

MODERN GREEK STUDIES

(AUSTRALIA & NEW ZEALAND)

Volume 13, 2005

A Journal for Greek Letters

Pages on Australian Society

Published by Brandl & Schlesinger Pty Ltd
PO Box 127 Blackheath NSW 2785
Tel (02) 4787 5848 Fax (02) 4787 5672
www.brandl.com.au

for the Modern Greek Studies Association
of Australia and New Zealand (MGSAANZ)
Department of Modern Greek
University of Sydney NSW 2006 Australia
Tel (02) 9351 7252 Fax (02) 9351 3543
E-mail: Vrasidas.Karalis@modern.greek.usyd.edu.au

ISSN 1039-2831

Copyright in each contribution to this journal belongs to its author.

© 2006, Modern Greek Studies Association of Australia

All rights reserved. No parts of this publication may be reproduced, stored
in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means
electronic, mechanical or otherwise without
the prior permission of the publisher.

Typeset and design by Andras Berkes

Printed by Griffin Press

MODERN GREEK STUDIES ASSOCIATION OF AUSTRALIA & NEW ZEALAND (MGSAANZ)

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ ΝΕΟΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ ΑΥΣΤΡΑΛΙΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΝΕΑΣ ΖΗΛΑΝΔΙΑΣ

President: Michalis Tsianikas, Flinders University
Vice-President: Anthony Dracoupoulos, University of Sydney
Secretary: Thanassis Spiliadis, La Trobe University, Melbourne
Treasurer: Panayota Nazou, University of Sydney, Sydney

MGSAANZ was founded in 1990 as a professional association by those in Australia and New Zealand engaged in Modern Greek Studies. Membership is open to all interested in any area of Greek studies (history, literature, culture, tradition, economy, gender studies, sexualities, linguistics, cinema, Diaspora, etc). The Association issues a Newsletter (Ενημέρωση), holds conferences and publishes two journals annually.

MODERN GREEK STUDIES
(AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND)

Editors

VRASIDAS KARALIS & MICHAEL TSIANIKAS

Book Review Editor

HELEN NICKAS

Text editing: **Katherine Cassis**

MEMBERSHIP TO MODERN GREEK STUDIES ASSOCIATION

plus ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION for two issues

Individual: AUS \$45 US \$35 UK £25 €35 Institutions: AUS \$70 US \$65 UK £35 €45 (plus postage)

full-time student/pensioners: AUS \$20 US \$30 UK £20

(includes GST)

Address for all correspondence and payments

MGSAANZ

Department of Modern Greek, University of Sydney, NSW 2006 Australia

Tel (+61-2) 9351 7252 Fax (+61-2) 9351 3543

E-mail: Vras@arts.usyd.edu.au

The periodical welcomes papers in both English and Greek on all aspects of Modern Greek Studies (broadly defined). Prospective contributors should preferably submit their papers on disk and hard copy. All published contributions by academics are refereed (standard process of blind peer assessment). This is a DEST recognised publication.

Το περιοδικό φιλοξενεί άρθρα στα Αγγλικά και τα Ελληνικά αναφερόμενα σε όλες τις απόψεις των Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών (στη γενικότητά τους). Υποψήφιοι συνεργάτες θα πρέπει να υποβάλλουν κατά προτίμηση τις μελέτες των σε δισκέτα και σε έντυπη μορφή. Όλες οι συνεργασίες από πανεπιστημιακούς έχουν υποβληθεί στην κριτική των εκδοτών και επιλέκτων πανεπιστημιακών συναδέλφων.

CONTENTS

SECTION ONE

Stuart Roseworne	The Shifting Power Relations in Australia's Economic Success Story: From Neo-Liberalism to Neo-Conservatism	7
Carole M. Cusack	Religion in Australian Society: A Place for Everything and Everything and Its Place	28
Evan Kanarakis	Where Be the Rock? Sex, Drugs and Rock & Roll: Influence, Empowerment and rebellion, or Commercial Constructs, Cheap Imitation and War Over?	46
Steve Georgakis–		
Richard Light	The Athens of the South: Sport in Australian Society	58
Andrea Bandhauer–		
Maria Veber	German Studies Today: Gender and Intercultural Studies	75
Panayiotis Diamadis	Aegean Eucalypts	86

SECTION TWO

S. M. Hawke	Dancing with the Ghost of Charmian Clift: A Ficto-Critical Requiem	106
Alexander Norman	Where the Church Bell Can Be Heard, There the Parish Lies: Issues of Schism and Continuity in the Greek Orthodox Church in Australia	122
Yiorgos Anagnostou	Through the Lenses of Rage: Refracting Success in Greek America	132
Angie Voela	The Construction of the Woman in Karkavitsas' <i>Η Ανγερή</i>	145
Vassilios Letsios	Back to Bable in the Time of Modern Greek. Language Varieties in the Novel <i>Αντιποίησης Αρχής</i>	167
Elena Koutrianou	Poetry as Recomposition: Odysseas Elytis Translating Sappho	192

Petro Alexiou	Diaspora and Colonialism in Australia in the 1920s: The Case of Alekos Doukas's Migrant 'Voyage South'	206
Anthony Stephens	Interrogating Myth: <i>Ariadne</i>	230

SECTION THREE

Joanne Finkelstein	The Demotic City – The Chattering Classes and Civility	263
Robert van Krieken	Occidental Self-Understanding and the Elias–Duerr Dispute: 'Thick' versus 'Thin' Conceptions of Human Subjectivity and Civilization	273
Craig Browne	Castoriadis on the Capitalist Imaginary	282

SECTION FOUR

	BOOK REVIEWS (Edited by Helen Nickas)	300
	LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS	327

Vassilios Letsios

BACK TO BABEL IN THE TIME OF
STANDARD MODERN GREEK

LANGUAGE VARIETIES IN THE NOVEL *ΑΝΤΙΠΟΙΗΣΙΣ ΑΡΧΗΣ*

[I am grateful to Roderick Beaton, Alexandra Georgakopoulou, David Ricks, and Peter Mackridge for their meticulous reading of drafts of this paper, perceptive comments and advice. The comments from the audience of the 30th Anniversary MGSA Symposium at Princeton University (1999) were particularly helpful.]

INTRODUCTION

The focus of this study is the literary use of language in the novel *Αντιποίησης Αρχής*, which was written by Alexandros Kotzias (1926–92) and first published in 1979 (Kotzias 1992b). It will center on a linguistic description of its language varieties and an examination of its various linguistic styles. The aim is to argue that this range of varieties and styles represents the author's deliberate rejection of a linguistic straitjacket and that this, in turn, reflects a time of liberation of the language at an official level in Greece. This rich linguistic repertoire generates, as we shall see, constant linguistic interaction among the speaking characters and simultaneously provides persuasive evidence that narrative fiction does not need to be limited linguistically.

THE 'LANGUAGE QUESTION' CONTEXT

No historical account of Modern Greek literature can ignore the impact of the 'Language Question' ('LQ'), that is to say the debate about the appropriate form of the written language (Babiniotis 1979: 1-16; Browning 1982: 66-7; Mackridge 1985: 6-11; Mackridge 1990: 25-71). According to Ferguson's notion of diglossia, two functionally different varieties of the same language, a distinct High (H) variety, *Κατηγορέουσα* (K), and a (socially) Low (L) variety, Demotic (D), coexist (Ferguson 1959: 336). K is differentiated

from D mostly through a greater degree of grammatical complexity as a strictly standardized language whose transmission does not occur in the context of primary socialization, but rather secondarily in schools. It is not used in everyday conversation, but instead in formal speech situations and for written communication (Bussmann 1996: 128).

Drawing on the period of the Colonels' regime (1967-1974), Kotzias' novel focuses on the specific historical point of the Polytechnic School's uprising in November 1973. The essential themes of compromise and resistance to the dictatorship are reflected in the novel's writing and time of publication. Long before 1967 though, the 'LQ', increasingly became of a political issue; D became associated with the political Left and K with the political Right. Beaton, referring to the Colonels' fulsome entitled *National Language*, says that, 'although the text denies it, the prescription of the Armed Forces HQ marks the final assertion of a more or less formal state of diglossia' (Beaton 1994: 325).

Since the fall of the Colonels' regime, the 'LQ' and its polarization for almost a century, seems to be coming to an informal end. Significantly, the novel was published in 1979, yet, the 'LQ', in relation to the way literature is written and read, ended officially with the Education Act of 1976 (Landsman 1989: 171). This Act attempted to abolish diglossia and its concomitant linguistic, educational and political problems by declaring D to be the official language. Margaret Alexiou argued that since the nineteenth century MG language reflects how written and spoken forms have evolved into 'a series of complex and constantly changing oppositions that affect writing and speech in different but interrelated ways' (Alexiou 1982: 173-4).

