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NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

For presenting the Greek words in texts the ethnographers have adopted several systems of transliteration from modern Greek to English, that are used in different ethnographic texts. This is because there is no agreement among the writers about a single system of transliteration. Some systems are more accurate, while other are more effective in presenting Greek terms in a way that is recognized from those who understand Greek language. I may have not succeed in presenting the Greek terms to be correctly pronounced by the non-Greek speakers because I have done much of the transliteration myself.

In my thesis I have used dh for the Greek δ

ch " " " χ
d " " " ντ
b " " " μπ
γ " " " γ
ι " " " ι,η,υ,οι,ει
κς " " " ξ
φ " " " φ
νυ " " " βγ
ζ " " " ζ

I have also used local and standard Greek forms for the names of villages, cities and counties that are written in this thesis. I remained faithful to the forms of transliteration other authors employed when they referred to my text. Every Greek word appearing in the text is stressed by the use of italics. E.g; topos (= place, locality).

NOTE ON THE USE OF DIFFERENT FONTS

In this text I use different fonts characters in order to represent clearly both the Informants' and the anthropologist's view. For example, when "they" ask me "Where do you come from?" it is their voice in the text. When I say "I come from here", it is me - the writer speaking.

As for the references of other authors I use a completely different font character: Epstein stressed for ethnic identity (1978:99) that "in Erikson's terms, identity is always psychosocial".

8
NOTE ON PSEUDONYMS

In every case, I have used pseudonyms for the people and the places of the locality presented in this thesis. The name of the village itself is imaginary. Of course, one cannot ensure the entire obscurity of the place itself: a small mountain village situated in central Greece, is not difficult to be identified but I rely in my readers' recognition for the ethical consequences that follow the identification of place and its people.

All the names I use for the locals and migrants are pseudonyms for protecting them from the consequences of being recognized. From the beginning of my fieldwork I made myself clear to my informants that I would not expose them by using their real names in my texts. During writing up, the villagers often asked me about the progress of the thesis and they were particularly interested to know if and what I was writing about them. I often showed them my drafts and the photographs I was going to submit together with my thesis. They asked me to choose their own pseudonyms and not give them the ones I had decided to give them. They find this procedure very amusing for they were allowed to make some "amusing" comments about themselves and the others via their pseudonyms. People who understand Greek will recognize some hints about people's character in the surnames (which are also pseudonyms). I found it appropriate to adopt their suggestions as a voice of their own. I feel that they are still here with me in my writing up as their contribution in life and the pseudonyms provoked more profound understanding about the matters in hand.

It is the least I could do for all the people who have contributed genuinely in my research. Their explanations and their help throughout the research have been authentic and valuable. Many have told me stories confidentially; their interest about my work grew together with the months I passed in the field. I was given permission to use the material I was told; I found myself wondering many times about who was really the ethnographer. Their inquiries about my research were always a guide for understanding their attitude. They did not repeat what I asked them not to and finally, I hope that I have not exposed their confidentiality, secrets or even the "gossip" they shared with me.
ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICTS

The self-government unit in Greece is the Community (Koinotia) for villages and the Dimos for towns. Community presidents and mayors and their councils are elected. The country is divided into administrative districts (Nomoi) headed by a Nomarchis who is appointed by the government but is assisted by a representative Council. The districts are numbered on the map and their capitals are:

1. Thessaloniki (Serron)
2. Ioannina (Ioannina)
3. Kastoria (Kastoria)
4. Florina (Florina)
5. Pellis (Edessa)
6. Kilkis (Kilkis)
7. Serres (Serres)
8. Drama (Drama)
9. Kavala (Kavalla)
10. Xanthi (Xanthe)
11. Rodopi (Komotini)
12. Erythrai (Alexandroupolis)
13. Pieria (Pieria)
14. Attica (Attiki)
15. Thessaly (Thessaly)
16. Euboea (Euboea)
17. Kozani (Kozani)
18. Thessaloniki (Thessaloniki)
19. Chalkidiki (Polygyros)
20. Arcadia (Arcadia)
21. Evia (Evia)
22. Corinthia (Corinthia)
23. Laconia (Laconia)
24. Arcadia (Arcadia)
25. Phocis (Phocis)
26. Phthiotis (Phthiotis)
27. Magnesia (Magnesia)
28. Boeotia (Boeotia)
29. Attica (Attica)
30. Euboea (Euboea)
31. Evia (Evia)
32. Acharnae (Acharnae)
33. Corinthia (Corinthia)
34. Argolis (Argolis)
35. Arcadia (Arcadia)
36. Messenia (Messenia)
37. Lacconia (Lacconia)
38. Kefalonia (Kefalonia)
39. Elis (Elis)
40. Cephalonia (Cephalonia)
41. Zakynthos (Zakynthos)
42. Ithaca (Ithaca)
43. Lesbos (Lesbos)
44. Chios (Chios)
45. Samos (Samos)
46. Rhodes (Rhodes)
47. Chios (Chios)
48. Lesvos (Lesvos)
49. Heraklion (Heraklion)
50. Crete (Crete)

CHAPTER 1  Studying "otherness" but with a passport

I. The aims of this research

The area of research, the mountain village of Trano is situated in the central Greek mainland province of Evrytania, some miles from Karpenisi (the capital of the county) in the southern Pindus Mountains. The area there is characterized as a mountainous zone, cross-cut by deep ravines, steep mountains sides and many rivers. It was inaccessible for many years and people's subsistence was based on the terraced fields and their livestock.

The aims of this research is to explore place and identity with reference to the residents and migrants of a mountain village in the central Greece. In the village only about 300 people live permanently, while life is revived occasionally during the year by the arrival of many migrants both internal (those who live in other cities in Greece) and external (those who live abroad). The place itself, and its different readings of history are crucial for the making of claims to a local identity or for challenging those claims.

The history of the place includes the period during the Second World War when guerrilla organisations used this inaccessible area as a base from which they established not only groups and networks of resistance fighters, but also an experiment in local democracy, known as Free Greece, with local self-rule in which women had an equal voice and vote with men. The turbulence of the era of National Resistance and the Civil War (1941-1951) have deeply affected the life of the local people, many of whom migrated at that point, and also played a particular role in the way the local history was presented later. The silence following these historic periods and the memories of War, Resistance and evacuations contribute to the shaping of local identity. This place has its own history and its people have their own identities.

My main objective is the quest of identity and the ways which it is revealed and presented via everyday practices in a rural community. Because identity is a process rather than an attribute, factors like space and time help establish the boundaries by which people become conscious about themselves, their communities or both. Therefore, the notions of space and time are critical for the shifts in identity that occur.
Here, it is necessary to introduce the image of the egg-timer, which I use as both a tool and a model for the analysis of identity. Imagine an egg-timer: the lower part is full of sand, while the upper part is empty. Once the egg-timer is turned upside down, the once empty upper part becomes the lower one and slowly begins to fill in with the ingredients which were before in the other part of it. The egg-timer loses its features if one part is missing: it will only be a ball. The three dimensional character of it and the shifts happening inside it when time and space changes made me relate it to the process of forming an identity.

