MODERN GREEK STUDIES

(AUSTRALIA & NEW ZEALAND)

Volume 11, 2003

A Journal for Greek Letters

Pages on C.P. Cavafy

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

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

Typeset and design by Andras Berkes

Printed by Southwood Press, Australia

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 Spilias, 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: PAGES ON CAVAFY

SECTION TWO: GRAECO-AUSTRALIANA

PATRICIA RIAK
La Trobe University

THE PERFORMATIVE CONTEXT: SONG-DANCE ON RHODES ISLAND

INTRODUCTION

A theoretical concern for Greek cultural "performance" must link both the singer and dancer to the dance. Ethnographers concerned with "performance" have suggested this through the study of song. In order to further develop the study of song-dance the processual anthropology of Victor Turner will be introduced. A theoretical consideration for "process" can create a portal to look into the ritual study of Greek song-dance through the "performative genre" (Herzfeld, 1981). This concern will be explicated ethnohistorically through an analysis of the Dodecanesian dance called *sousta*, as it was performed during the ritual ceremony of *ghamos* or wedding before Independence (1947).

The *sousta* functions much like a "process" seen through the processual anthropology of Victor Turner. As a courtship process, the dance frames four distinct performative stages. The first stage is that of *monos* where the separation of genders occurs corresponding to Turner's separation phase. The second stage is that of the *omadha* where the connection through dance units is established. The third stage is that of the *kiklos* or dance circle where association between genders occurs. Both these stages in the dance equate with Turners liminal phase. The final stage is that of *zevghari* or couple where isolation of a courtship couple is established corresponding to Turner's final phase of re-aggregation. These four stages highlight Turners tripartite structure. Thus, the ethnographic material does not explore the choreological aspect of *sousta* but a "processual" reality in the dance which serves to define the choreology of the dance as a socially mediated process of *rites de passage* in Rhodian culture.

SONG AS "SOCIAL DRAMA"

Anna Caraveli (1985) conducted research for the ritual of *glendi* at a wedding on the Dodecanesian island of Karpathos. She considered using a Turnerian perspective for the

ethnographic material by focussing on how song during *glendi* is a form of "social drama." Emotive moods in song and how they define the "moving" of performance explore *glendi* as an "emotive process". Caraveli's analysis of song applies the performative approach suggested by Herzfeld (1981) to the wedding as a rite of passage expressed through emotion. Victor Turner's "processual analysis" is analysed for the song as a process of "gradual engrossment". The *glendi* is the emotional state which strongly reflects the moods of the participants. The emotional state is an interplay of emotions. During this interplay, feelings of stability and calmness reflect a fixed structure of the event. However, digression occurs in the emotions of the participants. The emotive state of fluidity and engrossment reflect digression, which Caraveli treats as intense "social dramas." Engrossment is reached through *kefi* or high spirit and expressed in *mantinades* or songs where emotional intensity is highlighted. The dramatic interchanges in song breach the norm of joy and praise of *glendi*. Songs direct attention to individuals and introduce emotional intensity to the lighter tone of the rest of the *glendi* (Caraveli, 1985: 277).

There are two modes of progress in the *glendi*. The first is a thematic one which is cyclical, reflecting calmness to intensity to calmness – from joy to grief to joy. The second mode is emotional intensity fuelled by *kefi*, blending the thematic with the emotional through the stages of "superficial gaiety" to "complete engrossment". *Kefi* is achieved at dawn in terms of its seriousness and high quality, its restraint and its interactive quality. At the height of *kefi*, the group speaks as one coherent unit, sharing the same sense of timing and meaning. Thus, community is formed in performance, through symbolic action and a shared system of interpretation to achieve *communitas* (Caraveli, 1985: 278). Each social drama reflects a singular cyclical progression going from calmness to some form of symbolic dissolution of a given order and a return to calmness where a newly restored and negotiated balance is reformed. The social drama then is a means to achieving a cultural solution. Social dramas are the principle mechanisms for dynamic progress within a given event. The process of increased engrossment escalates intensity and duration of the performance (Caraveli, 1985: 277–278).