Since the distinction between K and D cannot be absolute, 'the two varieties could more adequately be represented on a *continuum* with extreme D on one end, and extreme K on the other' (Doukanari 1991: 510). The term Standard Modern Greek (SMG) (Browning 1982: 58; Mackridge 1985: 11-14; Joseph and Warburton 1987: 2), which linguists use to refer to the current form of the Greek language, is described as a 'lively entity, a complex system made up of components which have arrived from different sources and by various routes; the sum total of all the idiolects of its users' (Holton 1990: 32). In the time of SMG, the two distinct forms and their linguistic varieties and features are available to speakers or writers to define their discourse appropriate to a variety of contexts. Mackridge, in his study of MG language, says that,

the official introduction of SMG into all walks of life has made it at last possible for Greeks to make stylistic choices from the wealth of alternative words and forms: thus a new set of registers suitable for various situations is developing within this one language, where before there existed simply the invidious choice between K, D, and μικτή (Mackridge 1985: 14).

For example, Mackridge has attempted to describe general stylistic characteristics of both oral and written discourse and the distinctions provide opportunities for stylistic choices in an appropriate range of registers (Mackridge 1985: 338-60). The way this relates to what I want to say is that Kotzias is not using SMG as an organic synthesis (Babiniotis 1979a: 7) but deliberately highlights the underlying associations between linguistic choices and registers of language use. The novel, as I hope to show, can be read as a modern appropriation of the myth of Babel mirroring the author's attempts to communicate his response to a historical, political, and linguistic abnormality.

THE NOVEL AND ITS RECEPTION

The novel was first published five years after the fall of the Colonels' regime and three years after the abolishment of K and diglossia. It was part of a new style of prose-fiction writing, and centered on recent political history and in particular to the events of the Civil War or the uprising at Athens Polytechnic. These violent events are reported through the perspective of an informer, who ironically, is named by the name of a klepht of the early nineteenth century, Katsandonis.

The title of the novel, in juridical K jargon, is polysemantic. In fact, it seems that there is as much usurpation of authorities as there are usurpers and 'authorities' in the novel. The resistant students say: 'ωσότου υποχρεωθεί η δικτατορική κυβέρνηση να εγκαταλείψει την αρχή που σφετερίστηκε' (: 167), whereas the Prime Minister claims: 'οι αναρχικοί απέβλεπον εις τον κλονισμόν και την υπονόμωσιν της εθνικής υποστάσεως' (: 282). From the first perspective, the colonels usurped the authority of democracy while from the second it was the students who tried to usurp the dictatorship.

In terms of the use of language in the novel, as signified through the title, 'αντιποίησης' mirrors the 'anti-poetic' varieties of language such as the underworld's argot or slang, 'private' or 'secret' varieties that are known to exclusive initiates. Such speakers use 'εν αρχή ην ο λόγος' to identify the Word alternatively and typically coin new equivalents for 'standard' terms and concepts. By extension, this anti-language applies to the radical linguistic deviation and neologisms that characterize an anti-novel that does not conform to the conventions of narrative discourse typically associated with novel (Wales 1995: 27-8).

As a writer, Kotzias had always been a linguistically aware at both a theoretical and practical level (Kotzias et al. 1989: 4; Kotzias 1992a: 8). This propensity appears to have developed as the result of being an admirer of Papadiamantis' poetic language and an able translator of some of the most widely read and influential writers, in terms of their sense

of language, such as Dostoevsky and Kafka. He is considered to be 'ένας συγγραφέας ηθικός' (Yatromanolakis 1994: 202), and was publishing for almost forty years, starting with the novel *Η πολιορκία* (1953), and ending with *Ο πυγμαχός* (1991), just before his death by accident. In general, he focused on the events of the Civil War, and by referring to it as 'ο τριακονταετής πόλεμος' (1944-74) he related it to the 'τριακονταετής πόλεμος' in ancient Greece.

Apart from the initial critical reaction at the time of its publication, very little analytical research into the novel's complex use of language has been undertaken, apart from a few comments or brief articles. Tziouvas says that 'αποτελεί ενδεχομένως σταθμό για τη γλώσσα του νεοελληνικού πεζού λόγου των εικοσιπέντε τελευταίων χρόνων' (Tziouvas 1993: 210), whereas Miké mentions that 'είναι εξαιρετικά δύσκολο να τραβήξει κανείς τη διαχωριστική γραμμή ανάμεσα στα γλωσσικά επίπεδα' (Miké 1994: 179). Most of the critics, who refer to the language of the novel quote Zannas' words: 'μία γλωσσική αναδημιουργία που αποκαλύπτει ταυτόχρονα τη φθορά της γλώσσας, αλλά και τις δυνατότητές της' (Zannas 1980: 86). Fourteen years later, Yatromanolakis still drawing on Zannas, added that such a linguistic system 'προβάλλει ένα αληθινό όραμα' (Yatromanolakis 1994: 212). Overall, the essential uses of language that are identified are humor (Canakis 1994: 234), irony (Beaton 1994: 285; Ziras 1989: 165), disorientation (Peckham 1996: 141), and true presentation (Kourtovik 1994: 53) of a cultural (Tsaknias 1983: 50), historical (Romanos 1985: 215), or ideological (Argiriou 1979: 70) decline.

Typically, a few of the novel's linguistic dimensions are briefly discussed by means of a Bakhtinian theoretical framework. Its language has been merely characterized as 'polyphonic', 'polyglossic', or 'heteroglot' – the term that Bakhtin used to distinguish between the language used to represent the attitudes and opinions of the authors and that used by individual characters in fiction and epic (Bakhtin 1981) – without in depth description or justification. For example, Tziouvas claims that 'η Αντιποίησης σηματοδοτεί τη μετάβαση σε μια πιο ετερογλωσσική δεκαετία για τη νεοελληνική πεζογραφία' (Tziouvas 1993: 213). Miké says that 'ο ιστός των πολλών φωνών που πλέκονται γερά μεταξύ τους είναι καλά υφασμένος' (Miké 1994: 159), while Yatromanolakis says that 'δημιουργεί την αίσθηση ενός πραγματικού πολυφωνικού και ανεξίτητου γλωσσικού συστήματος' (Yatromanolakis 1994: 212).

In summary, critics have already mentioned the complexity of the novel's literary language and some dimensions of its use, but they have not described it in detail from a linguistic point of view. Given that Greek prose fiction in the last two decades evolves progressively towards polyphony (Tziouvas 1993: 213; Beaton 1994: 348), and since 'it is probably only since 1976 that it has been possible to write about Modern Greek literature

from a standpoint outside the debate about the language' (Beaton 1994: 15), there is a need to discuss and analyze how such a complicated language works in the novel in a more detailed manner and this is the objective of this study.

GOING BEYOND

ουρλιάζουνε στην άσφαλο κάτω από την τσάτσα οι χεμαγγιόροι άιν-τσβάι-
ράους *έξω ωρέ παντίδοι* μουσκέτ φουζιλίρεν στο ζιντάνι ουρλιάζει ο
χεμαγγιόρος Ούρλιχ *με ιοβόλλον όμμα* τσουρμπελετόν μουσκέτ κι ας τον
περικαλάνε από το ράδιο τ' αναρχοσκατόπαιδα αδέρφια μας στρατιώτες
αδέρφια μας στρατιώτες αδέρφια μας στρατιώ (: 274)

The passage above illustrates that Greek prose fiction authors of the time had a wide range of linguistic styles to draw upon. First, these few lines include at least four linguistic varieties; a stigmatized low variety or 'της πιάτσας' ('περικαλάνε'), a strict K ('με ιοβόλλον όμμα'), a nineteenth-century vernacular or 'ρωμαίικα' ('ωρέ παντίδοι'), and finally an acoustic rendering of non-Greek features (German) with mixing incongruities ('φουζιλίρεν', 'μουσκέτ'). Second, it exhibits different discourse types; for example, narration, character's speech, intertextual fragments from a nineteenth-century novel with both narration and character's speech, and finally radio speech.

To examine the actual language as an autonomous entity I intend to identify 'language varieties' (Ferguson 1994: 23) included in the novel according to the source of utterance in order to argue that the wide range of stylistic choices function differently according to the situations. An examination of the use of language in an other way, for example, according to linguistic forms or discourse types would be a complicated task, since K and D differences are not always clear-cut, while the varieties are not spread regularly, and such an examination would be confusing for the reader.

