "Balkan entanglement" is a matter of culture and power. The author touches on this in his discussion of the vagaries of nationalism in Greece. Turning back to the nineteenth century, he notes that Greece's father of national history, Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos, emphasized culture as the embodiment of national identity. Veremis then describes how the historically grounded culture turned inward and narrowed after the destruction of the Ionian vision and became even less open during the Cold War. But the author overemphasizes the singular, narrow path of Greek nationalism. There is a broader vision, which intellectuals in the twentieth century such as Seferis, Theotokas, and Cavafy have elaborated.

The real issue for culturally inscribed nationalism, however, is the temporal dimension. Paparrigopoulos and his epigones, whose ideas were reinforced and popularized by state-directed education, perceived Greek identity diachronically. Implied in the author's remarks on recent developments in the Balkans is a lament that his fellow citizens have been too slow to understand that others' culturally based perceptions of Greece have changed and, therefore, the power balance for the country has shifted as well. Belatedly, Greeks have recognized the need to take a synchronic approach to seeing themselves. But one cannot chide the West for abetting Greece in binding itself to a unidimensional self-image against its self-interest during the past several decades. Greeks must now recognize the multidimensional aspects to their culture, a legacy of their past, as they define national foreign policy for the future.

This book is a thoughtful account of the interconnectedness of foreign policy and national identity. It should be welcomed by Greeks as well as others.

— *Gerasimos Augustinos*
Department of History
University of South Carolina



I. K. HASIOTIS. Ἐπισκόπηση τῆς Ἱστορίας τῆς Νεοελληνικῆς Διασπορᾶς [Survey of the History of the Modern Greek Diaspora], Thessaloniki: Vaniis, 1993. Pp. 230. Maps, photographs.

DIMITRI C. CONSTAS AND ATHANASIOS G. PLATIAS (eds). *Diasporas in World Politics; The Greeks in Comparative Perspective*. Foreword by James Rosenau. London: Macmillan, 1993. Pp. 239.

Historian Christos Hadziiosif observed that the *paroikiako* (diaspora settlements) phenomenon had been over-used by historians as an interpretive master-key to unlock the secrets of modern Greece's history, in an essay published in 1982. There was insufficient empirical and theoretical knowledge about the role of the modern Greek diaspora at the time, according to Hadziiosif, to sustain what he considered as exaggerated claims made about the significance of the diaspora in shaping Greece's development. In doing so, he was reflecting critically on a cluster of historical works that appeared either in the period of the 1967-74 "colonels'" dictatorship or soon after the regime's collapse. Those works, by Kostis Moskoff, Nikos Psyroukis, Nikos Mouselis, Yiorgos Dertilis and Konstantinos Tsoukalas argued that the diaspora communities and their relations with Greece had been pivotal

in shaping modern Greece's history in the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries. In different ways, the works by those and other authors cast Greece as an underdeveloped periphery of Western Europe and portrayed the diaspora as a crucial element that facilitated and preserved Greece's dependency. In contrast, Hadziiosif believed that the diaspora connection was too narrow an interpretation of something as complex as Greece's historical development, though he acknowledged that the emphasis those studies placed on the diaspora's role was partly a tactical ruse to draw attention to a neglected topic.

The shape of modern Greek historiography has changed considerably over the past decade and a half, and historians have shifted their attention towards Greece's indigenous forces and the role they played in shaping the country's evolution although interest in the diaspora remained. The 1980s witnessed an outpouring of studies on the history of Greek financial institutions and their impact on agricultural and industrial development and other economic history studies that focused on the internal dynamics of Greek society. Nevertheless, the diaspora was not entirely overlooked in the 1980s. A number of valuable monographs on Greek diaspora communities appeared that examined those communities primarily in their own geographical and social context and discussed their ties with their homeland as a secondary phenomenon or at least as a function of each community's situation abroad. The new focus on the host-society meant that the concern with the diaspora's role as a link between the world economy and a dependent Greece was quietly put aside. In some cases, scholars confronted the view that the Greeks abroad had indeed operated as a link between Greece and the world economy in a critical manner. This was the case with a study of the role of Greek bankers in Constantinople (conventionally considered as part of the economic diaspora) in the late nineteenth century published by Haris Exertzoglou in 1989. As it happened, none of the proponents of the older paradigm were in a position to respond to such criticisms because in most cases they themselves had moved on to working on the internal aspects of Greece's socio-economic development.