SONG AS A SOCIALLY AMBIGUOUS RITE OF PASSAGE

Song should be analysed as a socially ambiguous state of passage in the ritual context through a consideration of its value as a "performative genre" which marks very important transitions in the life cycle of *rites de passage*. Herzfeld (1981) stresses the importance of the emotive state in defining the song as performative genre encompassing "expressive performance" (Herzfeld, 1981: 47). The expressive performance genres such as those of joy through the ritual of marriage and lament through the ritual of the funeral

song can be analysed as a "performance" which distinguish the ritual. Herzfeld argues that both the emotion felt and the performance acted upon must be understood through an analysis of the ritual. Caraveli further develops this point by discerning "emotional" and "thematic" modes in *glendi*.

Herzfeld's concern for the study of Greek song is that there is a lack of study done on the social context of songs. The singers' awareness of how they perceive their performance to the ritual must be considered. For example, reference to musical parallels is a component of the social context of the song. This brings about "analogy" between performative genres – joy in wedding or sorrow in lament (Herzfeld, 1981: 58). Thematic features of sharing a socially ambiguous status in the song displays a sequence of shared narrative devices. (Herzfeld, 1985: 53). Herzfeld gives the example of water running down a mountain in both a song of joy (wedding) and a lament (funeral) to imply an "analogy" between two contrasting types of ritual passage (marriage and death). The analogy is confirmed by a taxonomic opposition between songs and laments at the level of the performative context (Herzfeld, 1985: 56). Thus, with the development of the concept of ritual passage, the analogy between death and marriage could at least be shown to confirm a much wider pattern of structural replication. The performative context then considers what "kind of passage is involved" (Herzfeld, 1985: 57).

The study of song-dance on Rhodes may follow the concern of both Herzfeld and Caraveli for a Turnerian approach. This concern draws out the importance of song as a performative genre through the emotions that are felt and which give rise to particular songs (performed while dancing). Emotions performed during the song-dance correspond to a heightened mood, one which Caraveli defines as "engrossment". However, Caraveli mentions that song-dances in her study do not represent engrossment, but the state of calmness. The song represents the middle state of emotive expression where social dramas are found. The song-dance is performed after the song to connote a return to a state of calmness (Caraveli, 1985: 277). Through the study of song-dance on Rhodes, I would like to argue the opposite – that the song-dance also characterises emotions which bring out the sense of engrossment, so long as they are situated in the limen (that is, the threshold) state where social dramas, according to Caraveli, can occur during the wedding ritual.

There is a difference between the performance of songs in Caraveli's analysis of *glendi* on Karpathos island and the performance of song-dance in my analysis of the *sousta* in the wedding ritual on Rhodes Island. For Caraveli (1985), song creates dialogue between men and women in the *glendi*. During the performance of the *sousta*, dialogue between men and women in song is not achieved. Only men sing to women during the song-dance of *sousta* and women remain passive agents during the performance. Social drama is achieved in the *sousta* with the revealing of a love match by the young men when they reveal the identity of

the women they love in the song-dance. "Engrossment" then returns to a state of calmness when the song-dance finishes.

THE TRIPARTITE STRUCTURE RECONSIDERED FOR PERFORMANCE OF SONG-DANCE ON RHODES

Turner's analysis of ritual process has not so far been drawn on in the analysis of Greek dance. However, Loutzaki (1983) has brought us close by analysing dance in Macedonia within the framework of van Gennep's tripartite structure. Loutzaki's (1983) pioneering study of folk dancing in Macedonia has adopted a tripartite structure formulated from van Gennep (1960). Loutzaki's tripartite structure serves to highlight "the ritual of marriage" as a "dance event"[5]. Dancing is a significant part of celebration, before, during and after the rite of matrimony. Loutzaki offers a historical comparison of the dance event performed both in 1922 and 1983. A tripartite structure in the marriage ritual indicates that dance remains a central feature in all stages of the ritual. Although there is an indication that the sacred dance had been abandoned in the phase before the rite in the 1983 event, little else has changed. Dance remains central in both the religious and secular phases of the marriage ritual. Public dancing takes place in the village streets during all three phases of the rite, showing how important dance is to the ritual process of marriage in a Greek village.

Loutzaki (1983) has been influenced by the work of van Gennep (1960) in offering a spatial analysis of her Greek dance material. She speaks of the domain of the 'sacred' as being (located) inside the bride's home and on the threshold of the houses of both bride and groom. The "secular" is enacted within the house of the groom. Men and women have their separate spaces in the ritual. The separation of space also reflects the differentiation between female and male roles: the females are protective (of the bride and the objects used in the ritual of marriage) whereas the males are involved in entertainment. Loutzaki (1983) observes that during the secular celebrations, the separation is neutralised when men and women join in the dances, that is, enter the same space (Loutzaki, 1983: 37). The marriage rituals at once define differentiated male and female roles. It is the spacial function of dance to neutralise gender roles.