I intend to discuss how these different discourse types (Bakhtin 1981: 262-3) add to the novel and, in particular, focus on how the discourse and meaning is related to a particular time and context. What has to be interpreted is the orientation of utterances towards an anticipated implied response. In other words, a 'dialogue' between discourse types that also interacts with the 'dialogue' amongst the reader, the implied author, and the speaking persons. What is interesting here is to see in what ways and to what extent different linguistic styles are interrelated within the same novel.

1. NEITHER DEMOTIC NOR KATHAREVOUSA. THE IDIOLECT OF MENIOS KATSANDONIS

To examine the main character's speech, we should first describe it linguistically, and second discuss how it functions in the novel itself. Many different linguistic varieties are included in this speech, in such a way that we may speak about many hybrid varieties, whose single elements come from different forms of the Greek language, and which together make a hybrid idiolect, i.e. characteristic of a particular speaker. This highly individualistic manner of expression is, to varying degrees, apparent in the character's active vocabulary and syntax, and its complexity distinguishes it from other language varieties that are characteristic to socially defined groups.

It is also worth noting this hybrid's position in the novel and in particular its relation to the narration. Argiriou says: 'το μυθιστόρημα γραμμένο στο τρίτο πρόσωπο, εξαφανίζει μολοταύτα τον αφηγητή που αναλαμβάνει το ρόλο του μυθιστορηματικού ήρωα' (Argiriou 1979: 67), whereas Miké claims that: 'χρωματίζεται ο λόγος του αφηγητή από το λόγο του κεντρικού προσώπου' (Miké 1994: 179), and Kotzias himself, in a self-criticism study published in 1992, says that Menios is 'ήρωας-και εν μέρει αφηγητής' (Kotzias 1992a: 7).

The intentions of both the narrator and character are indeed combined in a single hybrid. By means of several narrative techniques, such as free indirect speech and interior monologue, the narration reflects the 'emotional structure' of the main character while 'inner speech [is] transmitted and regulated by the author' (Bakhtin 1981: 319). As a result, the hybrid varieties apparent in the main character's speech may also appear to the same degree in the narration when the narrator reproduces the idiolect of Menios to bring to life things from Menios' perspective. The narrator appears to abandon Menios' idiolect only when he wants to evaluate on the context. Being an omniscient narrator, he tells the story in a non-marked SMG characteristic of 1979 narration. The third person narrator appears to give voice to the characters and let them lead the reader through their language rather than tell his own story in his own style. Below I will discuss three essential linguistic varieties that appear in both the character and narrator's language: the low varieties, the intertextual references and finally the non-Greek features.

1.1 'Εγώ να πούμε ονομάζομαι Κατσαντώνης'

This 'low' variant of colloquial language, with explicit social and regional variants, is characterized by the innovative use of common vocabulary as well as newly coined words. It corresponds to Greek slang, argot of the underworld or anti-language, in that standard lexical terms are replaced by new alternative, 'in-group' language that is characteristically

very informal. This is like a ‘secret language’ (Fairclough 1989: 90), or ‘της πιάτσας’, which is known only to exclusive initiates and not widely understood by mainstream society (Bussmann 1996: 437).

Specifically, since such a variety is designed to be unintelligible to the uninitiated, its distinction is often mainly lexical representing forms of MG: D and K. In phonology, in D, examples such as ‘πιστάγκωνα’ appear, whereas acoustic monolectic render of K fixed phrases are common, such as ‘ομηγέναιτο’. In noun and verb morphology, we find in D, ‘ξεμολόγος’, ‘περικαλάς’, and in K, ‘εκτουπλησίον’. In vocabulary, the range of variation is creative, such as ‘μέγγλα’ (made in England), a part of which is not included in any MG language dictionary, such as ‘τεροκρυφίως’, and other K features, such as ‘αι αρχαί’. In syntax, both the main character’s speech and narration may be extremely long, lacking punctuation, and with fragments of mixed discourse types as we see mainly in the novel’s last chapter, in order to reflect the intonation of spoken language.

Με το κουμπάσο η επανάσταση, φρόνιμα. Κι αν ομηγέναιτο... θυμίσου το γέρο σου, είμαι ξεσκολισμένος εγώ, μού’χουνε ρίξει βρωμόξυλο όλα τα ζακόνια (: 138)

There is a surprising creativity in the use of vocabulary such as ‘κουμπάσο’, originating from the geometry register and literally meaning ‘compasses’, or to ‘calculate’ the revolution, ‘ξεσκολισμένος’ literally ‘graduated’, to say he is experienced and ‘ζακόνια’ – or ‘habits’ – meaning all political sides. The phonological one-word rendering of the fossilized three-word phrase (‘ομηγέναιτο’), given by the implied author, is an element of oral discourse in written form. Since it is considered as a prestigious cliché, it is also a way of undermining his educational status; because of the way the implied author renders it, we guess the character is able to say it but not to write it correctly.

Such a hybrid variety, shared by both main character and narrator, comes from different sources. It includes, alongside the range of a stigmatized language, features of D and K, ungrammatical usages and hypercorrections. Long contact with different sociolects has left its mark on his idiolect. Katsandonis’ idiolect seems to be a kind of sum total of all language varieties he is familiar with.

This anti-language, in every way anti-poetic, ‘is taken by the author precisely as the common view, as the verbal approach to people and things normal for a given sphere of society, as the going point of view and the going value. To one degree or another, the author distances himself from this common language, he steps back and objectifies it, forcing his own intentions to refract and diffuse themselves through the medium of this common view that has become embodied in language (a view that is always superficial

and frequently hypocritical)' (Bakhtin 1981: 301-2). Katsandonis' hybrid variety, undermined by the implied author, and shared by both the main character and the narrator, creates an 'alternative' common world or a counter culture. This is in close relation to the official authority of that time through the unpoetic and one-sided language of which we view the historical and fictional events that take place in the time of the Colonels' regime.

1.2 'Ένα ποινικό μητρώο κλέφτικον μυθιστόρημα'

The transposition of utterances of the nineteenth-century novel *Ο Κατσαντώνης. Κλέφτικον Επεισόδιον ή Ελληνικόν Μυθιστόρημα*, written by Konstantinos Ramfos (1776–1871) and published in 1862, into *Αντιποίησης*, 'accompanied by a new articulation of the enunciative and denotative position' (Kristeva 1993: 15), is one of the most interesting cases of intertextuality in MG prose-fiction. To examine in what ways and to what extent the two novels are interrelated linguistically, it is worth referring briefly to the context of the novel and the characters whose voices are intertextualized into *Αντιποίησης*.

Menios Katsandonis, a fictional informer of the Colonels, ironically shares the same name with the hero Katsandonis who is a historical person. However, it is another fictional character, the monk Karderinis, who becomes his alter ego. In common, they are both betrayers and have the same red birthmark on the forehead. An ex-teacher partisan, Kapetan Perdikis, after Menios' early betrayal first mentions such a similarity with the monk from the specific novel. After that, Karderinis is felt to have become Menios' saver, so that Menios is called by that nickname. While Menios was in prison he had read the novel *Κατσαντώνης* so many times as to learn it by heart so that he remembers its fragments in the time of the novel's conception.

Κατσαντώνης (Ramfos 1994) is considered a historical novel in literary criticism, although not all the events and characters of the text reflect history. Dedicated to youth, it expresses the desire of the hero to bend to no authority. It is worth mentioning that apart from history Katsandonis himself is well known through folk poetry (Stamelos 1988: 228) or shadow-puppet theatre (Myrsiades 1988: 45-60). The novel refers to the last days of the historical hero Katsandonis (1773/5-1807/8), a klepht captain and a freedom fighter of the early nineteenth century, before he was arrested and tortured by Ali Pasha (1741-1822), the provincial governor of the Ottoman Empire in Yannina. Isuf-Arapis, a historical person, known as the Blood-Drinker (Plomer 1987: 56), was a high member of the Turkish ruling class. The monk Karderinis, who is the betrayer of Katsandonis in *Κατσαντώνης*, is a fictional character though (Stamelos 1988: 171). The

key question here is what are these characters doing and saying in the early 1970s at the time of the Colonels' regime, from such a different historical, political and linguistic context, and how do they communicate, if they do so, with the modern Athenian community within the text?