More recently, there has been a resurgence of interest in the Greek diaspora and its political links with Greece, generated by the geopolitical changes in the Eastern Mediterranean in the post-Cold War era. Somehow, in the wake of the new world order, many Greeks sought to affirm the transterritorial presence of Greeks across the globe. Developments in eastern Europe were particularly important in that respect. The break-up of the Soviet Union brought many refugees from the lands around the northern coast of the Black Sea and a corresponding interest in the considerable Greek settlements in the former Soviet Union. The break-up of Yugoslavia and the re-emergence of the Macedonian Question raised speculative questions about the numbers of Greeks in that region. The size of the Greek presence in

Albania became widely discussed after the collapse of the regime in that country. These "national questions" also concerned Greek communities in the United States, Canada and Australia either in terms of lobbying their governments in an effort to persuade them to support Greece's positions or in terms of countering the activities of the lobbying efforts of other communities, most notably the Slavo-Macedonians in Australia and Canada. This general climate brought other less politically connected diaspora questions to the public's attention in Athens and in Greece more generally. A good example includes the interest over the Greek community in Egypt witnessed by several events focused on Cavafy that have been held in Alexandria, the product of the indefatigable Kostis Moskoff who has worked in Egypt as Greek cultural attaché and later as the representative of the Foundation for Hellenic Culture. The activities of that organization, a force for the world-wide dissemination of Greek culture, have been greatly concerned with highlighting the universal spread of the Greek diaspora.

Both of these books reflect the academic dimension of this recent renewal of the fascination with the Greek diaspora and they also represent a new, third phase of diaspora scholarship that is much broader than the earlier ones, embracing the present as well as the past and focusing on demographic issues as well as politics. Yannis Hasiotis, a professor of history at the University of Thessaloniki, has written a book whose purpose he describes as limited, namely to offer a broad survey of the evolution of the Greek diaspora and to identify the major factors that influenced that process over time. The author regards his *Episkopisi tis Istorias tis Neohellenikis Diasporas* more as a starting point for the study of the Greek diaspora rather than a definitive statement on the causes or the significance of this phenomenon.

The book's structure conforms to its function as an introductory overview to this subject. Following a chapter that defines the terms and the periods that the author uses in treating the history of the Greek diaspora, there are three chapters that correspond to three broad chronological phases of the diaspora experience Hasiotis identifies, the period of Ottoman rule, the period from the formation of the modern Greek state through World War II and, thirdly, the post-WW II era to the present. A concluding chapter discusses the present situation of the Greek diaspora in terms of demographics, organizational structure and ideological as well as political orientation with relation to Greece. In this final chapter Hasiotis notes the problems of counting the numbers of Greeks abroad, he also notes the internal tension and differences that exist within diaspora communities and mentions the need to take into account historical and social factors in interpreting the success of many emigrant Greeks, in opposition to traditional explanations that have described that success as the product of the cultural or spiritual attributes of Greeks. The author states that, currently, Greeks abroad are able to combine their identification with their host

societies and their homeland more harmoniously than they were able to in the past and that makes for a potentially smooth relationship between Greece and its diaspora.

Hasiotis's volume is an excellent overview both of the unfolding history of the Greek diaspora as well as of the conceptual problems and difficulties that closer study of this phenomenon will raise. Although the book offers a general survey, the author writes with great care and precision paying great attention to factual correctness and details as well as to making balanced arguments. Hasiotis, being sensitive to the different conditions under which the diaspora experience has occurred and, moreover, well-read and well-informed on each case, invokes the findings and conclusions of the monographs that have been written on each diaspora community rather than trying to squeeze everything in some kind of grand theory. Thus, he succeeds in communicating to the specialist as well as the general reader the richness, variety and complexity of the Greek diaspora.

In their introduction to the volume of essays they edited, under the title *Diasporas in World Politics; the Greeks in Comparative Perspective* Dimitri Conostas and Athanassios Platias argue that the role of diasporas in world politics is important and is increasing thanks to changes the international system is experiencing. Writing from the perspective of students of international relations, these two Panteion University professors plead for greater attention to diasporas by their colleagues and explain the reasons and the circumstances under which diasporas can become players in international politics. James Rosenau highlights the same theme in his short preface to this volume. The essays that follow, based on papers read at a conference held in Athens in 1990, seek to illustrate this thesis by focusing on case studies.