As in the case of her van Gennepian model, Loutzaki's (1983) analysis states both the continuity of ritual through time and the way in which the set ritual structure assigns individuals to set places in a given social structure. Loutzaki is concerned with analysing "a change from one social status to another" (Loutzaki, 1983: 36–37), thus echoing a van Gennepian (1960) concern for the tripartite structure. For the song-dance I am not interested in concentrating on the reproduction of a structure by roles and status or on

the ritual itself but on the ritual personae and ritual process. Following Turner, I want to leave open the possibility of much greater fluidity and agency in involvement in song-dance.

In Loutzaki's (1983) study, it is women who take the leading role in the singing which accompanies the dancing at the wedding. Loutzaki explains that it is a general rule that men dance and women sing. The songs are sung by two pairs of women in antiphony (with the second pair merely repeating). The first pair of singers is located just behind the lead dancer and lead the song. When one verse by the first pair is over, the second pair, separated from the first by a male dancer, sings in response-an interpretation of the same verse. Loutzaki notes that no public dance takes place without their participation as a general rule (Loutzaki, 1983:43). For song-dance on Rhodes, for example, the reverse occurs in the wedding where men both dance and sing and women only dance. The general rule in the song dance (*sousta)* is that only the lead dancer does not sing because his responsibility is to the dancers, hence, to the dance. The fact that young women sing in Loutzaki's study and that young women don't sing during the *sousta* on Rhodes makes for an interesting point of comparison – why is it that only men sing during the performance of the *sousta*? Loutzaki (1983) did not probe into a more in depth analysis of the singing, as her concern was a structural one, a la van Gennep. However, it is exactly where the singing occurs that emotions are expressed, thus heightening the feelings of *communitas* (a la Turner). For the song-dance, I would like to pay more attention to the singing aspect in Rhodian song-dance in order to probe into the more emotive insights within a ritual which occur to those involved in the performative context.

THE *SOUSTA* AND ITS LOCATION IN THE AEGEAN

The *sousta* is part of a family of island dances. It is part of a variety of dances which make up part of the Greek island region of the Aegean. Loutzaki (1987) defines a "family of dances" by the relationship showing a common origin, in particular, the structure of the motif underlying the movement of each dance. The island family, she argues, is made up of a pattern of related dance traditions which overlap in expression, execution and function (Loutzaki, 1987: 55). The "island family" is then differentiated through aspects of Aegean culture, namely music, which differs within the Aegean to create distinct variations called "dance idioms". For example, she expresses the dance idioms of the Dodecanese and Crete. She further argues that from this, it is possible to distinguish dance traditions of particular islands such as Rhodes. This is because, although the dance idiom belongs to the same choreological area, it manifests local peculiarities (Loutzaki, 1987: 56).

In the Aegean, island dance culture is made up of a number of dance families:

Figure 1 **Family of Dances within the Aegean Island Region**

Aegean Region	Dance Families
Dodecanese Islands	*sousta isos zervos*
Crete	*sirtos sousta pentozalis maleviziotikos*
Peloponissos Coastsirtos	*balos karsilamas chassapikos servikos*
Saronic Islands	*sirtos*
Mainland Greece and Evvia	*sirtos balos trata kangeli karsilamas chassapikos servikos*
Sporades and E. Thessaly	*sirtos balos*
Cian Sporades	*sirtos balos karsilamas chassapikos zeibekikos*
Asia Minor Coast	*sirtos karsilamas balos chassapikos servikos tsiftedeli*

Loutzaki, 1987: 59

The figure indicates the family of island dances within the Aegean. Within this family of island dances, Aegean sub-regions perform particular island dances. All sub-regions, except the Dodecanese, have the island dance of *sirtos* as their most performed dance. The Dodecanese, on the other hand, has the *sousta* as its most performed dance. Thus, the Dodecanese displays a peculiarity in the sequence with regard to the most performed dance of the entire Aegean island region. The other major distinction is that, with the exception of Crete, no other island sub-region of the Aegean performs the *sousta*. Like the Dodecanese, Crete indicates that the *sousta* is a prevalent dance, however, holding prevalence only after the *sirtos*. This then indicates that the *sousta* is a dance performed only in the southern region of the Aegean islands. It is also interesting to note that the other dances performed in the Dodecanese region are not performed in the rest of the Aegean. On Crete, the situation is similar to the Dodecanese, with the exception of the *sirtos*. Subsequently, this indicates that all sub-regions of the Aegean share many dances with the exception of the Dodecanese and to a lesser degree Crete.