Here, it is useful to discuss the concept of identity (taftotita, in Greek), and the etymology of it in Greek. First, the Greek word comes from the word used for "the self" or "the same", i.e. to afto, tafto being an elision of to and afto plus the ending tita. Then, in order to discuss the theoretical issue of identity and the model I used for it, I have to refer to what Epstein stressed for ethnic identity: "identity is always psychosocial" (Epstein quoting Erikson:1978:99). Leach (cited in ibid:100) wrote "what we are, or what the other is will depend upon context". Epstein believed that the matter in hand was more complicated than this. So, he argued that none of us has just a single identity, and that all of us carry a range of identities at the same time together with our different roles and statuses. Then, Epstein stresses that identity, "is essentially a concept of synthesis" representing "the process by which the person seeks to integrate his various statuses and roles, as well as his diverse experiences, into a coherent image of self" and he concluded that "(t)he more inclusive the identity, ..., the deeper its unconscious roots and the more potentially profound the change of affect" (ibid:101).

These ideas and the importance of the notion of place in Greek context (topos, is the place or locality) where one belongs as a local ("doplos") made me aware of a close relation between place, time and the self. I started wondering if the identity of an Athenian in Athens or an American-Greek in the U.S.A. was the same or not with what one felt and embodied in the village. Identity consists of different parts which compose it. The egg-timer of identity often turns upside down changing this way the elements which fill one of its globes. While the sand (i.e. the ingredients composing identity) flows down inside the egg-timer, these elements pile up in a new sequel in the other side of it. Looking at this material one can find layers deposited one upon the other which concern social reality. It seemed that the place (i.e. the village where I conducted research) turns the people's selves upside down, creating another sequence in the ingredients
composing their identities at the time they remain in the village. So, by using the analogy of the egg-timer I will try to understand, explain and analyze identity.

Greek identity is articulated at two or more levels. For instance, people distinctively identify themselves at a local level with their home community and the particular region in which the individual comes from or born, that is the particular village or the town of origin (*patría edafi*, native land) and at the same time they identify themselves at a national level with Greece, that is the land / country of the Greeks (Herzfeld:1985).

These nested identities of various degrees of locality compose the Greek identity. Because of the dynamic character of the various levels of social reality, which are both supplementary and subject to continuous interpretations, the process of identification does not lead to a fixed identity but, as Loizos and Papataxiarchis (1991) argue, it formulates contested identities.

Identity is formed inside the individual, yet it also develops outside due to the many social environments in which the individual presents the self during his/her lifetime. The multiplicity of contexts offers to the individual different choices. Ethnic identity, for example "in a polyethnic situation offers only one among a number of possible forms of social identification" (Epstein:1978:xiv). Nonetheless, the notion of belonging in one group is good and secure for the self.

The challenging question is whether the individual can drop his/her ascriptive identities by leaving "home" and changing context. The hypothesis here is that identity develops through the combination of several levels of social experience, which are contained within one another, rather that aspects of social life overlapping one another. It might then be argued that the identity of an individual can be seen as an egg-timer which under some conditions, such as time and / or space (topos) overturns and inside out the sequence of components which work at the various social and cultural levels articulating consequentially, another / different / contested identity.

To answer this question I went to study the community of Trano which lies in the mountains of Evrytanía (Chart 1). For the writing of this thesis, pseudonyms replaced all the names and surnames of the informants, places and the village itself in order to protect their anonymity.
II. The researcher's family history and identity

For the Greeks a person's birthplace or place of origin is a pole of attraction itself and many keep strong and close bonds with it. Friedl (1964:104) has noted that

a man or woman's patrida, which means both the home community, and the nation of origin in contrast with other nations, is always recommended as a place to visit.

The anthropological "site" I chose for my research is related to my family's biography. My maternal grandfather, Minas Pappous, originated from a very extended and well-known family from Trano, a mountain village in central Greece. The extended Pappous family has always been settled in Sparos, which is a hamlet of Trano, in Evrytania; in fact, some of their descendants still live there, to the present day. My mother's father Minas Pappous was born three years before the turn of the twentieth century. He was the last of eleven children in an era when village families were struggling with poverty and famine; so, he, at the age of eleven, had to leave his village and he was sent to live with his uncle in Athens and work. Apparently, he managed to finish night school while working and later successfully graduated from the Army Academy, which at that time was a career that promised much. He became a military man: a quite prestigious achievement and profession for that time. Still, living in Athens, he kept as everyone else did, close bonds to his village. My grandmother, Maria, was born in 1910 in the only town of the county that is also the capital, Karpenisi, a few miles away from Trano. Maria was the only child of a very wealthy and well-known family of the local society. She had lived an easy-going life until her father died, when she was only seventeen. She remained unmarried for the next seven years under her mother's strict custody and surveillance. Her mother turned down all the potential grooms for fear that anyone of them would "eat" all the dowry (i.e. use it all up). It was, finally, her uncle's interference and my grandfather's strong insistence (he asked Maria's hand in marriage twice, as he had already been turned down once) that persuaded my great-grandmother, Panayiota, to agree to this marriage (Phot. 1). The groom had considerably less land and house property than his prospective bride, but his social status and high rank made up for it. For an explanation of successful match-making and the unusually long period of seven years of spinsterhood and the expectations of that era see Du Boulay (1974/1994:90-99).
After their marriage, the couple moved to Athens where their children were born and brought up, in the house Minas had built for his family. Both my grandparents carried some land (as a dowry) from their great-grandparents that was transferred without a break from one generation to the next up to the present. Having land or property somewhere becomes absolutely relevant to what one is: in my case, choosing the maternal place of origin for fieldwork is revealing in terms of place and identity.

The importance of this generational transmission is evident in the Greek context, no matter if it concerns a villager under study or the researcher's self. For the bond a person develops with his or her own land may be covered or is unconscious even invisible, but still lies dormant. Greeks are not used to recognising their strong affection towards their native land (where "native" means either the place one is born and/or the place one comes from) until in a case of a crisis or even when distance is concerned, as it happens with the migrants. Lolzos did his research in his paternal village in Cyprus before the Turkish invasion in 1974; after the crisis, his attachment to the Cypriot community was sharpened and his references to the land he owned in Cyprus are highly emotionally charged: "... I owned a beautiful old village house; but I could visit it no more than I could the orange grove in Argaki, the land which my father had given me, and his father had given him. ..." (Lolzos:1981:191). His feelings about the inherited land had grown, together with the sentimental ties which attached him to his place of origin and the strengthening of the bond to his native land come out clearly through his writing. The same happens whether one is completely cut off from the place of origin (i.e. migrant), or when one is getting to know a place which was previously unknown: the attachment and identification with the place continuously magnifies; longing for home (nostos).

Since, people's personification with a piece of land, a house, a site or a landmark is not unusual in Greece, the hamlet of Sparos in the old days was considered as a Pappous settlement. Therefore, an old barn in the village was linked to my grandfather's family and a whole area in the outskirts of Karpenisi bore my grandmother's surname: well-known facts to the older people who passed them on to the youngest.
For these reasons, the decision to do fieldwork in my maternal village, endowed myself with different identities related to our family biography. The elderly recognised me as being Mina's granddaughter, or Maria's granddaughter or even my great-grandmother's (Panayiotas) great-granddaughter, according to whom they had known better or to whom they were related. From the point of view of our kindred, my identity also ranged from a niece to various degrees of cousinhood (second, third etc.) together with the one mentioned above. But apart from these identities I was also an Athenian migrant, and this carried the very personal connotation, that no matter how close I was to their society, I still remained distant.