The above language variety is typographically distinguished in italic fonts to make the intertextuality clear, and is integrated into *Αντιποίησης* in fragmented form. Narration in *Κατσαντώνης* is in strict nineteenth-century K, such as *χαλκόχρουν έχοντες την όψιν*'. The characters' speech on the other hand is the nineteenth century vernacular or 'ρωμαίικα', e.g. *έξω ωρέ παντίδο*'. The distance between the Ottoman Empire and the Colonels' regime is diminished using language and its signification in both periods. Names and nouns coming from *Κατσαντώνης*, however, signify the specific time and place of the dictatorship in the seventies. Various alter egos are transposed mainly linguistically from the one text into the other. For example Karderinis, whose name reminds the bird 'καρδερίνα', betrays just like the folk poetry's betrayer-bird, whereas the hero Katsandonis, with the name of Dinos, appears as the betrayer's hero victim. Katsandonis' gypsy torturers give their names to the three military instruments and a character named Yampas is called Aliyampas, for Alipasas. A military captain, Kechayas, is named with a Turkish word meaning 'titled of the sultan's Court' and the military soldiers are called 'μπασιμπουζούκοι' (: 63), which means 'Ottoman irregular troops', or 'τσελεπήδες' and 'μπεχλιβάνηδες'. A military ruler is also called 'βεληγκέκας' like the first officer of the serai in Karagiozis' shadow-puppet performances, while Menios calls another ruler 'πολυχρομεμένε' (: 208). In the same scene, and with Chatziavatis, Stavrakas and Kollitiris around (: 211), friends and son of the shadow-puppet Karagöz, the doctor's wife calls him 'καραγκιόζη' three times to criticize him (: 205, 206, 217). Considering that 'Katsandonis is the most highly developed and most popular of the Karagiozis history performances' (Myrsiades 1988: 55), and mainly based on the plot of Ramfos' novel, in *Αντιποίησης* there is a linguistic representation of a cultural hybrid through hybrid language coming from the roots of Greek past tradition, a compound language whose single elements come from different languages.

It is worth mentioning that, apart from the voice of the narrator, the characters whose voices are transposed into *Αντιποίησης* are mainly Ali Pasha's and Isuf-Arapis', and to a lesser extent Karderinis'. On the other hand, there is no utterance of the main character of the novel, the hero Katsandonis. Such a one-sided linguistic representation of authority reflects the choice of the implied author of *Αντιποίησης* to give the whole story through the point of view of the informer and the dictatorship's supporters. In *Αντιποίησης*, there is no character that could have borrowed the hero's speech because there is no heroic character in it. Such a limiting choice linguistically undermines the

didactic and patriotic value of the language of *Κατσαντώνης*. After inviting characters from an old novel into his text, he chooses to reject those who were the heroes, and employed its tyrants and betrayers in his fictional world.

It is not only the implied author who undermines *Κατσαντώνης* though; the main character himself, who learned it by heart presumably out of respect, seems to undermine it by confusing its genre, since he reads it confusingly. When he refers to the father of the Minister, he clarifies it:

ήτανε ρεμάλι [...] νταής, φονιάς, ληστής, ένα ποινικό μητρώο κλέφτικον μυθιστόρημα (: 194)

The key words here are ‘κλέφτικον’ and ‘ληστής’ which have different meanings in the nineteenth century, and in the time of the main character. Apart from confusing the title of *Κατσαντώνης*, he gives the klephts a different meaning from Ramfos, i.e. ‘οι σωτήρες της πατρίδος και της παλιγγενεσίας τα κύρια όργανα’ (Ramfos 1994: 82), that is the sense of the word in the speaker’s time, which seems to be the same with ‘ληστής’, ‘robber’. The klepht described here is not distinguished from the bandit, who does not pursue a religious or patriotic dream to liberate Greece, but is treated variously as an anti-hero. From this subverted perspective, the informer as a reader finds that the ‘κλέφτικον επεισόδιον’ does not refer to the klepht Katsandonis but to Karderinis’ act of betrayal, in which he invests the main interest. Such an interpretation justifies every single utterance of *Κατσαντώνης* transposed into *Αντιποίησης*, since both worlds represent a tyrannical lawlessness.

Where Ramfos alludes to Solomos’ *Ύμνος εις την ελευθερία* to refer to a freedom fighter (Ramfos 1994: 69), Kotzias quotes Ramfos to refer to an underworld’s betrayer. What is undermined here is not so much Ramfos himself but rather the extent to which heroism is expressed through intertextuality. Nanos Valaoritis’ *Από τα κόκαλα βγαλμένη*, published three years later and titled with a line from *Ύμνος εις την ελευθερία*, alludes to Greek poets such as Solomos, Palamas and Seferis (Valaoritis 1982: 23, 57, 119, 172). Unlike Kotzias, he undermines them more extensively and in a different style by employing his surrealistic background. He rather distances himself from the more conventional poets than allows their language to add to his work. In *Αντιποίησης*, both the high linguistic varieties, in which *Κατσαντώνης* is written, and its original didactic and patriotic style create an ‘antagonistic’ relation to the language and style of the novel into which they are transposed. Language is used to become more extreme than a ‘γλώσσα αγοραία’ (Seferis 1950: 108), because it is seen as the instrument of a repressive regime’s underworld.

1.3 “Αιν-τσβάι-ράους!”

Two or more national languages are simultaneously present in the discourse of Menios and the narrator and they interact, in terms of polyglossia (Bakhtin 1981: 431), within the single cultural entity. The essential national languages are German and English but also include others such as Turkish and Albanian. In order to evaluate how they add to the novel, it is worth examining them linguistically and in terms of their position in that time and place. Both foreign languages are written in Greek characters: German is correctly rendered in phonetics, such as ‘πολιτσάι’, whereas English seems to be an imitation of meaningless sounds such as ‘γάου-μπα-μπλε-τσι-γκου-ράιτ’. In morphology, both languages have mainly monolectic renderings such as ‘γιαβόλ χερμαγιόρ’, ‘βερυγκούτ’. The vocabulary in English has no significant meaning other than acoustic representation of speech whereas in German it mainly represents the military register and specifically in the time of the German occupation during the Second World War such as ‘μουσκέτ’, ‘φουζιλίρεν’, ‘λόος’. Examples of these are exclamations of only few words that never amount to a full sentence.

μουσκέτ! ουρλιάζει ο Ούρλιχ το καθημερινό προσφάγι του, φουζιλίρεν!
λόος! ουρλιάζει. Γιαβόλ χερμαγιόρ! κλαρίνο οι Βάφεν καμεράντ κερβέροι
και κατασυνέπειαν φόγιαρ! (: 46)

The acoustic mixing of two national languages in these lines exhibits linguistic incongruity. In effect, the implied author again undermines the speaking person’s knowledge of the meaning of what he says. This incongruous use of language has the effect of disorientating the reader, no matter proficient they are in the ‘original’ language. This deliberate linguistic disorientation is used to mirror explicitly the unorthodox regime; the relation between the people and authority is reflected in the relation between the two languages in a polyglossic environment. Major Ulrich and Waffen SS appear, in their cultural and political system, in the novel’s context of the Colonels’ regime. The two authority systems associate one another both linguistically and politically. The polyglossic dialogue has the effect of both representing and undermining the registers in which fascism is expressed in both cases.

μόλις όμως βάζουνε στο χέρι τον κατάλογο τα κόκκινα ονόματα που κρατούσε ο καψο-Μένιος πεσκέσι [...] πλακώνουν κι οι Εγγλέζοι τα σκυλογαυγίσματα τα γάου-μπα-μπλε-τσι-γκου-ράιτ! (: 253)

This polyglossic incongruity, taken from the context of the Greek Civil War, generates humor rather than criticism. For example, there is a humorous interaction between the word ‘τα σκυλογαυγίσματα’ and acoustic rendering of English by Menios, who reproduces it by imitating the barking of the dog. What is undermined here is not so much the English language itself but rather language as an instrument of authority. A further incongruity is reflected in the language; Menios does not understand the meaning of the language itself but also underlines the context within which it takes place. This has the effect of highlighting and reflecting a political situation that people do not understand; they speak a different language to that of the authority. This mismatch becomes exaggerated in the time of the Colonels’ regime in which the people speak in one single language, and yet still, do not succeed in communicating.

2. A ‘prestigious’ language to speak

Menios Katsandonis, born 1925, grew up in a poor, uneducated family in the Peloponnese region and experienced the beginning of the ‘thirty year war’ at the age of fifteen. When referring to Menios’ circle, both the narrator and main character bring to life a stigmatized society through his grandfather’s disagreeing (: 110), his mother’s and schoolmistress’ teaching (: 98, 240) and the practical medic’s incantation, in an unknown language (: 69). In this chapter, I will examine the way in which two different social types are brought to life through language. The first example is Voula, Menios’ girlfriend, who abandoned him seven times for other men, in order to consolidate herself socially. The second is Koula, Menios’ wife, who looks after their children and tries to bring him to reason in her own way. These two women are distinguished from each other linguistically which seems to reflect the way that Menios, drawing on Herculean myth, is torn between *Αρετή* and *Κακία*, or good and evil. Both, however, in terms of name connotations, represent socially two dishonored types of people of the regime’s social ‘Tower of Babel’.