THE *SOUSTA*: A DODECANESIAN EXAMPLE OF "THE RITUAL PROCESS" ON RHODES

Monos – Gathering in the Kamara

I am primarily concerned with the *sousta* danced as an integral feature of the wedding ceremony. The wedding centers around the new bridal home called the *kamara*. After the

wedding ceremony, the celebrations take place in the *kamara*, the main site for dancing of the *sousta*. The *kamara* is an important setting for the dancing because it is the area where courtship develops between young people: it is the setting for courtship.

There is a strong social need for the dance in the community. The dance is a process whereby young men become closer to young women in order to achieve personal relations through the dance. Men socialise with young women in order to become romantically involved. The social dimension of the *sousta* is expressed through this social bonding at the wedding. Courtship is expressed through the dance, because it is not otherwise socially mediated in the village. In other words, because there is no form of socialisation between young men and women in the village, the one way they could communicate was through the dance. Thus, the *sousta* is an appropriate way for them to socialise without breaking this social code. In place of verbally communicating with each other, they dance together as an accepted means of socialisation. This seems to be particularly relevant to the young women (who are excluded from the practice of singing), as the young men sing songs to them without dialogue being exchanged between them. The *sousta* was thus a socially acceptable means of communication, because social activity in the village did not involve dialogue between the two genders.

The male walks to the dance space with the female he has chosen to dance with after offering her his *mandhilachi* or handkerchief. However, direct invitation does not mean direct attraction. Direct invitation functions to conceal rather than reveal courtship interests during the dance. Thus, indirect pairing after invitation means that a young men will often decide to invite a young woman whom he is not attracted to, in the hope that the young women he is attracted to may trail as part of the *omadha* he is forming, so that any affections remain concealed. Young women, therefore, enter the dance not knowing *how* an invitation is really meant for them. Thus, direct invitation and camouflage symbolises that an element of tension is introduced through the offering of the *mandhilachi*. This symbolises a man's sexual forwardness. In turn, to play down this sexual advance, the young lady invites friends to participate with her to form the *omadha*, symbolising the caution and concern for the sacred social order on the part of the female. The *omadha* then acts to camouflage or conceal her possible availability. Thus, the male instigates the formation of the *omadha* and the female completes it. In this way, sexual notions are suppressed by *timi* (honor).

Although a social gathering for the youth, the *kamara* houses the act of sexual segregation which occur during this gathering. For the purposes of youth socialisation, they are first seen to separate from one another. The *kamara* then reflects the cultural sanctioning of socialisation of young men and women together. So too during the wedding celebration, they are expected to aggregate only with their gender groupings.

During this aggregation, the social values separating young men from young women are still adhered to. This indicates that the *kamara* is yet another area expressing the social values of the village. It also indicates that eligibility and the dance code conform to the rules of "non-socialisation" before the dance is to begin. This indicates that socialisation can only occur "during" the dance. This act of sexual segregation is recognised in the gathering where the *kamara* corresponds to a clear separation of the house into male and female spheres. The *kamara* then acts to create sexual zones for young men and women when they gather for the celebrations.

Because courtship is concealed, it becomes a very present reality in the dance. At the outset, the male becomes a very strong instigator of courtship proceedings and consequently, all young women who enter become aware of the strength of the courtship in every male dancer. The dance thus leads young women into courtship. They are honored through the *timi* expressed to them through the *mandhilachi*, and this is the only direct invitation to courtship. The *mandhilachi* thus shrouds the rest of the courtship activity in mischief. It as though the *mandhilachi* serves to symbolise a "covering up" of the courtship activities to come. The *omadha* is thus representative of courtship possibilities for the entire group who will be participating in the dancing.