They are divided into three parts. A cluster of essays offers case studies of how the Greek diaspora has influenced foreign policy. Three of those essays discuss the Greek American factor. Paul Watanabe writes on the role of the Greek Americans during the U.S. Turkish Arms embargo of 1975-78, Van Coufoudakis outlines his theory about the "reverse influence phenomenon" namely how the Greek-American Lobby has, more recently, had an impact on Greek foreign policy, Nikolaos Stavrou offers a critical view of Greece's treatment of the Greek Americans. Three more essays discuss the role of other Greek diaspora communities. The Greeks in Australia are the subject of an essay by Andrew C. Theophanous and Michalis S. Michael, the Greeks in Canada are examined by Stephanos Constantinides while Christos Theodoropoulos writes about the involvement of the South African Greeks in the formulation of Greek foreign policy. A Part II in this book focuses on "political opportunity structures" in the host-countries. There are three essays by specialists in ethnic politics that analyze the extent to which a particular political system supports or does not create conditions in which ethnic mobilization can take place. Kalevi

J. Holsti examines Canada, James Jupp discusses Australia and Walker Connor focuses upon the United States. Finally, in this volume's third part Richard G. Hovannisian discusses the role of the American diaspora and Gabriel Sheffer writes on the topic of the Jewish diaspora and its impact on Israeli foreign policy.

This volume that Conostas and Platias put together, and indeed, the conference upon which it was based, organized by Panteion's Institute of International Relations, is a sign of a new attitude in contemporary Greek academe. The editors have cast aside the usual ethnocentrism or the almost routine invocation of Greece's "specificity" that yields home-grown and often idiosyncratic problematics that affirm that narrow view of Greece. Instead, Conostas and Platias work toward framing the Greek experience within a more general disciplinary concern, in this case an aspect of international relations theory. They use Greece as a case study that can shed light on a much broader trend of diaspora politics and integrate Greece within a more universal context. And the topic itself, diasporic political mobilization is well chosen, for nobody can deny that the modern Greek experience is not conducive to examine the importance of diaspora politics.

While drawing our attention to the topic of the Greek diaspora in such fruitful ways, both these studies are not immune from pitfalls that await any student of the diaspora phenomenon. I believe that one of the most serious of those pitfalls is connected to the question of definition. It is a two-level problem. First, how is "diaspora" defined—is it merely an outcome of emigration and settlement abroad, or is it a *relationship* with the homeland? Hasiotis notes there is an analytical difference between the study of emigration and the study of the diaspora. There is also the need to consider whether perhaps emigration abroad and settlement there do not automatically create a diaspora, as Hasiotis seems to imply and that the diasporic condition entails some sort of relationship with the homeland.

If the diaspora condition is expressed through a relationship with the homeland, then what kind of relationship is it? Surely it can be a cultural one as well as a political one. We can have a Greek diaspora community whose members may not necessarily be willing to mobilize themselves over Greece's "national issues." Especially, I should add, if those issues are reduced to policy proposals of questionable value, let alone common sense, as we have seen recently with Greece's attitude towards the break-up of Yugoslavia. At any rate, diasporic Greekness, whatever it is, is not necessarily an exclusively political manifestation. Sometimes, moreover, there might be constraints on an effective political mobilization. The United States with its ethnic lobbies is, after all a unique case ad not all other countries conform to that model as Professor Holsti notes in his article on Canada. Other times there may simply be a lack of interest in expressing ties with the homeland politically. Not all diasporas are politically mobile, but does that

make them any less of a diaspora? Granted, the Conostas and Platias volume is interested in the political dimensions of the diasporic condition. Yet we should not forget that the political ties are not the only ones that bind emigrant groups to their homeland and produce the diaspora phenomenon.

— Alexander Kitroeff
New York University



HUGH POULTON, *Who Are the Macedonians?* Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995, 218 pp.

In the introduction to Hugh Poulton's survey of the Macedonian problem, one of his many proleptic remarks reads: "In such a controversial area it seems impossible to avoid offending some or even many, although needless to say this is not our aim." It is to the credit of the author that he stays true to his word. Not only is it easy to see how his account would offend each extreme Balkan nationalist position, but there is real achievement in articulating clear explanations to complex issues within the quagmire of contending claims in a remarkably evenhanded manner.

This short book, whose main goal is to give a popular introduction to the contested problem of Macedonian identity, is structured around ten chapters, of which the first is a brief methodological introduction, followed by five historical chapters (antiquity and the medieval period, the Ottoman legacy, the decades between 1878 and the end of World War I, the interwar period, and the war years), three thematic chapters (the ethnic situation and politics of Yugoslav Macedonia, the Macedonian problem among the neighbors, present developments in independent Macedonia), and a last two-page concluding chapter which attempts to look into the future.