2.1 ‘Η πίστις να πλερώνεται εντηπαλάμη’

Voula’s variety of language is characteristic of a particular social group or class rather than an idiolect. There are phonological one-word renderings of both D such as ‘νάταμας’, ‘καλώσμουτον’ and K features such as ‘εντηβασιλεία’. The morphology reflects non-Greek features such as ‘κορμπίφ’ and regional features such as ‘χάνουμαι’ and ‘ξουράφι’. In terms of vocabulary, there is a wide range of low variety words such as ‘μπουχός’ and ‘χαϊρι’, and expressions such as ‘το και το’. In the following passage, Voula shows Menios how to address the Minister.

θα του κλαφτείς, πώς με λησιμόνησες κύριε υπουργέ μου εντηβασιλεία σου...
 που οι πατεράδες μας ήτανε αποτέτοι, κουμπάροι του βασιλιά του Κώτσου
 – τι έλεγες καλέ οι πατεράδες σας... (: 10)

There is a mixing of two incompatible stylistic usages here. The H variety feature ‘εντηβασιλεία σου’, from ecclesiastical language, in an acoustic monolectic rendering, while the L variety feature ‘αποτέτοι’, a put down, and a vague feature instead of the ‘appropriate’ word. Such a diglossic incongruity has the effect of undermining the speaker’s knowledge of the prestigious language she uses; in addition, it parodies her inappropriate use of register. For example, she sycophantically addresses the Minister in the name of the Father drawing an implied parallel between divine and human power. In ironically addressing Menios, who belongs to the same social class, she is, however, not able to remember a very simple word.

Her use of language illuminates an artificial, hypocritical character that wants to enhance her social standing by using the H variety. Through this linguistic incongruity, there is a sharp criticism of the diglossic situation because, as it is clear from the above, real life cannot seriously be represented with the coexistence of such a strict functional differentiation between a (socially) L variety and a distinct H variety. Such combinations are quite frequent in the writers Costas Tachtsis and Elena Akrita. Unlike Tachtsis (Kazazis 1979: 27), the implied author criticizes the context by identifying the characters socially in terms of language and in contrast to Akrita (Canakis 1994: 221), he does not seek only to amuse the readers. Behind the humor, there is an implicit social criticism through language against a socially ambitious woman and a society that tolerates social and linguistic instability.

2.2 ‘Συνεβοσκόμην ο τάλας κτήνεσι’

In common with Menios’ utterances, Koula’s speech reveals a similar ‘dialogue’ between the given text and other imported texts from previous centuries. These come from Church hymns and belong linguistically to New Testament Greek such as ‘τας δυνάμεις των ουρανών εβόων σοι ζωοδότα’. These utterances draw from the hymns of the Prodigal Son, the Seven Sons in the Furnace, the Day of Judgement and Christ’s Resurrection.

It is worth mentioning here that Church hymns, although a highly prestigious variety, are not considered as exaggerated as Menios’ utterances, since people in rural communities tend to memorize hymns they hear at the Church rather than nineteenth-century novels they read. There is also a range of linguistic hybrids reflecting mainly regional features in morphology such as “πίσκοπε του Δαμαλά’, ‘Τζιμλόντος’ and a few fixed phrases in D such as ‘Θε μου συχώρεσέ με’, or in K such as ‘ήγγικεν η ώρα’.

η επιστροφή του ασώτου, λέει, εκείνος ο χαλές ο άσωτος με τη φώτιση του Κυρίου παρατρίχα εγλίτωσε το πυρ το εξώτερον [...] ήμαρτον ενώπιον των οφθαλμών σου πάτερ οικτήρμον κι άσε κάτω τα δολάρια θεοσκοτωμένε [...] που να σου ξεραθεί το χέρι Κάιν (: 36)

The example above shows a stratification of language according to two different points of view. Koula uses an utterance from the hymn based on the Prodigal Son, who after he abandoned his father, bitterly regretted it and returned home. Menios, unlike a Prodigal husband and father, returns home only to get money from his wife and considers the Prodigal Son as a common underworld type who was lucky to be forgiven. In fact, Menios is explicitly paralleled with the negative aspects of characters in the New and Old Testament, the Prodigal Son, who passed over an affront to his dignity, and Cain, who killed his brother. Menios betrays Dinos, whom he calls 'brother' in the last chapter. There might also be a correspondence between the Prodigal Son who betrayed his Father and became a shepherd of pigs (New Testament, St Luke, 15.11-32), and the fictional monk, Karderinis, who betrayed a hero and became a shepherd of goats (: 212).

Koula is a self-righteous character, a moral voice. Her idiolect reflects that what she sees around is an immoral world from which she wants to distance herself. There is an ironic interaction between Koula's morality and her fossilized language, and Menios' obscenity and his vulgar language. By juxtaposing two belief systems expressed through different language varieties, the implied author keeps the two characters at a distance, and simultaneously distances himself from both. Koula's voice sounds meaningless and too 'prestigious' in that context and is undermined by the narrator, who interprets the parable of the Prodigal Son as a ploy to survive rather than to gain absolution.

As we have already seen the K form or 'purified' language was officially established as part of the Colonels' regime and used as the instrument of dominance. All the authoritarian figures in *Αντιποίησις* – politicians, military rulers and police – use this language to distinguish and distance themselves from others. Significantly they are addressed by their titles – corporal, the Prime Minister, or with approving characterizations, such as 'τα Τσακάλια' for the soldiers – rather than by names. This has the effect of constructing an abstract single 'authority' rather than few dominant individuals. This chapter will examine four such cases: the Minister, a military ruler, the Prime Minister's official radio addresses, and a newspaper article.

3.1 'A Statesman of Tomorrow'

Minister Menios Katsandonis ironically sharing the same name as the main character, his cousin, seeks to advance his position, whereas his cousin is trapped in the underworld.

This distinction is also played on linguistically at a mainly lexical level. The Minister's speech consists of prestigious examples in both D such as 'εκδούλευση', 'νεφελοβατεί' and K such as 'διαρρήδην' or foreign language (English) such as 'a statesman of tomorrow'. In the following passage, the narrator uses free indirect speech to convey how Menios undermines the Minister's reputation:

τοιουτοτρόπως εκθέτει το Μένιο Κατσαντώνη, δίνει λαβή στον Κυριάκο και τους συν αυτό, επωφελούνται οι ανόητοι λοχαγίσκοι που αντιπολιτεύονται το Μένιο Κατσαντώνη (: 187)

Language in this case dichotomizes people so that they do not actually communicate, since the availability of the one or the other variety depends on education and social class. The use of strict K features distances the Minister from his interlocutor. On the other hand, the use of free indirect speech to convey the Minister's discourse undermines the self-promotional intent of the original. The narrator adopts an ironic stance towards the character and undermines the authority. This is particularly apparent through the repetition of the speaker's name, in order to emphasize on his dominance. According to the pamphlet of the Armed Forces HQ, language is not an organism but a set of clothes (Beaton 1994: 351), and when the Minister asks Menios to change his name in order to keep his reputation intact, the Minister is paying attention to the effect of words and names rather than to what words and names actually represent (Kazazis 1968: 140).

The stratification of society is made concrete by the implied author's stratification of language. From the point of view of a post-1976 era, he also criticizes the long term effect of such a stratification in society by 'freezing' the voices in their original context and by constructing a disrupted society which is divided into political parties that continue to speak different 'languages'.

3.2 'Κατασυνέπειαν ο στρατιωτικός νόμος άρχει'

The captain is the main representative and the most powerful of the military rulers in the novel. His speech consists of K, such as 'εθνοπροδόται', antiquated features such as 'ουχήττον', low D such as 'μουνουχίστηκε', and K-like coinages such as 'αλλέως'. The effect is that he seems to 'dress up' his vernacular with a formal set of clothes such as 'χωρίς ουδείς να πάρει πρέφα'. In the following passage, the captain, in the manner of an ancient Greek general before the fight, encourages the snipers for attack:

'εις υμάς τους επιλέκτους τεχνοκράτας εναποθέτει η εθνική επανάστασις δια το ευτυχές αποτέλεσμα' (: 257)

The captain addresses the snipers in a ‘purified’, strict language to give the situation formality and authority to himself. By using the language in the old-fashioned style of an authoritarian commentator addressing a mass audience, the author humorously undermines its authority so that it appears to a dishonest speech. Focus is thrown onto his rhetoric that conceals rather than reveals truth.