Separation

The rite of separation highlights the way in which the ritual initiands are separated from each other through constraints placed upon them in their community. What occurs here is a process which begins with social constraint but transforms into symbolic separation of youths from their normal social setting. The "power" of separation then, so to speak, leaves normal sociality and enters into each individual dancer. The zoning of the *kamara* indicates strong sexual symbolism and that eligibility, as a social status, is separated. Young men are positioned in the front where utensil rooms are concentrated (male sexual symbolism) and young women at the back where storerooms are concentrated (female sexual symbolism).

The mutual isolation of young men and women in the *kamara* is directed through the church. Sunday church congregations saw men and women clearly separated in different locations: men at the front of the church and women at the back in a room called the *artikas*, also known as the *ghinekitis* or "room which houses women". It is the church which instructs young men and women on how to congregate in the *kamara*. The fact that men stand during the congregation at the church service, while women in the *artikas* sit, corresponds to the way young men stand and young women remain seated on *pangi* in the *kamara*.

As a rite of separation the *monos* stage sets up a climate of non-socialisation where feelings of separation will serve to heighten the state of togetherness when the youths begin to dance. However, as the dance teams begin to form, they continue to express separation through the process of invitation. The use of the *mandhilachi* in the first invitation to a young woman by a young man continues to honor this value. The act of same sex invitation by the invited female serves to foreclose any notions of romantic love at this stage. The emphasis then is not on establishing a romantic mood, but on ordering gender groupings for the formation of the dance.

The jump-steps in the *sousta* set apart the youths from the community through the symbolic marking of agility. Individuals are shaking free from existing bonds, carrying structures and meanings of separation. It is significant that the primary dance action carried out during this stage is an intense shaking of the body characteristic of the jumping action. This shaking also highlights the violent stirring of emotions. Hence, the performers experience a move into the anti-structural moment where they sense an initial freedom to relay emotions and desires related to courtship. The dance allows the youth to break the shackles of their prior non-socialising behaviour and evokes emotions which will unite rather than separate the genders. The mood is one of anticipation, excitement and subdued eroticism.

Connecting and the Omadha

After the young men and women have been separated in their areas in the *kamara*, the protocol of connecting together begins. Young men and women are joined through a two-stage process of invitation which then forms the dance unit (*omadha*). The *omadha* is the first of the transitional forms which occur during the *sousta*. The *omadha* is unique in that it represents a critical point in the socialisation of the youth. It is considered the only and the most formal occasion where young people interact. What marks this form as distinct is a social code. The social significance of developing the *omadha* is that young men have chosen particular young women to dance with through the process of invitation. The young woman then invites other young women who represent the second process of invitation representing a "gender grouping". This is a socially dynamic form which determines an important social juncture in the life of a young man or woman.

The *mandhilachi* plays an important role during the male invitation to the female. The *mandhilachi* seems to signify a progression of this theme to separate the genders at this next stage of the invitation. The *mandhilachi*, which is used during the invitation of male to female, is held by the female once she has accepted and rises up from her seat. What is important to understand here is that young men and women are further separated when

words of invitation are exchanged through the *mandhilachi*. Although they socialise verbally through the exchange of remarks to dance, the *mandhilachi* acts as a physical buffer between them so that they may not touch physically – continuing to separate their sexuality.

Associating and the Kiklos

The *sousta* is performed in the center of the *kamara* directly beneath the archway which gives the house its name: *kamara*. The dance circle is located at the very center of the house where there is a large vacant space (which is not a partitioned room). This space is a common space which can be described as a lounge room. A new *omadha* will firstly wait to *dhesi* or tie from behind the dance circle in front of the leading *omadha*. Secondly, the old leading *omadha* disengages from behind the dance, travelling clockwise to the end position of the *kiklos*. Thirdly, the old *embros* will switch positions with his *koustieres* to form the tail (*oura)* position. The placement of *koustieres* then changes as they now place themselves behind the preceding *omadha*. The new *oura* then waits to dance with another group of *koustieres* when the lead *omadha* comes to the *oura*.

The *omadha* thus shows its second socially dynamic aspect, that of reforming at the end of the dance circle. A newly formed *omadha* develops last in the *kiklos* and creates a mixing of different *kavalieri*[2] and different *koustieres*[3]. Once an *omadha* reaches the lead position in the dance circle, providing there is not an *omadha* waiting to *dhesi* from in front of them, it dances a few rounds and then proceeds to the end of the dance circle where it disbands to create a new *omadha*. This is how original *omadhes* break up and reshuffle in the dance. The *omadha* then functions to both bring a group of young people together through the initial invitation and to disband this very group in order to mix different dancers into newly formed *omadhes*. The *omadha* then acts as an important unit in the dance where it serves to socially mediate young people, bringing a group of people together for the dance and creating new social outcomes during the dance by reforming the unit.