The succinct introductory chapter sets some of the methodological premises of the book. Writing in a clear prose devoid of professional jargon, the author introduces the reader to the ambiguities of the name and its controversial coverage in terms of geography, politics, and ethnicity. Rightly claiming nationalism as the center of the Macedonian controversy, the author summarizes in a brief sketch the major contributions of the present enormous literature on the nationalist phenomenon. The use of history emerges as the most powerful weapon of nationalists and the following chapters are devoted to a survey of Macedonia's historical development and the contending nationalist interpretations. Especially good at synthesis are the chapters covering the

period between the Congress of Berlin and the Second World War.

Representing the authentic contribution of the book are the three thematic chapters covering the post-World War II period. They are clearly the result of the author's own research and provide valuable anecdotal material that has not been systematized heretofore from the archives of Amnesty International, different broadcasting associations, the press, as well as émigré organizations. The understanding, which is not tantamount to endorsement, the author shows for each side's point of view in the controversies is a genuine accomplishment. Thus, we hear the voices and arguments, and implicit in them the fears and hopes, of often incompatible visions. These are not only the different positions of the contending states—Macedonia, Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia, Albania—but also different groups within the states: governments in power, opposition parties, intellectuals, minority organizations, etc. Especially valuable is the attention drawn to the role of émigré communities, often more fiercely (and irresponsibly) nationalistic than the nationals at home. Although the author does not specially analyze this issue, his material clearly shows how the controversy is exploited by different political mobilizers for internal purposes. While the prediction that Macedonia will become (in the short term at least) more closely oriented to Bulgaria (p. 209) will most likely turn out to be a false prophesy, the analysis of the contemporary scene is remarkably well informed and lucid. The author has succeeded in giving not only an evenhanded but a clear and succinct summary of a very complex issue.

It has to be stated from the outset that, albeit commendably evenhanded and living up to the exigencies of scholarly objectivity, this is not a book by a scholar. Very often it reads more like a handbook than an analytical survey. In fact, one can see this book as a companion volume to the previously published and praised work of Hugh Poulton, *The Balkans: Minorities and States in Conflict* (London, 1991 and 1992). As already pointed out, the author will manage to offend extreme nationalistic sentiment on all sides. And at times he will succeed in offending the feelings of professional historians, although this does not diminish the general value of the work. A historical gallop through several millennia inevitably results in some mistakes and discrepancies. For someone quite sensitive about the nuances of ethnic groups and identities and well-read in modern historiography, it is rather careless to speak of the settlement of "Turks and other Muslim-Turkic-speaking peoples" in the Ottoman empire for the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. "Turks" was not an ethnic name distinct at the time from other Turkic (or Turkoman) tribes; it became an accepted ethnonym only with the advent of Turkish nationalism. This, at first glance inconsequential, differentiation may inadvertently support nationalist Turkish claims for a "nation before nationalism."

Although Poulton's undertaking does not require an exhaustive synthesis based on all existing secondary works, it is still hardly ap-

appropriate to rely on a single work, often not the result of most recent research or simply not the most authoritative. The whole section on antiquity is based on Hammond's *A History of Greece to 322 B.C.* which is dated on the problem of Greek migration. Occasionally unfortunate turns of phrase occur, clearly borrowed from the source, such as the ancient Macedonians being "apparently more phlegmatic" than the Greeks and that "the everyday language of the people was distinct from that of its southern neighbors but today it has *almost* (M.T.) vanished" (p. 12). For the uninitiated, this gives rise to speculations that the ancient Macedonian language could have survived in distant corners. Irrelevant but also unfortunate is the comparison of the relationship between the Macedonian dynasty of Philip and Alexander and the Greeks with the relationship between Bulgarians and Slav Macedonians in this century. Whatever one's position on the Bulgarian-Macedonian controversy, no one can contest that the two languages are very closely related (the controversy extends to the claim that they are one language). In the case of ancient Macedonian and Greek, we simply do not have enough material to definitively decide the dispute in favor of the Greek provincial or non-Greek (Thracian, Illyrian) origins of Macedonian. But the comparison implicitly reveals Poulton as an advocate of the Greek thesis, which I suspect is not his intention.