The ‘purified’ language that was officially abolished in 1976 becomes an object of criticism. This artificial language variety expresses an unorthodox way of dominating just like the unorthodox way of using the language itself. The narrator distances himself from such a fake world by telling the truth and commenting in the standard language of his time, when not marked by Menios’ idiolect. This undermining language creates an alternative variety through which he is able to undermine the world that is expressed. This unified sense of language represents both the language situation since 1976, and the political changeover since 1974, which together reflect the beginning of a new era at both a political and linguistic level.

3.3 ‘Η αυτού εξοχότης ο κύριος πρωθυπουργός’

The Prime Minister’s speech, in pure K, is heard in fragmented form through the ‘National Institution of Radio and Television’ after the imposition of military law, for example ‘εγένετο’, ‘οιανδήποτε’. A different font, like the discourse of the Athens Polytechnic Radio Station distinguishes it from the rest of the text. These two registers are ‘objective’ modes of history concerned with the narration of events in the past (Kotzias 1992a: 12). There is also a constant interaction between such discourse types with the speaking voices of the narrator and other characters that are juxtaposed in the novel. There is a fictional ‘dialogue’ between the PM and a sergeant, and secondly, the narrator:

κατέστη βεβαιότης ότι οι αναρχικοί απέβλεπον εις τον κλωνισμόν και την υπονόμευσιν της εθνικής υποστάσεως έχει ιερά αποστολή ο πιθηκάνθρωπος του δάσους υπέχει τας ευθύνας [...] σου την έβαλε την τρικλοποδιά ο σαλτιμπάγκος (: 282)

The above discourse types are interwoven but distinguished linguistically, so that together they make for a Babel-like linguistic and social environment. The narrator, who removes the statement’s set of clothes, in order to reveal its underlying meaning, ironically undermines what is said above by the PM publicly in strict K language. The choice of the noun ‘ape-man’ is not accidental as it highlights a primitive figure that uses an ‘imitation’-language. The narrator both imitates and marks the formality of the PM’s speech by using K features. After stripping off its formality, nothing is left. The listener interprets things

according to the facts rather than words, and reveals this ‘clothing’ language as superfluous and misleading.

There is an unbridged gap, conveyed through a dichotomized language, between what is publicly said about the privacy of individuals, and what individuals say about public life. In such a diglossic society, power is not based on people’s free spirit and individuals are not free to create their own world. The distance between public and individual life is illustrated more widely, in a different style, ten years later, in Thanassis Valtinos’ *Στοιχεία για τη δεκαετία του ’60* (1989). Although there is no undermining narrator, a criticism is evident by the juxtaposition of personal letters (low variety), with public articles (strict K language). Apart from the influence that diglossia actually had on written and oral language, writers tended to parody and criticize such a paradoxical language and social situation.

3.4 ‘Ελεύθερος Κόσμος’

Free World, the ironically titled newspaper considerably supports the prevailing authority. Using K features, the narrator imitates the language of the newspaper in order to achieve its formal register (‘δια την δόξαν’). However, he also integrates D features totally inappropriate to a journalistic context of the time (‘ποδάρια’).

κατόπιν αγοράζει τον ‘Ελεύθερο Κόσμο’ που αρθρογραφεί σοφά [...] ο Αρχηγός, ως αρχαίος Περικλής ισάξιος Ελευθέριος Βενιζέλος, θα ορίζει έτσι θέλω τα πάντα [...] δια την δόξαν και το μεγαλείον της πατρίδος που έχει στα ποδάρια της κάταγμα και επιβάλλεται γύψος (: 26)

In the passage above, the narrator demonstrates Menios’ respect for the paper, but simultaneously undermines the comparison between the Leader and the famous leaders of ancient and modern Greece and the metaphor of Greece as a patient in need of plaster. The mass media utterances within the fictional text inject the historical reality into a fictional world creating an intertextual relation between fiction and history. By following Menios among the people in authority, the implied author encourages the reader to appraise, from a distance, how this world operates in its historical context. Without the historical elements, the effect would be too fictional to be believed.

4. A ‘language’ to resist

The few voices of resistance that appear in the novel are frequently formed as an elliptic sentence and often take the form of figures of speech, such as political slogans. They appear in a ‘mass’ form rather than individual sentences, so that they appear as a com-

mentating sound effect rather than integrated into the plot. Interestingly the resistants and figures of authority never actually meet in the plot although their speeches may be juxtaposed within the text. Political slogans appear in a variety of discourse types such as placards (: 154, 159), leaflets (: 160), by means of the Athens Polytechnic Radio Station, protest marches (: 133), street discussions (: 218), or conversations (: 117).

To examine the discourse of resistance linguistically and its role in the novel, I will now focus on four different cases: the political slogans of the University students, the voices of the students through the banned radio station of the Athens Polytechnic, the left-wing sociolects of youth, and the speech of a self-styled left-wing aristocrat.

4.1 'ΨΩΜΙ-ΠΑΙΔΕΙΑ-ΕΛΕΥ-ΘΕΡΙΑ!'

University students appear in the novel as a mass rather than individually and when appearing, are referred to by the names assigned to them by their opposing political side, such as 'φοιτητοτσολάνια' and 'αναρχικοί'. The mass of thousands speak linguistically with one voice only, usually in slogans. As previously mentioned, they appear as an additional sound effect rather than as an identified voice and serve to accompany a story which is a calculated one-sided perspective from the 'debased instruments' of authority. This discourse is typed both in capital letters, to signify the massive voice, and in syllables to emphasize its rhythmic quality (ΘΑΝΑ-ΤΟΣΤΗ-ΧΟΥ-ΝΤΑ). In written discourse, however, this fragmentary speech becomes morphologically a meaningless ungrammatical usage, particularly at points of maximum fragmentation (e.g. ΕΘΑΙΝΕΙ-ΟΦΑ). In terms of vocabulary, there is a range of mocking usages, mainly in D or 'μαλλιαρή', for humorous effects (e.g. ΠΑΡΤΟΜΠΙ-ΘΗΚΟΚΙΕ-ΜΠΙΡΟΣ!). The sentences are elliptical with use of exclamations.

χιλιάδες φοιτητοτσολάνια γελαστά ομορφόπαιδα ξυρισμένοι ή μουςάτοι καλοταϊσμένοι [...] χοντρούλες κούκλες ζουμερές αποκόκκινες – πού εκείνοι οι λιμάρηδες της κατοχής οι βερέμηδες – κραυγάζουν μερμυγκιά οι αναρχικοί – ΨΩΜΙ-ΠΑΙΔΕΙΑ-ΕΛΕΥ-ΘΕΡΙΑ! [...] να νικήσουνε με τα ξεφωνητά τη σιδηρά επανάσταση... (: 116)

In this example, the narrator undermines the significance of the well-known slogan 'Bread-Education-Freedom' by presenting the young resistants sarcastically as 'beefy guys' and 'little fat girls', educated, and at liberty to put up energetic resistance, in comparison to the 'good-old' partisans of the Civil War. The sarcasm questions the need to protest, while also underlying the futility of trying to subvert the Colonels' authority. From this point of view, there is a strong sarcasm against the ones who protest orally at that place

and in that time against authority, just because there is no need to do so, and, in addition, there is no possibility to subvert such a powerful revolution.

There is an irony in the way the students appear to resist. Since they use language to shout rather than to discuss, they lack clear argumentation and justification. The fragmentation of such a 'language' has the effect of keeping this group at a distance from the others. The distinction between a public and an individual sense of resistance is illustrated in an extreme way, three years later, in Ersi Sotiropoulou's *Η φάρσα* (Sotiropoulou 1982: 255-67). A criticism is evident in the juxtaposition of patriotic slogans used to attract people's attention (strict K language), with a telephone conversation used to highlight passivity (low variety). The implied author in *Αντιποίησης*, however, through such a stratification of language, criticizes the self-presentation of a society which is divided into many fragmentary parts, just like their language.