The *kavalieros* in the *oura* simply "held the tail" (*kratouse tin oura*). This position then opposed that of the *embros* who "held the time" (*kratouse to passo*) during the dance. As well as being on opposite sides of the dance circle, the person at the *oura* is also in contrast to the *embros* in the matter of dance improvisation: he just stands there. This contrast is further emphasised by the fact that the lead "dances" and the tail "sings".

His main activity at this stage is tugging. It allows the *embros* to display prowess in the dance. In the *kiklos*, the male is able to exhibit how good a dancer he is as the *embros* of the *kiklos*. This is an important opportunity to gain public praise by his *kiklos* and by the

entire village. This praise is very important in gaining the admiration of young women and even that of their parents.

Liminality – Communitas

The communal bonding which occurs during the *kiklos* stage is facilitated in a number of ways through song-dance. Once the performers dance, they experience a state of suspension after being separated from normal life. Feelings of unity then develop between the dancers as they continue to dance toward the centre of the circle facing each other and away from the "outer world". This begins to heighten the shared feelings of *communitas*. However, *communitas*, although a shared feeling, does not imply sameness between all the dancers. Males and females highlight their differences during this time. For men, *communitas* develops out of a sense of equality symbolised by their dance positions, and song enhances this sense. The *sousta* as a song-dance is performed only by men. Female performers, on the other hand, do not share similar dance positions; nor do they sing. Because of these very fundamental differences in the song-dance, *communitas* can be seen to highlight differences rather than similarities between men and women.

The dance under the archway symbolises the idea of a threshold. This rite of transition represents a change in social status from "single" to "married." The movement of the dance under the archway is such that the genders come together and are seen as "belonging together". There is a clear blurring of the sexual zone, with the dance being performed partly in the male sphere and partly in the female sphere creating a rotation of men and women moving into each other's domains, so signaling the binding that comes with courtship. Again, the suspension of "known reality" serves to bring about novel experiences, emotions and interpretations of life's potentialities.

When the *sousta* is being performed it is performed with two jump-steps forward and one jump-step back. The *kiklos*, then, contracts inwards or forwards deeper than it expands outwards or backwards. This movement thrusts the dancers into close proximity towards the centre of the circle. This "in and out" movement works concurrently with the "up and down" movement during the performance of the jump steps. Thus, the dancers move with great mobility during the dance as they both "shake free" and "move close". The movement to the centre of the circle literally makes the dancers the "centre of (communal) activity", so that the mass movement is symbolic of the creation of *communitas*. The sustained movement into the centre of the circle gives continuity to the creative experience of *communitas*.

Communitas for men is firstly achieved through an equilibrium achieved by dance positions. The *oura* cancels out the *embros*. Here one man stands at the end of the *kiklos*

not dancing while another man leads at the head. The equilibrium is also evident in the non-singing position of the lead, which cancels out the singing role of *kavalieri* dancing in the body of the *kiklos*, as well as the *oura* at the end of the *kiklos*. Males experience *communitas* in the equilibrium created as a balance between different positions: some dance, some don't dance; some sing, some don't sing. Thus, males feel "equal" because they feel their diversity makes for mutual dependence. This experience of performative interchange and sharing of difference creates true *camaraderie* amongst the men also.

The climactic moment experienced by both young men and young women occurs when the young men sing the *kantadhes* of the *sousta* to young women. While the dance has indicated the more structural notions of movement and group formation, the song expresses the more emotional tenor of feelings and desires. The song serves to heighten the moment of *communitas* with sentiments appropriate to courtship. The song then becomes an expression antithetical to societal norms, with moments of freedom projecting romantic values which have been otherwise constrained by society. The songs are an inner extension of *liminal* personae, indicating that it is behavior that is not "normal", but a transformation of relations between young people.