At the same time, I was also my mother's daughter, for people had first met me with my mother. This last identity, however, did not carry historical ("Yes I remember Pappous from Sparos... He was a colonel when he died... wasn't he?"), economic ("I used to work your grandmother's land... you know"), sentimental ("I was your grandfather's sister...") or, factual connotations ("So you are from Athens, aren't you") as the other one (being my mother's daughter). It was imposed on me due to the fact of my mother's decision, when in the 1980s she started to look after her paternal property in the village. Since for the last twenty five years (because of her father's death and her mother's fatal accident) nobody took care of this property, her appearance in the village was considered by all the villagers as "all of a sudden", obviously connected with the Pappous absence from the local scenery for many years. Since at the same time, many believed that she had rights to be there, others (and particularly those who had benefited by this long-term absence) challenged her presence with some vigour. The point to be made here is that some of the Pappous property in the village had already been appropriated twenty-five years ago and at that time was considered definitely lost. The villagers (especially those who had gained from all this) didn't want to have trouble so they approached her quite aggressively or they simply turned her down with no help at all in locating her native land. They also gave her a nickname, that is "sortish" because of her height, which subsequently was transferred to me as a reference: I was "sortish's" daughter. When I appeared in the village, people assumed that I was possibly there to claim "our rights" once more. On top of all this, it must be said that among all the other identities, being an unmarried female in her late twenties proved to be significant as well.
Simultaneously, my arrival was considered as something natural, for everyone has a birthright to return back to the roots: I was not stigmatised as an intruder for I partly came from there. Being a Pappous was a vote of confidence that I carried all the time even if I did not realise it sometimes; it was also a passport for the anthropological research I was about to conduct there for a year, and I could not stop wondering what kind of information I would have had access to if I was another Greek person unrelated to this place or even a foreign anthropologist. As the Greeks hold on to the notion of their places of origin, all the people whom I met were linked like myself (from either birth or origin) to this small village (young or old, well-educated or not, locals or migrants) would compliment me on my decision to do research in the ancestral land.

In contrast to Okely's remark (1992:11) that anthropologists "have rarely gone to the field with the self-consciousness of preparing an autobiographical account" the research conducted in Tranou of Evrytania is highly charged with the notion of autobiography, as had become clear from the very beginning. Lolzos' second book "The Heart Grown Bitter A Chronicle of Cypriot war Refugees" published in 1981, takes the significant turn towards autobiography. His own feelings and expectations start to appear timidly but with an overwhelming power when he describes that after the Turkish army invasion of his village, he could just look from a distance where his village lay; there "I owned a beautiful old village house; but I could no more visit it than I could the orange grove in Argaki..." (Lolzos:1981:199).

Okely (ibid.:19) argues that "the emotional and personal cannot be so easily separated from intellectual endeavour". Challenging the earlier positivist theory, where participant observation is conducted by the objective researcher, Okely readjusts the feminist theory in anthropology and stresses that it is almost impossible to separate the self from the autobiography of fieldwork, therefore, the personal becomes theoretical. Under this light, the self of the villagers or the migrants may be explored via the identities the fieldworker was given. The female fieldworker carries more than one identity in the eyes and mind of her narrators; they entitle her to many identities but they chose only one from the various she carries. Moreover, this one identity is not necessarily the same one at all the times. The choices made by the villagers prove to be important for the sake of the anthropologist: one is becoming part of the culture one is trying to explore.
III. Anthropology at Home

The great controversy about the social anthropologist who is working at home has been generated because of the nature of anthropology itself. The early anthropologists sought isolated and remote communities allegedly unaffected by Western culture. By and large, these "primitive" societies contrasted with modern societies with their detailed records, written history as well as formal legislation.

Anthropologists have been largely engaged in what Ardener (1987:39) describes as "the daily experience of misunderstanding": not speaking the language, depending on one Intermediate informant / translator, interacting with an exotic culture seems to be the only way for an anthropologist to become objective. It seems that traditionally it has been argued that not having been there ever before, seemed more adequate and professional for the anthropologist who set out to do research among his or her own exotic people. Ardener argues that the familiarity one has with his/her own culture becomes an obstacle, while "distance lends enhancement, if not enchantment, to the anthropological vision" (ibid:38). For many a crucial factor should have been the alienation from the place itself, but one would somehow be able to objectify the native people behind her/his anthropological lens.

Jackson (1987:8) has noted that "the exotic might be only five miles away - it is, indeed, all around one. It was a grave mistake to think that the distant savage had more to give to anthropologists than one's local "compatriot"; they simply have different types of information to impart". Nowadays, it has been largely recognized that the study of social anthropology in either an exotic place or just at home can be equally revealing for both the anthropologist and the participants: "anthropology is more a voyage of self-discovery that mediated through other people" (Jackson:1987:10).

This research will argue against the very idea of traditional fieldwork and for a reflexive fieldwork and non traditional methods for anthropological studies. Moreover this is increasingly recognized. Fieldwork is and/or can be done in a variety of contexts and it is being questioned as a self contained location itself (Fog Olwig and Hastrup:1997; Gupta and Ferguson:1997).
Kirsten Hastrup, who did research in 1982-83 in Iceland, suggests two innovative ideas (1987:95-108). The first is related to the sex of the anthropologist that "becomes a primary element in the local classification of the other" (ibid.:96). The other, refers to the Icelanders whom she studied as friends not simply as subjects. In relation to the latter, being Danish, she records Iceland as being historically close to the other Nordic countries, with whom the Danish shared a common language and history some time ago. Also, she confronts the notion of women anthropologists who are seen or became "honorary males". She recognizes that it may have been imposed upon them initially as being a distinct expression of Western society, then as a fault of academia which consists largely of men and, finally, of the discipline of the anthropology itself. The question whether the sex of the anthropologist plays a role in the material the anthropologist is expected to collect cannot merely be answered in terms of "honorary male" or other "specification markers" (Ardener cited in Hastrup:1987:95) used by the distant or exotic cultures to distinguish the foreign female anthropologist. Hastrup explains how her gender endowed her with a particular female role in the context of rural Icelandic society and a fishing village.

While in exotic tribes the female ethnographers may, indeed, lack some or even most of the critical "specification markers" of women, in one's own culture this is not so. (ibid.:95-96, emphasis added)

In order to collect information she had to be of some use and not be a burden in both cultures she studied (a fishing community and a farming community). She had to fit in to those societies somehow, and the tasks she was given were according to her female classification. Hastrup writes (ibid.:97) that her sex was "very much part of her signification in the field", as in the former case she became associated with other female migrant workers of the fish factory, while in the latter she was perceived as a traditional female figure of the local society. Another parallel can be seen in the ethnographic work, which is not "the study of a culture" anymore, as the ethnographer has multiple facets and her/his role can have multiple meanings. This is the most important issue for an anthropologist to take into account: his or her given role as classified within the cultural context cannot be neutral or honorary; only one's involvement with the life of the people under study can assign one which concerns exchange of information. As the anthropological exchange is a mutual exchange both between
the anthropologists and the people under study, it is inevitable that "the ethnographer herself is a sign open to interpretation" (ibid.:100).