Bogomilism's center was not Macedonia but the region around Plovdiv in Thrace, and *pace* Ilievski's (Poulton's sole source on this question) assertion that it rose from the old teaching, it was brought in by Manichean groups from Anatolia, following the demographic policy of population transfers exercised by Byzantium, as attested by extensive specialized literature on the problem (p. 20). While it is correct to question the linear continuity of the Greek nation from antiquity to the present, it is rather unfortunate to try to disclaim the increasingly Greek character of the Byzantines, particularly by the end, and to overemphasize the "many Greeks" who fought alongside the Ottoman armies. Moreover, the questionable assertions about Byzantium are not supported by a single Byzantinist, but are based on Douglas Dakin, an authority in his own right, but on the nineteenth century.

While the chapter on the Ottoman period gives an overall fair account of the five centuries of Ottoman domination, particularly by focusing on the transformation of the imperial *millet* structure (based on separate religious groups crossing over ethnic and linguistic lines) into the contemporary structure of nation-states, it is not exempt from inappropriate and sometimes problematic statements. It is ridiculous to assert that the Arabic script is difficult to learn or that it was inappropriate for Turkish because it did not sign vowels, which "resulted in frequent misunderstandings." Ataturk's introduction of the Latin script was motivated by a westernizing ethos, and it is naive to accept

the legitimizing of the change at face value. But the assertion that "by the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, Ottoman Turkish had *degenerated* (M.T.) into bombast with inelastic and tortuous embellished phrases and constructions" (p. 32) demonstrates both ignorance of the fine poetry and literature produced in this period and lack of understanding about the relationship between reality and language (in this case the inelastic and tortuous bureaucracy and the specific language in which it was reflected). While there is little doubt about the hellenizing tendencies of the Constantinople patriarchate during the nineteenth century, to assert that "for centuries" the Phanariote Greeks had used it to hellenize the Orthodox populations of Macedonia is anachronistic.

The standard strategy of scholars who do not wish to take sides in the controversy between Bulgarians and Macedonia, or who want to be accepted by both sides (and usually end up rejected by both) is to speak neutrally of Slavs in Macedonia. This is partly understandable: indeed, it can be argued that a considerable part, if not the majority, of the Slavic population by the middle of the nineteenth century had no clearly expressed (Bulgarian) national identity (the Macedonian was not yet constructed at that time). However, calling them Slavs, a notion that was never used as a self-designation but only ascriptively by nineteenth-century Western observers to cover all Balkan Slavs they could not differentiate, and by enthusiastic central European and Russian Slavophiles, certainly sheds additional darkness on the confused problem on identity. In fact, Poulton readily admits that the Slavs in Albania were called Bulgarians, as they were also (privately) in Greece. Granted, Bulgarian claims on Macedonia can be rejected, at least in a scholarly fashion, mostly on the ground that national consciousness was lacking in a population that was identified mostly locally and through its religious allegiance. Yet to say that the Miladinov brothers, authors of *Bulgarian Folk Songs* and irrefutably identifying as Bulgarians, "helped to popularize and spread the idea of Slav or Bulgarian consciousness" is to strain historical reality too much to achieve the dubious goal of tactical neutrality.

After all, it would be equally objectionable to nationalists on all sides to claim that Macedonian identity was simply the last in the line of constructed national identities in the Balkans throughout the eighteenth to twentieth centuries. This would alienate believers in the organic nation, to whom the notion of a later historical, let alone "constructed," identity is offensive. But this is the story of all Balkan nationalisms, though with different intensities, specific foci in the construction of identity—language, religion, history, etc.—and most importantly different timing, beginning with the Greeks, followed by Serbs, Romanians, and Bulgarians, later joined by the Albanians, the Macedonian case being an addition of the post-World War II period, with roots in the post-1878 context. Although Poulton recognizes the

constructedness of the Macedonian, as well as any other, national identity (especially in his excellent seventh chapter), he sometimes falls inadvertently into the trap of "backdating modern concepts," of which he justly accuses local nationalists. Not taking a clear position only adds to the morass of misunderstanding.

All this is not meant to introduce a pedantic criterion in judging this work whose main task lies elsewhere, but precision is important in such highly charged matters. Finally, this book has to be evaluated on its own merits for what it aspires to achieve. The problem it deals with is extremely convoluted, and it takes real courage to try to simplify it and present it accordingly without vulgarizing it. In general, Hugh Poulton has succeeded admirably in offering a practical, evenhanded, informative, and useful account. Still, I doubt that it will find its way to the university classroom. On the other hand, it will be preferred reading for and undoubtedly of great help to diplomats, politicians, and the general public.

— *Maria Todorova*
Department of History
University of Florida