Zevghari and Isolation

One of the keys to understanding the *sousta* is to recognise that the ultimate goal of courtship, the couple (*zefghari)*, is not formed immediately. Rather, it is formed through the dance sequence as an isolation after the dance has finished. The *zefghari* is the result of a process of dance courtship. Only when the courtship sequence of the previous three forms have been completed, and when the dancing is finished, is the *zefghari* then formed. Thus, dance actions do not represent this stage of the courtship process – it is when the dancing finishes that the *zefghari* forms.

Isolation of the individual couple through the courtship process is characteristic of revealing: the *sousta* reveals the couple. The nature of the dance is to conceal a young woman's *timi* but it also acts to reveal her desirability as a match for a particular young man. Isolation of the couple then is a result of the act of revealing after that of concealing. The acts of concealing and revealing seem to occur during different temporal junctures during the courtship process. Concealing seems to be acted upon before revealing can take place. Thus, isolating an individual couple will occur after young men have acted to conceal the *timi* of the young women entering the dance.

The fundamental similarity between *omadha* and *zevghari* is that they are both formed outside of the dance. The gender grouping for the dance unit forms before the dance is to begin and the individual couple forms after the dancing. Thus, before the dancing,

dancers are determined. After the dancing, courtship couples are determined. These groupings are what represent the socially dynamic process of the meaning of the *sousta* as a courtship dance. These social groupings give the process a very unique social dimension. The first group represents the dance and the second represents love.

A *kavalieros* invites a *koustiera* with his *mandhilachi* to dance in his *omadha*. It is quite evident in this situation that a pretension couple exists within an *omadha*. This form of coupling, that is, giving a direct invitation to dance, is reserved only for those who are in love. Direct invitation is not the norm but rather the exception to the rule. However, direct invitation is practised between those who are in love and want to make their love known to the village. The expression of one's love in this way usually implies marriage.

The *kantadha* which reveals the identity of the young woman functions like the direct invitation – in that the young man reveals the identity of the young woman he loves and makes a public demonstration of their courtship. Once the *kantadha* reveals the identity of the young woman, it is then appropriate for the young man to ask for her hand in marriage. Although young women are concealed before this final stage, they are revealed at the end of the dance. The significance of this is that once love is revealed, dancing cannot continue. Thus, young women, like the bride, have not been "open" to sex, thus dancing and singing do not continue. Dancing and singing can only "conceal" the identity of the male because of the female's "closed" social status. Thus, to keep the young woman "pure" is to keep her status "closed". To create the impure young woman is to "open" her status. Thus, love is achieved in the process of a "closed" state during the dance.

Re-aggregation

In the third and final stage of the *sousta*, those who have experienced *communitas* are identified as units not previously recognised in the dance itself; namely, as new couples. This is the stage of re-aggregation, which in this instance brings about the goal of the courtship process. The final state of being "true couples" is stabilised through the revelation of personal love; that is, through public displays of affection. Once the community acknowledges this new social condition, couples can then take their place in the re-shaped social structure by formal betrothal.

The individual couple is recognised through a process of isolation formed when a young man reveals who he loves through singing a *kantadha***.** During the heightened feelings experienced in *communitas*, some men will soar higher than others and sing a *kantadha* which reveals the identity of the one they love. The feelings expressed are extremely strong, as the revelation of identity represents a commitment to marry on a man's behalf. A *kantadha* which reveals is, then, a measure of social responsibility and it is

valued as a stronger testimony to love than any concealing *kantadha*. This is because the revealing *kantadha* highly personalises the dance performance, whereas a concealing *kantadha* is in a sense incomplete. The revealing *kantadha* represents the ultimate maturation of feelings of love and a commitment to a relationship outside of the dance. The concealing *kantadha i*s, then, a stage in being attracted to a particular girl, but this state or feeling in principle remains only during the dance. The revealing *kantadha* is the ultimate honor given to a young woman in the dance. As the dance is considered an honourable affair, the revealing *kantadha* serves as its ultimate goal.