This has also been noted by Loizos, who is aware of the presence of "male bias" in his first book, "The Greek Gift" (1975); his explanation of this is the nature of the villagers' manhood. It is evident, that an unmarried man in his late twenties in a Cypriot village was expected to spend his time in the company of other men, even if he could not speak the language properly at the beginning: "the men of Argaki, (who) made it clear to me that the kind of kinsman they wanted was the kind who spent his time with other men" (1981:194).

Mascarenhas-Keyes (1987:184) returned to her village of origin in Goa (West India) to conduct her research. She also confronted the problematic ("a priori") nature of the native anthropologist but she had ascribed a position. Her web of kinship and associational links worked in a dual way: initially, blocked the way of her professional purposes (i.e. research) and at the same time did not alienate her from the villagers, for she was by no means an outsider.

Margaret Kenna, who did her PhD research in a Greek island in 1966, then carried on related research on migration in Athens in the 1970s, and in both Athens and the village in the 1980s, recognises the significance of gender in the field. Having the rare opportunity of looking in retrospect at her own work during three decades she reflects (1992a:150) that

I don't think that I really understood at that time* the different ways in which the Islanders could have interpreted my presence there: primarily as an outsider and a foreigner whose gender was a complicating factor... (emphasis added).

Kenna later adds (ibid.:152) that difficulties in collecting information were caused not solely by her gender but due to "Greek assumptions about knowledge as power, information as a valued resource and secrecy and concealment as social skills". It must be said that her later research, as well as her changing roles and identities over the years endowed her with the trust (which necessarily goes together with the manipulation of her role) among both locals and migrants. This was confirmed when a rare collection of photographs of political exiles in this Island was published in 1992 in a Greek magazine (Kenna:1992b:115-144).
IV. Crossing the boundaries: Us / Them / or Both?

Doing fieldwork at home does not offer the anthropologist the title of the "lone hero" (Okely:1992:7). But as far as Greeks are concerned, speaking the Greek language can be an issue of profound significance. For many centuries, both language and religion were the two crucial criteria that united the widespread Greek *ethnos*, and strengthened the Greek consciousness and identity. Greeks also are fond of their local idioms: as they vary from region to region, picking up words, expressions or local names proved to be a benefit for the researcher's sake.

Apart from speaking Greek as my native language, I could also follow (even adopt) the local idiom, to which I was already accustomed from my own family. It was interestingly annoying for me, when I took the liberty of using the idiom in some cases, to accept people's compliant ironies "Ohh.. I see you already turn out to be one of us..". This was insinuating that I was absolutely not one of them, neither I was going to become until they would decide for it. Acceptance was confirmed when I was encountered with the following comment "Now, that you have become one of us we should find you a proper place to fit in our society", which meant not only that I was one of "us", an insider, but also that I had to find a proper place to belong (Photos 2 and 3).

Of course, fitting into the society was always related to my position as unmarried, therefore still available, relatively young female. Kenna (1992a:152-153) vividly describes people's curiosity in relation to her private life.

I was taken aback initially by the range and the depth of questions about myself, my family and my life... the Islanders' preoccupation with my dowry.

This attitude occurs for other reasons than those of curiosity, for controlling the information or to belie the informant's answers as Kenna has suggested. It is also related to the villagers' sense of identity. They bear the outsider out for even if one seems different, she/ he may be not that different when something is done or has happened ("the same way over here" as they very keenly suggest or comment). The similarities found by the natives in their setting could be possibly
looked at as an attempt to shift the boundaries between themselves and the researcher's identity. Of course, in many cases, as in that of Kenna's experience, no evidence of a common ground of existence had been made. The locals she studied assumed that she was neglected by her family, for it was most unusual for a Greek girl to live alone and away from her own family, as Kenna did.

One would expect the extended kindred I had would have helped me in many different ways and would also have proved to be an asset and of a great value in practical terms. The case appeared to be completely different: the existence of a long list of relatives in both the village of Sparos and Karpenisi, worked more as an index or reference, than otherwise. "So.. You are Ermioni's niece" people would say, and Ermioni would more keenly salute me whenever she saw me or use the title "niece" to refer to me, rather than do anything more intimate for me. As Lolzos (1981:194) has stressed "I was not asketo" (means irrelevant) ... "a state which invites from others both suspicion and condescension".

On the one hand, one could count on kinsmen for they were "blood", but on the other I was still an unknown, distant person who appeared to have no previous relationships with the majority of the kinsmen. In some cases, the extended kin were a negative backlash in the hasty way people identified my political or other views: "Ahh.. So, your cousin is Sotiris, the civil engineer.." (implying that he and I shared the same political perspective, without any doubt). In contrast, to Lolzos' experience (1981:192), access to information was not particularly eased through kinship in my research; on the contrary, the villagers I did not know and was not related to were more willing than my reluctant kinsmen, in whom I often detected a hidden sense of shyness related to my presence. Still, Loizos is very much aware of certain tensions when a person studies her or his own kin (ibid.).

However, the most important asset for my access to information was the name of our family. Still, as origin appears to be the most important issue of everybody's personality, (evident from the very first question a villager asks when she or he first meets somebody: "Where are you from?") , the answer will definitely determine the villager's expectations, trust and attitude. If a person has any kind of bond with the village, either from matrilineal or patrilineal ancestors
they will automatically become one of "our own people", although they may later be found as not entirely of "our own" by the villagers.

In these terms, my absent or even dead closest relatives (mother, grandmother, grandfather, i.e. first degree relatives) rather than the extended but unknown living kin, appeared to be the key to open the locked community door. The actual surname my mother and I carried was the most useful tool: Pappous, were a well-known family so people' reactions were close to their memories or comments. "Pappoudes were a well-established and renowned family.. They were good house holders, educated, with their own property.." and these features went ahead of me all the time.

Although the past seemed to be of great importance, it was the present that I lived in and encountered. Anthropologists have recognized that statements about the past have to be viewed carefully. The statements made by the local people in the past tense may not be exact references to history and they may not be exact "facts". Anthropologists recognize that these statements may be myths or idealisations about what the present ought to be in the natives' narratives and not statements about the past itself.