4.2 'Εδώ Πολυτεχνείο'

The voices of the University students are also expressed, in a different way, through the banned radio station of Athens Polytechnic, which is worth examining separately. As far as I know, this radio discourse is close to its original transmitted form. It appears in fragmented form and its role in the novel is significant because it sets up a dialogic relationship with the fictional text. It appears first in the middle of the novel and progressively increases hereafter. Unlike the previous one, this discourse is single-voiced rendered mainly by two announcers, a girl and a boy who represent all resistant voices of the country. Further, this student voice attempts to explore issues in complete sentences that are continually interrupted by the narration. Written in different font, like the 'National Institution of Radio and Television', this register phonologically renders the spoken language of educated people that was spoken in everyday life. Unlike the slogans, its vocabulary and syntax does not include 'exaggerated' linguistic usages.

οι ηγέτες όλων των πολιτικών παρατάξεων εκφράζουν [...] την ευγνωμοσύνη του έθνους, διαλαλεί περιχαρή από τον αναρχικό ραδιοσταθμό ο σκατομπαγάσας όμως οι ντιστεγκέδες ελεύθεροι [...] σχολιάζουνε τώρα σεξουαλικά την καμπαρετζού κουφάλα που [...] περιγράφει περιχαρή την Ελλάδα [...] σε αντεθνικό ντελίριο (: 250)

Two different discourse types, radio register and narration, representing two unbridged worlds are juxtaposed in the novel. Again, the narrator undermines the opposition by holding up the female's voice to sexual ridicule but after he has already allowed its linguistic testimony. It is up to the reader whether he takes the part of the narrator or not.

The existence of alternative voices gives the reader the opportunity to select the separated voices and build himself more a critical truth. More than any other intextual register, however, the radio discourse captures a historical truth.

The implied author's truth is even more important though. The interrelation of the few historical testimonies with the fictional world spoken not in a given language, but through language, is 'κάτι πιο αληθινό από την ιστορική αλήθεια – ένα μυθιστόρημα' (author's abstract.) Historical truth, given in one single voice, like the historical testimony, is a part of a greater whole; 'the constant interaction between meanings, all of which have the potential of conditioning others' (Bakhtin 1981: 426), subverts the historical monologue through the dialogic interaction of different consciousness. With such a technique, as far as it is a linguistic one, there are as many truths as voices; all stratified yet unified at the same time within the same genre, the novel.

4.3 'Ζήτω η λαϊκή ενότητα!'

Sakis and Roula, both Menios' children, members of the Youth Communist Party, support the resistance of the University students and attempt to apply Marxist capital theory into practical life including their own family. Roula calls her father 'λακέ του ιμπεριαλισμού', whereas Sakis says that their house is 'λαϊκοεπαναστατικό' (: 32, 136). Such a left-wing political sociolect, a quite common linguistic code among young generation of that time, is defined mainly in lexical terms ('ρεβιζιονιστές', 'προβοκατόρικα') and in the elliptical syntax of political slogans. In the following passage, another 'comrade' of the same of political party disturbs Roula and a 'comrade', during their protest against authority.

'Ζήτω η λαϊκή ενότητα!' 'Λερώνετε το προλεταριάτο... λερώνετε' έσπρωξε πέρα Ρούλα και καλόπαιδο ένας μουστάκις με κόκκινο ζιβγάγκο [...] 'Παρασπονδία!' 'Μας το ανάθεσε η οργανωτική επιτροπή!' 'Ενότητα!' (: 133)

Comparing the first and the last sentences, in the first case 'unity' becomes the significant indisputable factor that defines that social group, whereas the second, and after the perfidy, becomes a self-referential demand. Significantly, neither the narrator nor Menios undermines the characters' voice, but the characters themselves. In this case, such a group is divided both in terms of society and in terms of itself, as a group. Considering the time of such a usage, such a socially defined group identifies itself through an ideology that is impossible to implement.

The Babel-like effect stratifies society because people are divided into different political parties that are identified with different 'languages'. As this linguistic stratifica-

tion is also of a political nature, this is more serious than ‘a cheerful war, the Tower of Babel as a maypole’ (Bakhtin 1981: 433); apart from the humorous effect that comes from the description of a society that is not able to communicate, there is a strong criticism of a society in danger.

4.4 ‘Σύνν-χαρητήρια! απίσσ-τευτο!’

Mrs Mnisikleous, a left wing of the upper social class and a naval captain’s wife, appears to be enthusiastic for resistance as a style of life rather than as a practice against political crisis. She holds a protest leaflet as a souvenir and admires the revolutionary style of Sakis, Menios’ son. Linguistically, there is a marked foreign accent in her emphasis of words whose meaning are emphatic themselves (‘υπέρ-ροχα!’, ‘παίδ-δαρος!’) Morphologically, there are prestigious usages of K clichés (‘εν μια νυκτί’) or marked non-Greek features (‘έχω εκζιταριστεί’ from ‘excite’). In terms of vocabulary, there are formal registers (‘αγαπητέ’). In the following passage, she describes her feelings for the young communist, but after she realizes the betrayal, she speaks the language of interest.

Σύνν-χαρητήρια! απίσσ-τευτο! [...] Να σου ζήσει αγαπητέ πρέπει να ’σαι περήφανος. Πού είναι το Βουλάκι να τους χειροκροτήσουμε... Αχ, πόσο έχω εκζιταριστεί, θα κλάψω! (: 118) [...] Καλύτερα να τη σκίσουμε ’την προκήρυξη αγαπητέ [...] Όποτε χρειαστείς καμιά εξυπηρέτηση, ο Αντώνης... (: 120)

Just like her language, her political beliefs are an imitation. She, herself, undermines and parodies her own words, when she switches register from the foreign stressed discourse of the intellectual aristocrat to the flat fixed phrases of a member of the upper class who wants to protect her position. Language is used as a ‘cover’ again in which people alternate between registers to create a desirable face, behind which there is nothing. Speakers objectify the linguistic instrument and use it to identify themselves with something they are not rather than to express themselves or communicate.

Such a linguistic environment, while comic, is highly tragic in effect. Behind this subversive use of language, there is nothing but people who want to distinguish themselves from the others and to protect their authority. This distance between words and things takes an exaggerated form and expresses something about the junta society. The author who lets the reader to realize that under such range there are only words and no things marks the wide range of linguistic environment used. The author brings to life a fake Babel society that speaks different languages, in which people never communicate because they simply want to establish their self-authority.

CONCLUSION

και επαύσαντο οικοδομούντες την πόλιν και τον πύργον δια τούτο εκλήθη το
 όνομα αυτής Σύγχυσις, ότι εκεί συνέχεεν κύριος τα χείλη πάσης της γης
 (Septuaginta, Genesis, 11. 8-9)

With this study, I examined the ways in which the linguistic choices within a novel have been used to represent a particular place and time in the history of Modern Greece. I discussed how this type of linguistic representation adds to the novel. The stratification of the different language varieties within a single language and the ways in which they are unified in a specific genre, are examined according to speaking 'voices', in order to identify a system of voices that were frozen at their own place and in their own time.

The first chapter examined the main character's idiolect, a case of complexity because of the use of different linguistic forms and discourse types. This exaggerated hybrid language embodies the continuum of the MG language, from super-low D features to prestigious nineteenth-century strict K. The implied author criticizes through parody, irony or humor the coexistence of linguistic forms for different purposes in the official diglossic situation of the time in which the plot takes place. Such an unorthodox mixing of varieties is the result of an 'unorthodox' legal system and the way people respond to it in actual life.

The second chapter discussed the linguistic representation of Menios' circle, and focused on two linguistically different female voices that reflect both the wide social and close family environment to which the main character belongs. Voula wants to sound 'posh' while Koula is after moral affirmation. From the extreme D features on the one hand, to the prestigious New Testament Greek on the other, both of them speak a hybrid variety which represents a social class that adopts or imitates a variety that they consider to be particularly prestigious and which is useful for their social aspirations or moral standards.

In the third chapter, I have briefly approached the linguistic representation of political and military authority. This focused on a discussion of the linguistic usages of a junta Minister, a military captain, the Prime Minister and finally of a newspaper that supports the regime's system. Considering in advance that they all mainly use the official language of junta, i.e. K, their linguistic varieties are reduced in terms of range. What is very apparent, however, is the appearance of 'dialogisation' among the above, and the narrator's hybrid dialect which introduces a subversive and ironic perspective towards the official code of the authority.

The fourth chapter discussed the resistance's limited, fragmentary discourse that examined the slogans of the students, the fragmented speech of the Athens Polytechnic

radio station, the left-wing sociolects of youth and the speech of a self-styled left-wing aristocrat. The essential element in all these cases is the dialogic interrelation among the speaking voices and the narrator and the way the resistance to the junta is parodied by both since the implied author allows them to have a massive voice but no comprehensive language.