A closer examination of dance has, through previous considerations of the ethnographic analysis of song, shed some light on the possibility of treating song and dance (either separately or together in analysis) as an important cultural "process." Through the theoretical developments of Victor Turner, further research may enable a wider understanding of Greek dance culture, an area still requiring development for the ethnography of modern Greece. Explanations are still required for an understanding how social processes play such an important role in shaping Greek dance and dance-related activities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Caraveli, 1985
A. Caraveli, 'The Symbolic Village Born in Performance', *Journal of American Folklore*, vol. 99, no 289, pp. 260–286

Herzfeld, 1981
M. Herzfeld, 'An Indigenoud Category of Meaning and its Explication in Performative Context' *Semiotica*, vol. 34, pp. 113–141

Herzfeld, 1985
M. Herzfeld, 'Interpretation from Within: Metatext for a Cretan Quarrel', in M. Alexiou and V. Lambropoulos (eds.), *The Text and Its Margins*. New York: Pella

Kollias, 1991
E. Kollis, *The Knights of Rhodes. The Palace and the City*, (Medieval Town of Rhodes World Heritage Site UNESCO 1988) Athens: Ekdotike Athenon S.A.

Loutzaki, 1983
R. Loutzaki, '*Marriage as a Dance Event. The Case of the Refugees from Eastern Rumelia at Micro-Monastiri, Macedonia*', trans. A. Doumas, *Ethnographika*, vol. 4–5 pp. 3–50

Loutzaki, 1985
R. Loutzaki, *The Traditional Dance in Greece*, Thessaloniki: Hellexpo

Loutzaki, 1987
R. Loutzaki, 'Dances of the Aegean', in *Music in the Aegean*, Athens: Ministry of Culture / Ministry of the Aegean, pp. 53–71

Raftis, 1987
A. Raftis, *The World of Greek Dance*, London: Finedawn Publishers
Raftis, 1992
A. Raftis, *Dance, Culture and Society*, Athens: Greek Dances Theatre
Raftis, 1995
A. Raftis, *The Encyclopedia of Greek Dance*, Athens: Greek Dances Theatre
Turner, 1969
V. Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Antistructure*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
Turner, 1972
V. Turner, 'Passages, Margins and Poverty: Religious Symbols in Communitas Parts One and Two', *Worship*, vol. 46, pp. 390–412 and 482–494
van Gennep, 1960 (1908)
A. van Gennep, A., *Rites of Passage*, transl. M.B Visedom and G.L. Caffee, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

NOTES

1 See Loutzaki, 1983, p. 37.

2 The term *kavalieros* refers to the male dancer in the *sousta and* defines a particular image. The dancer portrays a "knight". The term *kavalieros* is etymologically related to the English "cavalier", meaning "horseman" or "gallant gentleman". Hence, its broad meaning is that of "lady's escort" or "partner". Raftis (1995) defines the *kavalieros* as a male escort to a female during the dance. However, he also says that the term *kavalieros* signifies a male escort performing European ballroom dances such as the waltz or tango. He gives the example of European dances on Rhodes, where the female is called a *ntama* and the male a *kavaliero* (Raftis, 1995, p. 228). The term *ntama* is etymologically linked to the Italian word *dama*, meaning "lady", and the French word *dame* also meaning "lady". As noted earlier, the use of the term *kavalieros* relates to the influence of the occupation period of Medieval times. The Order of the Knights of St. John was once of the strongest Orders in Europe and it governed Rhodes for almost two hundred years. The Order was established on Rhodes in 1309 as a military formation espousing Western European ideologies and having an international representation from Latin Europe. The Order consisted of seven tongues or *lingua* (national groups) when it reached Rhodes, ranked according to the antiquity of each (Provence, Auvergne, France, Italy, Aragon, England and Germany) (Kollias, 1991). Each tongue had its own inn on Rhodes and this was where its knights and other associates assembled. These inns also offered hospitality to eminent visitors from Western Europe. Respondants referred to the term *kavalieros* as something from the Italian occupation which strongly projected the Medieval character of the island.

3 The female dancer is called a *koustiera*. The term *koustiera* gives the dance a more localised meaning for performance on Rhodes. Raftis (1995) mentions that only during the performance of European couple dances does this name change to *ntama*. He also says that the term, in

being related to the ideas of being "situated to the side of", like a "coastline", defines female dancing as being "to the side of the male". The word *koustiera* also means the stone adjacent to a corner stone in wall masonry. Raftis (1992, p. 2) argues that this meaning likens the *koustiera* to a pillar during the dance, where she acts to support the performance of the *kavalieros*. Unlike *kavalieros*, which is a term describing the male dancer around Greece, the term *koustiera* is only used on Rhodes. As the *sousta* is locally defined as "an honorable dance" the performance seems to evince a specific, localised conception of *timi* through the performances of a *koustiera*.