As long as the first question the locals ask a stranger/foreigner is "where are you from?", the answer will define the degree of trust and intimacy, a fact that is obviously related to the Greek sense of localism. Inasmuch as I answered back "my maternal origin is from here", the next question was "whose are you then?". My answer ("being a Pappous on my mother's side") always provoked the same response expressed with a great tone of recognition implying also relief for relating myself to the local family: "Ahh, you are one of the Pappous family! Then you are from our places" (Ahh, i Pappoudes! Tote ise apo ta meri mas). As soon as they learned that my grandfather was from there, they would change their attitude. This metamorphosis occurred as a result of one being or not being from "their" village (that is, I was either one of "us" or one of "them"). Something that one could visually scan in their voices and by a recognition in their eyes was that their bodies seemed physically more relaxed and the context of the conversation would unconsciously change. At long last I was one of them, not an Intruder - I could be trusted.
This change - the so-called difference between "us" and "them" - was a solid and direct transformation happening in front of my startled eyes: what they initially expected to be one of "them" turned to be one of "us". One can not just visually but also physically observe the change in her/his co-speakers. The attitude of the villager who is speaking changes when listening to the key-answer: the questioner stops being expressionless, the voice is immediately raised, the body posture alters leaning towards the person who has just introduced her/himself. The villager may in some cases hug the other person or even kiss her/him. The fact that one not already known comes from the same village, works as an apocalypse to the villager. It is as if one more missing link has been added in the chain of the people one could and should trust. The notion of place is essential here. It is because one comes from this place that makes her/him a friend, trustworthy and not usually a relative. The few but extended village families used to number a lot of members in the past, who had usually migrated. As the remaining members of those families married each other it is not unusual that one who comes and visits the village for the first time, will encounter a lot of distant and usually unknown relatives.

It is therefore not just the place but the possibility of kinship that drives the villagers to react this way. In the introduction of Hirsch and O'Hanlon's book (1994:1) about landscape an interesting remark reminds us that

landscape shares a similar status to the body in anthropology; that despite its ubiquity it has remained largely unproblematised.

During my research in the village many people said that I was accepted for I was one of "us". But their bodies initially belied their statements: their body language showed that I was one of "them". There were, for instance, people, who I visited and initially accepted me in their "good" (guest) rooms. While I passed various stages of integration into the community I was later to be accepted in their everyday rooms (usually their kitchen). I observed the shifting of the family boundaries through the villagers' bodily knowledge of me. Every afternoon I visited my closer friend and informant's family: his mother, sometimes together with his sister, would do crochet and sit near the fireplace or outside at the entrance of the house, according to the season's climate. As soon as I appeared in the entrance, they would both stop doing crochet and hide their work...
behind them. More than eight months had passed before they would keep working even if I was just passing by.

It should be noted that the importance of place, however, is flexible in time and according to personal migration history. For example, I was the embodiment of someone with different identities of place. From my past family history but also from my participant observation in the village, I moved from being the stranger to someone who is accepted because of my link to the place through family and land. I was studying "otherness" but with a passport, which helped me to get in. Through my personal experience I resembled something of the return migrants. I became "theirs" (dhikl tous) from the beginning, but not so much "us" (dhikl mas) until I became very close to one family in the village. Then I became really one of "us" (Photos 4 and 5).

Gender, age or status can be significant factors for the way the people under study accept the anthropologist and his or her fieldwork. There are not many means for the anthropologist to proceed with his or her research. But one should remain open in every way that allows him or her to "crash" and enter the culture and stop being observed (although one would be never entirely unobserved). As Okely states (1992:16) senses, movements and body should be taken more into account, together with new approaches to autobiography.

The following photographs (Photos 4 and 5) provide visual evidence of the different bodily postures and behaviour among one family over time, in the presence of the anthropologist who is also the photographer for the majority of the photographs presented in this thesis. The photographs were taken during the period of my research in the village that started from April 1994 and ended in October 1996. If the photographer of the picture is another person than myself (i.e. Malenou) then this is stated in the comments that follow the photograph.
V. Authority, power and gender in research

While for many decades (and many ethnographies as well) the matter in hand was the informants' culture and society, only relatively recently have ethnographers started to consider their own roles, and their reflections about the community and the available information in hand. With reflexive anthropology, the anthropologists started to pay attention to who is conducting the research and his or her potentialities. It is however obvious that being an unmarried, an engaged or a divorced woman or man, a widow or a widower, or a married anthropologist with a partner or children in or out of the field also makes a difference; not to mention being a totally foreign or a native anthropologist. Anthropologists always assumed that it is the culture we study which is under a lens (the well known ethnographic lens). But the fact that the ethnographer is also becoming an object for observation on the informants' side has only recently been taken into account.

Herzfeld (1998:26) claims that exploring heterogeneity connotes an inequality of power between "them" and "us"; the decisive role of the participant observer carries a distinct discrimination against his/her informants, for one uses his/her social status in order to examine "them". Herzfeld goes to say that "anthropologists may seem to respect deeply their informants but this is just a privilege of authority, provided that respect is only optional" (ibid.). During my research I confronted challenges that made me only partially agree with Herzfeld's argument. The reason is that knowledge is never a one way road: people learn from you as much as the researcher learns from them. Moreover, they have power and exercise their authority quite openly in many circumstances. Informants, like the ethnographer, also control information and there is always a shift in the management of power.

The fact that ethnographies are never neutral or without a perspective seems part of our science. The minutiae of details which we only achieve when we are further accepted into the culture usually pass unnoticed. Anthropologists insist that it is "we" who are studying "them" and not the other way round. Herzfeld (1998:26) goes on to say that the ethnographer is without fail accepted; s/he chooses the informants and s/he also chooses what to ask whenever s/he
wants to. Anthropologists may seem to respect their informants, but because authority is in the ethnographer's hands respect is optional, as the ethnographer's presence there is optional too. Finally, Herzfeld concludes: "the observer is privileged for when this one is just a member of society, at the same time s/he enjoys privileges concerning all the members of the society" (ibid.).

My fieldwork did not fit in this scheme at all. Power and questioning were in the hands of my informants most of the time. I did not conduct traditional research, or so it seemed to me at that time. All the methods I had learned as suitable for research turned out to be completely useless: I was mocked if I was going to use a tape recorder; I was ordered when to take any pictures; I was obliged to shoot video whenever I was told; and on the top of all this, after spending more time with some of the villagers instead of others, the latter withdrew from providing me with any answers. In retrospect, I feel as if I was chosen by some villagers to be informed about whatever suited them. While, I was mostly silent, I was continuously asked about everything: "where did I come from?", "whose was I?", "what was I doing there?", "what did I want to know?", "what was I going to write?", "when they were going to see it?", etc. The available information changed as "they" were studying "me", as "they" had decided or concluded what was "I". It was their decisions and conclusions of who was "I" supposed to be that altered in time the volume of my information.

As my research progressed, I became quite sceptical about Herzfeld's argument; I challenge the notion of power and respect very strongly: respect is innate in each one of us. The existence of respect presupposes some conditions and terms which are usually laid down by the others, not by "us", i.e. the anthropologists. Many have claimed that the anthropologists have manipulated their science in order to fit an ethnocentric perception of the world. In the light of my research, it can be said (as an analogy to the previous statement) that fieldwork has a tendency to be an egocentric perception of the world (although, one can only find out one's own truth), because "we" take the pain to go somewhere and stay there. Therefore, "we" (the anthropologists) presume that "we" are the centre of "their" world and not the other way round.

The discipline of anthropology has character just like all people have: perhaps this character is hidden, but is necessary to consider it as gendered. An
ethnography can be feminine or masculine, like a person. When one writes for a doctoral thesis or after becoming an authority in the discipline, the text appears immature or mature just like a person can be either inexperienced or mature. Another comparison could relate status to the ethnography, which could be either prestigious or indifferent, depending on the aims and objectives of the researcher. These analogies underlie the endless possibilities of writing a text, that like a person are open to changes and evolution all the time.