Clearly, there is a complicated interrelation among the speaking persons, the narrator, and the implied author, who though completely voiceless is nevertheless emphatically expressed through language. Apart from the intertextuality introduced by the transposition of an exaggerated and subversive nineteenth-century authority system into the novel, all other heteroglot utterances come from the wide linguistic resources of the MG language of the time. Such a language system, as far as it is a heteroglot one, is a demanding task for the reader and would be extremely difficult to translate into other languages. Apart from the complexity in terms of phonology, morphology, vocabulary and syntax, the translator would be involved in trying to render orality in all its different forms in order to capture a wide range of social contexts. Both H and L hybrids, and antiquated forms, K features and mainly the extended discourse of *Κατσαντώνης*, and all other language varieties as specified in this study, combine to make a rich linguistic repertoire which is key to a reflection of a sociopolitical abnormality.

To conclude, this general anomaly is not presented through a simply dichotomized world in either D or K, but in a complex hybrid language. Such a marked hybrid enables Menios to embrace both a linguistic continuum and to communicate with both political sides that appear to speak different languages. Menios' idiolect, a charged and unorthodox hybrid, linguistically bridges the gap among the two political sides that speak different languages, and which do not actually meet into text. The fact that a range of language varieties are included in the same genre, the novel, creates a synthesis but the way they add to the novel, drawing on the myth of Babel, highlights heteroglossia (Tziovas 1996). The junta Babel is portrayed in words, first at a political level, in which the political sides express their discourse in fragments that are very close to each other, despite the fact that they never meet or communicate. Secondly, it is portrayed at a purely linguistic level, where people speak different 'languages' to distance themselves from the others. The end of *Αντιποίησης* signifies the end of the 'τριακονταετής πόλεμος' and, through the linguistic resources potentially available to the writer in Greek, which are obvious with such an idiolect as Menios', criticizes the results of a historical, political, and linguistic anomaly.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Greek publications cited have Athens as place of publication except where otherwise specified.)

- Alexiou, M. 1982. 'Diglossia in Greece', in W. Haas (ed.), *Standard Languages, Spoken and Written* (Manchester: Manchester University Press), 156-192.
- Argiriou, A. 1979. 'Η άνοδος μιας δικτατορίας και η παρακμή μιας ιδεολογίας'. *Διαβάζω* 25: 66-70.
- Babiniotis, G. 1979. 'A Linguistic Approach to the "Language Question" in Greece', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 5: 1-16.
- Bakhtin, M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four essays by Mikhail Bakhtin*. M. Holquist (ed.), transl. C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press).
- Beaton, R. 1994. *An Introduction to Modern Greek Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Browning, R. 1982. 'Greek Diglossia Yesterday and Today', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 35: 66-67.
1983. *Medieval and Modern Greek* (2nd edn; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Bussmann, H. 1996. *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*; transl. G. Trauth & K. Kazzazi (London and New York: Routledge).
- Canakis, C. 1994. 'Diglossia as an Agent of Humor in the Writings of Elena Akrita', *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 12/2: 221-237.
- Doukanari, E. 1991. 'Greek Diglossia to Greek Dimorphia: A New Dilemma for Linguists and Teachers', in J. A. Alatis (ed.), *Linguistics and Language Pedagogy: The State of the Art*, (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press).
- Fairclough, N. 1989. *Language and Power. Language in Social Lifestyles* (London and New York: Longman).
- Ferguson, C.A. 1959. 'Diglossia', *Word* 15/2, 325-40.
1994. 'Dialect, Register, and Genre: Working Assumptions About Conventionalization', in D. Biber & E. Finegan (eds.) *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register*, (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Holton, D. 1990. 'Modern Greek today – one grammar or two?', in M. Roussou–S. Panteli (eds.), *Greek Outside Greece* (Athens: Diaspora Books).
- Joseph, B. and Warburton, I. 1987. *Modern Greek* (London: Croom Helm).
- Kazazis, K. 1968. 'Sunday Greek', in *Papers from the Fourth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society* (Chicago: Department of Linguistics, The University of Chicago), 130-140.
- 1979. 'Learnedisms in Costas Taktis's Third Wedding', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 5: 17-27.
- Kotzias, A. et al. 1989. 'Γλώσσα και Νεοελληνική Έκφραση', *Το Δέντρο* 42-3: 3-38.
- Kotzias, A. 1992a. 'Αληθομανές Χαλκείον. Η Ποιητική ενός Πεζογράφου', *Γράμματα και Τέχνες* 64-5: 3-14.
- 1992b. *Αντιποίησης Αρχής* (Κέδρος) (first pub. 1979).
- Kourtovik, D. 1994. 'Άλέξανδρος Κοτζιάς (1926-1992)', in K. Lempesi (ed.), *Αφιέρωμα στον Άλέξανδρο Κοτζιά* (Κέδρος).
- Kristeva, J. 1993. *Desire in Language. A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, L.S. Roudiez (ed.) (Oxford UK & Cambridge USA: Blackwell).
- Landsman, D. 1989. 'The Greeks' Sense of Language and the 1976 Linguistic Reforms: Illusions and Disappointments', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 13: 159-82.

- Mackridge, P. 1985. *The Modern Greek Language: A Descriptive Analysis of Standard Modern Greek* (Oxford University Press).
- Miké, M. 1994. 'Ιστορία και μυθοπλασίαL Η Αντιποίησης Αρχής (1979) του Α. Κοτζιά και *Ο Κατσαντώνης* (1862) του Κ. Ράμφου', in K. Lempesi (ed.), *Αφιέρωμα στον Αλέξανδρο Κοτζιά* (Κέδρος).
- Myrsiades, L. 1988. *The Karagiozis Heroic Performance in Greek Shadow Theater*; transl. K. Myrsiades (Hanover and London: University Press of New England).
- Peckham, R.S. 1996. 'Memory Besieged: Some Contemporary Greek Novelists' in *London Magazine*, April/May 1996: 135-145.
- Plomer, W. 1987. *The Diamond of Jannina. Ali Pasha 1741-1822* (London: Jonathan Cape).
- Ramfos, K. 1994. *Ο Κατσαντώνης. Αι Τελευταίαι Ημέραι του Αλή Πασά* (Ίδρυμα Κώστα και Ελένης Ουράνη) (first pub. 1862; rev. edn. 1884, 1889).
- Romanos, C.S. 1985. *Poetics of a Fictional Historian* (New York, Berne, Frankfurt am Main: Lang).
- Seferis, Y. 1950. *Ποίηματα. Γλωσσάρι* (Ίκαρος).
- Sotiropoulou, E. 1982. *Η Φάρσα* (2nd edn.; Κέδρος).
- Stamelos, D. 1988. *Κατσαντώνης. Η Αποθέωση της Παλικάριάς. Μυθιστορηματική Βιογραφία ιστορικά και βιβλιογραφικά τεκμηριωμένη* (Εστία).
- Tsaknias, S. 1983. 'Αλέξανδρος ΚοτζιάςL Αντιποίησης Αρχής' in *Δακτυλικά Αποτυπώματα* (Καστανιώτης).
- Tziovas, D. 1993. *Το Παλίμνηστο της Ελληνικής Αφήγησης. Από την αφηγηματολογία στη διαλογικότητα* (Οδυσσέας).
—1996. 'Heteroglossia and the Defeat of Regionalism in Greece', *Kampos* 2: 95-120.
- Valaoritis, N. 1982. *Από τα κόκκαλα βγαλμένη* (Νεφέλη).
- Valtinos, T. 1989. *Στοιχεία για τη δεκαετία του '60* (Στιγμή) (revised edn. 1992, Άγρα).
- Wales, K. 1995. *A Dictionary of Stylistics* (London and New York: Longman).
- Yatromanolakis, Y. 1994. 'Αλέξανδρος ΚοτζιάςL ένας συγγραφέας ηθικός', in K. Lempesi (ed.), *Αφιέρωμα στον Αλέξανδρο Κοτζιά* (Κέδρος).
- Zannas, P. A. 1980. 'Ένα ελληνικό μυθιστόρημαL Αντιποίησης Αρχής του Αλέξανδρου Κοτζιά', *Ο Πολίτης* 34: 71-80 and *Ο Πολίτης* 35: 78-88 and in *Πετροκαλαμηθρες: δοκίμια και άλλαL 1960-1989 1990* (Διάττων).
- Ziras, A. 1979. *Χρονικό 1979*, in Sokolis, G. 1989. *Η Μεταπολεμική Πεζογραφία. Από τον Πόλεμο του '40 ως τη δικτατορία του '67* (vol. 4; Σοκόλης).