Men's ethnographies often differ radically from women's, an illustrative example is Malinowski's (1922) and Weiner's (1988) research on the Trobrianders. The veil covering some topics is raised as it depends on who the topic may refer to, a man or a woman researcher. In my research, information was available only in pieces. Although I was perceived as an insider ("one of us"), at the same time I was given misleading information or I confronted silence about many aspects of life in the village. The usual answer was "Wait... Don't ask! You have just arrived! If you stay long enough you will see what's going on by yourself". The meaning of this was that I would never be a trustworthy person until I persuaded them somehow. How was I going to persuade them about my real interest?

I came to the field with the naive notion that fieldwork is studying everybody. At the beginning I lived there with the constant feeling that I was missing something: people, activities or performances. Time was never enough to catch everything that was going on. Why was that? I think because of "me": being "me" meant the "ideal Malinowskian researcher", and because of this attitude my informants had already decided what I would "like" most to be presented with. But I was by no means the "perfect" researcher I expected to be. As time went by, I realized that people's willingness to help me, was either misleading or misleading on purpose. This happened because, I, the researcher, was "a pain in the ass"; that is curious, involved in every activity, willing to ask, eager to record and disguise the interrelations and the network beneath the acts: for I was looking to find the way things were done. By my stopping doing traditional research, people opened their inner selves. It was then time for real ethnography to happen. I was not given anymore what "I" thought I had to ask about, what they did, but what "they" felt or thought they should give.
Maria T. from Karpenisi and Minas Pappous from Sparos on their wedding day in 1937, Athens (photographed by Ch. Vaftikas). Minas always claimed that "a bride from home is better than a wealthier bride from elsewhere" (Papoutsi ap' ton topo sou ki as in' ke balomeno).
Easter 1994 in Trano with relatives.
The researcher and Dafne, my cousin's daughter photographed by her mother Elena, on Holy Saturday, after the service at Easter. While I was taking photos she asked me for my camera to take a picture of both her daughter and me:
"I want a memento from you two", she said, "you aren't going to be in any of these pictures you take all night";
thus the gaze of the anthropologist is reversed.

In my case, fieldwork was situated between auto biography and anthropology, as Hastrup (1992:117) argues. "(Fieldwork) connects an important personal experience with a general field of knowledge. The connection itself is of generative impact upon the reality of anthropology" (ibid.).

(Photographed by M.D., 1994)
On Easter Sunday in my cousin's house, Elena insisted that I should spend the day together with the family instead of hanging around "aimlessly" in the village doing research. "What are you going to do? People stay inside their houses together with their families this day... You have us here, I expect you to come." Traditional celebration and family are interrelated in Greece. I was not "allowed" (dhen epitrepete) to visit others while I had my own relatives to celebrate with. So, in 1994, I did not leave their house for the whole day: we prepared traditional tit bits, we roasted the lamb, we ate and drank until late in the afternoon. Their house is surrounded by a fence, which can be seen in the background of the photograph. This traditional stone made a boundary, which separated the house from the village, and had turned into an imaginary and symbolic boundary: by staying "inside" I was becoming one of them, a part of the family and the village. The only people to go around on this special day are the tourists who are staying in the village and have no family to visit.

(Malenou, 1994)
Easter 1996 at a friend's family.

Having met me for the first time they are in their best room. Notice the curtains, the framed pictures of the daughters of the family on their wedding day on the top of the wardrobe (on the left) and the embroidered frames on the wall. Everybody is smartly dressed, the tablecloth is white linen. The plates are carefully placed on the table and everybody waits for the photographer to sit down in order to start eating. "Give the girl our best seat" the housewife said to my friend "it's the first time she has come in our household" (Dhosti tis tin kaliteri thesi. Proti fora erchete i kopela spiti mas). Notice how the people's posture is frozen.

(Malenou, 1996)
Easter 1997 in the same house.
There is a metamorphosis through bodily expression. Celebrating in my friend's house at Easter: now everyone is in the kitchen where the table was prepared for eating. The tablecloth is white and red cotton, the plates are placed casually on the table. Notice the cupboard in the background and the plastic mustard and salt containers in the table. Noone is well-dressed or pays any attention to the photographer. They do not wait for me to begin eating. They have already started smashing the Easter eggs. Their body language indicates intimacy.

(Malenou, 1997)
CHAPTER 2 Methodology of the research

I. Reflexivity

From the era of the "armchair" Victorian scholar to that of post modernism, anthropological concepts about the tradition of ethnography, fieldwork and writing have been challenged. The old ethnographic tradition focused on isolated communities; with the "reflexive turn" in the discipline much controversy emerged in relation to the notion of the isolated group of people. Today, "the era of the apparent globalization" affects anthropological writing (Fog Olwig and Hastrup: 1997:2). At the same time, the interpretation of anthropological autobiography has changed respectively: the autobiography of the "armchair" or library scholar, contrasts with the emerging issue of "the autobiography of fieldwork (which) is about lived interactions, participatory experience and embodied knowledge" (Okely:1992:3). Now reflexivity in research and in written text is "commonly acknowledged in the discourse of anthropologists" as James (1993:5) writes. However, this has not been universally welcomed. Writing up my thesis I came across the reality of autobiography and reflexivity many times. As I was going over and over my first notes from the field I had this tantalizing desire to narrate the ones which seemed less "scientific" than anything else recorded. Writing about the trivial, the personal and the autobiographical details of starting fieldwork became an obsessive preoccupation. Especially after having to interrupt fieldwork and start again, I engaged myself in the experience of writing and understanding the differences between the first and the second attempt at research. By looking, in retrospect, at the hand written notes I had, it seemed as if someone else (and not the same person) had written the first and the second ones; I yielded to analysing them both at last. I will move from my personal encounters outwards to a wider selection of people.

Doing fieldwork did not necessarily mean that I was thrust in to a strange and unfamiliar environment for more than a year. I was somewhat familiar with the site, I had selected for my research. As a child I was sent to my aunt's house in Sparos for a month during the summer of 1972. The reason for being there was my parents' divorce (although I had not realised it at that time). I was sent there alone, so I had to stay all the time under my aunt's surveillance and I was not allowed to hang around. Sparos is situated on the banks of river Karpenisiotis next to the main road, a respectable suburb. I retained some vague
images from that visit: the river and its cold water, rats running on the dirty road due to a flood, the corn-cobs fields and the roasted corns, the fifteenth of August festival (to paniyiri tis Panayias), warm hugs and nice treatment from so many unfamiliar relatives. As a teenager I spent more time in Karpenisi, rather than visiting the village. Together with my family (mother and sister) we either stayed in a hotel or occasionally we were invited to stay in my cousin's house. The purposes of our visits ranged from reasons of business (my mother was trying to trace her mother's property) to a vacation. From 1977 to 1985 I had visited Karpenisi many times at Easter, on weekends, at Christmas holidays for skiing and during the summers as well. I had become very close to my cousins and siblings in Karpenisi and less so with those who lived in Trano. After I became a student in 1985, I did not return to Karpenisi for more than nine years.

In conducting research, I first arrived in the village in the Holy Week of Easter 1994 (Photos 2,3). The house of a migrant Tranlot military pensioner was assigned to me by his widow (one of my mother's acquaintances), who lived permanently in Athens. When she found out I was going to do research in the village, she offered to let me stay in her house without any rent, for my mother had helped her when her husband was seriously ill.

Mrs Popl (whose origin was not from this village or this county at all) proved to be a very illuminating example for the character of those who had been accidentally involved with the life of the village (e.g. those whose origin was not from that village). So I shall devote some space to this case study. She had met her husband in Athens twenty years ago. Both of them had been married before: she was a divorced American-Greek woman in her forties who had moved to live permanently in Athens, he a widowed military man in his fifties without any children. "We both start again," Mrs Popl explained to me smiling, half-hiding half-exposing her satisfaction for the good time they had together, "he wanted me, he went after me and when we got married I was like a queen..." she was whispering.

After her husband's death, she found herself in a muddle of an inheritance she never dreamt of. Having her own house, "a palace where we lived together, for I did not want him to say that I was taking him for his estate", she started to wonder what to do with her husband's estate: a summer house near Athens, a traditional old house and land in the village and of course his widow's pension; she already had her own pension from the U.S.A. The first year she made the best of it. She stayed the winter in
Athens, the spring in Loutsa, and the summer ("where everything is burning but Karpenisi") in the village. She exploited every asset she had because she thought "what's the reason having all these houses if they are not open and lived in...". The next year her relatives started to push her to transfer her property to them. "You don't really need all these for yourself. You have got more than enough... Transfer the summer house to my daughter just for the sake of her children.. You see how difficult it is for them to go on vacation by the sea. They will be very happy to have you there with them whenever you want to go. Nothing would change, it will still be your own house!" her sister would insist. Or "Sell the house in the village and give the money to your niece... Now she is getting married you know how many things a household needs". For a year she was asked again and again to do whatever the other believed it was right to do with her property. When I met her she was living her personal drama "It's a nightmare! I am constantly quarrelling with everyone.. I don't visit them anymore because they are always asking me to provide them with goods or money. They just want me for my money...". During her marriage she was a wealthy and "crazy" American - Greek woman (trelo -Amerikana*) capable of making her own life and decisions. Another implication of her husband's death, was the change in her social status: she was seen as a rich Greek - American widow without the competence of making her own decisions, with no ability for managing her own affairs and household. Her Greek roots were stressed more than her American quality, a trait for which she was often mocked in the past. At this stage she was more Greek than American, therefore she was to be told what to do: she had changed both her status and identity.

* The word "American", in English is used both as a noun and as an adjective; in Greek this single word is used like a noun (for there is a different word for the adjective o amerikanikos, I amerikanikl) but with a double meaning: that of a noun and of an adjective. In many contexts of Greek life this word is used ambiguously; The American: o Amerikanos, I Amerikana a) being a noun is also used as a noun that means the person who is coming from the U.S.A. (a migrant) or a person whose ethnicity is the American one, b) as an adjective it carries the connotation of someone who is rich and wealthy, because people who migrate to America sent remittances back to their villages.
Salomone and Stanton (1986:118) state that an old widow comments on her status after her husband's death. She states that she is an outsider or a guest in the houses of her relatives even if she had to live there because she is not capable of making her own mistakes and decisions: "When you are a nikokyra no one says you didn't do this right, or come and eat this food which was made for you. I don't have my own household. I don't have anything anymore".

The concept of complementarity is inherent in the Greek family life, as much for those who experience it as much for those who are outsiders. So after Popi "lost" her husband, even the verb chano used in Greek for someone dead shows this kind of breach, the break of a mutual commitment, the loss of a partner for life. She became a prey to the society's (that is, other members than those of her close kindred) circumstances. Salomone and Stanton (ibid.) show in their paper that the ideal of the household (nikokyrlo) is a dynamic process where the woman's dependence on the man of the house is not the case. On the contrary, complementarity occurs as the man and the woman together establish their household and they both contribute equally to it and furthermore to the social and economic life of the place in which they live.

Mrs Popi answered stereotypically to all those pressures for transferring her titles: "I can't do this. This is Yioryos' s house not mine". From time to time she was cunningly adopting a kind of self-defence practice. She was pretending that she was tempted to sell the stone-house in the village. She would invite prospective clients to see it and enumerate the assets of this house; it was situated in a favourable place in the middle of the village, it was in a good condition, it has been recently renovated, she would sell it fully furnished, etc. When people showed a real interest, then she would step back by asking them an extremely high amount of money for it. If the potential buyers were not short of money, she would ask more, in some cases an excessive price. If they showed less enthusiasm, she would refuse to sell it, by offering an excuse: the house reminded her of the deceased, she was sentimentally attached to the place, these people would not care for the house as she would etc.

Mrs Popi acted like this for a very specific reason: the house in the village was all that remained from her deceased husband. He loved it because he was born there and belonged to his family for many years. The house (or the land) became part of his identity and Mrs Popi realized that and kept it as a memory of him. This way she was not totally detached from him. This was also a means for her to retain something of her past identity.
This tactic is also widely used by the locals. Buying and selling of houses and land do not happen openly in the village. When it does, it is usually via the family or the professional network. The villagers prefer to keep the house or land within the family. If they have to sell, they choose to sell it to distant relatives or koumbarous (when this is possible). When outsiders ask to buy estate from the villagers, they let them be disappointed: the villagers make the outsiders feel that they are not capable of buying rather than show that they are not really willing to sell.

This commonly used strategy permits the locals to have the control and the last word always in their economic affairs. It may also be related to the Greek obsession with land and their identification with it. Greek identity is made of soil as much as from ideals. Native soil (land or house) is not just an indication of welfare, or an asset for living. In many cases it may be worth nothing or very little indeed. But the Evrytans evaluate it more for the connections it carries with their identity rather than its value or actual location. Native soil is figured out in personal and not numerical standards. A plot may be "worth nothing" but it is "ours"; so one has to keep it and transfer it if possible to the next generation as a token of identity rather than as a useful asset. That is the reason why people in the village, when asked about a piece of land or a house which they are not using and somebody else wants to buy it, give the same short and concluding stereotypical answer to the question of "what do you need that (e.g. house or plot) for?" and "why don't you sell it if not using it?" - "Nothing, let it be" (Tipota, asto na vriskete or asto na iparchi). Both verbs which are used in Greek language to describe the reason why soil must remain are also used for answering any question related to the notion of the self: "I am/found my self" (vrisko ton eafto mou) or "I am/come into being" (iparcho). Greek identity in this locality at least is related to land and self at the same time. When the self changes locality, identity readjusts to the new context. That is the argument of this thesis with the model of the egg-timer, that later helps to clarify it and the notion of identity and its shifts. But here I will continue with the implications of my appearance in the field during my first intrusion in the village.

So I arrived at the village with my mother's car, which was necessary for carrying all my belongings. The people in the village assumed that it was my mother who had arrived for the Easter (she used to pay visits to the village, staying with my cousins for the weekends from time to time). I caught everybody
by surprise when they saw me instead of my mother. One of my cousins, Elena, together with her husband, daughter and parents were in the village for Easter. They all lived in Lamia but visited the village as much as the family's obligations allowed them. She bought a house in the village because she "loved the place" but her parents did not have property there. She asked me to visit her on a daily basis to eat and "sit" together so that I would not feel lonely in the village (Photo 6). I already knew them very well as Elena had lived in my grandmother's house in Athens for two years while she was studying.

My first "real" encounter with the locals happened the next day after my arrival. I did not know it was going to be one of great importance for me as much as for the locals. Next to Popi's house is one of the two general-use and grocery shops of the village, the bakaliko of Dimitris. I went there to buy a bucket in order to mop the house I had started cleaning. Dimitris's shop is fully licensed, so it also works as a coffee-shop, a kafenio, where the men can drink a glass of wine or tsipouro (this is a very strong drink made from distilled grapes) and eat a snack. The shop's double function permits the local men to find some excuse; waiting, for example, to buy bread (there is no bakery in the village) which usually is brought from Karpenisi around lunch time to gather there where they start treating each other: they are very fond of drinking tsipouro and nibbling titbits. Although this shop is a bakaliko I have rarely seen any women shopping there: it was usually the children or the men who were sent to fetch necessary items for the household. Many have also stressed the domestic and public dichotomy and its relationship to gender roles in Greece (Friedl:1967:98; Hirsch:1978:57; Dubisch:1993:274, et.al.). Dubisch (1986:11-12) in her introduction writes:

_...in rural Greece it is considered better for a man not to spend too much time at home but instead to pass his leisure hours with other men in some public space like the kafenio, "coffeehouse", a place traditionally forbidden to women._

My arrival in Dimitris's bakaliko caused a stir: I was a new-comer, a woman entering in their proscribed space. They treated me to tsipouro and titbits, while interrogating me about my personal, social and professional status. I could not leave without offending those who treated me: Greeks take offence if one does not accept treating or do not finish it. As everybody took his round, I was made to drink continuously whatever I was given. Three hours later, I returned to the
"Fieldwork started" I wrote to my field notes "but I have

to get used to it...". But I was not the only one to suffer a cultural shock (and not

only a cultural but also a shock of my palate as I had never tasted tsipouro before

in my life). The villagers were also surprised in seeing a woman drinking this

horrible, sour and heavy drink (man-made drink) called tsipouro, that they

produce themselves from the dregs of the grapes used for producing wine

(tsaboura) (see Chapter 8 Photos 58, 59). This was my crash-course in their culture. As

a woman I was expected to drink just a little sweet drink and not hang endlessly around the shop accompanying the old men in their heavy
drinking. As Cowan (1991:183) extensively describes, women in the village drink

only sweet drinks, like liqueur or wine, in very small portions. "We are going
to have a good time here. We always do... Are you sure you
can drink some more?" they repeated to me, every time one said it was his
round for treating. They continued pouring me tsipouro but when I insisted on
buying them a drink too, they refused: "Don't worry... Plenty of time
to treat us... It is your first day here, you are not
allowed to pay...". Leaving the shop I thought I was lucky enough not be
given even the bucket for free! (Photos 7,8).

The next morning I left for Athens to return my mother's car (that I had

used to carry my belongings to Mrs Popi's house) and in the afternoon I returned
to the village with my motorbike. This was again for the villagers their second
cultural shock: not only was I a heavy drinker, but I drove all the way from

Athens on one of those big, street motorcycles they almost feared. My deed
spread very fast in the village and the people who knew me no longer saw me as
the typical female model they were accustomed to (as for those who did not
know me I can just imagine). In Greece as in many European countries the
ownership of a motorcycle bears some certain cultural values with it, like
aggression towards others, resistance to social status, personal freedom, rebellion
etc. My appearance and behaviour which was "normal" and passed unnoticed
before, now underlined that I had crossed all the male/female boundaries of their
world. Being a woman, I was driving a heavy motorcycle embodying symbolically
masculine qualities. Because of this, everything I did later on was filtered from
the presumed independence the motorcycle endowed me. For example, by
always wearing trousers, I did not have the typical woman's appearance; by
running wild and sitting playing with the children, I was not becoming a Miss
Youlie to children who thought I was like an older sister or cousin to them. By
having a dog living with me, I would no longer fit with the villagers' notion of household and family. By insisting on paying for my share and even my treat (Ine i sira mou na keroso), I was practising an inconceivable act for a woman. As Kenna (1992a:150) comments, reflecting on her first period of fieldwork, "I don't think that I really understood at that time the different ways in which the Islanders could have interpreted my presence there: primarily as an outsider and a foreigner, whose gender was a complicating factor".

In 1994 for a couple of months I mingled with the villagers and some of the migrants, who returned in the village for Easter. Everybody kept telling me to visit them and ask them what I wanted to but it was they who were eager to learn as much as possible about me. Two months after Easter I left the village in a hurry, although I thought that I was going to return soon. This was not the case: a family crisis emerged which fast developed into a combination of disasters followed by deaths. I had to stop fieldwork and anthropology for one year and a half.

The beginning of my second fieldwork took place in August 1995. I returned to the village for a second start. This time I was not staying at Popi's house in the village, for it did not suit my needs anymore. By looking for renting a house I was facing two problems: I needed a house with central heating (Popi's house where I first lived had no central heating, but the winter was almost over when I had moved there); I was also looking for an empty house to carry all my father's furniture. All the places to be found in the village were migrants' settlements, thus they were fully furnished. Nothing was found in the village for me, so I had to look for a place to live in Karpenisi. Even that was not easy but I finally rented a house on the outskirts of Karpenisi. My visits in the village followed a pattern encountered from my first experience. I spent every afternoon in Dimitris's shop, while during the mornings I visited my relatives in their houses or at their work and stayed with them for lunch. At the same time, living in Karpenisi brought me closer to my cousins who also lived there: Sofia and Sotiris, whom I already knew from Athens where they studied.

The older cousin, Sotiris, after finishing his studies in Athens, returned and married in Karpenisi. He had "his own job", therefore he was "nicely settled". Being a keen football player from his youth, he was still playing football for the village's team. At the weekends I would follow the team whenever they played and to take photographs. Being a professional photographer was a
skill that proved to be quite important for me in crossing the boundaries of many
different contexts of village life and not just the "us"/"them" dichotomy. It gave
me prestige and also an occupation—that did not challenge anybody else's
profession. My capacity as a photographer would have not been possibly known
but for a coincidental encounter with one of the locals one year before my arrival
in the village. It was his confirmation that I was working as a professional
photographer in an Athenian tavern with traditional Greek music that reassured
the locals that as I had been paid once for taking pictures in public, it was natural
for them as much for me to go around the village taking pictures all the time. On
the contrary, using my tape-recorder was never possible. The authority of my
other "profession" allowed me to use the camera, but not the tape-recorder or
even my notebook in public. My role as a photographer was well established as
the villagers asked me to attend the football matches and take photographs. My
decision to do so proved useful because quickly the locals wanted me to
participate in many aspects of their life, casual or everyday as well as formal.

To attend the football matches, taking place elsewhere than the local field,
we always travelled in my cousin's car, which I occasionally drove when he had a
hangover or was too bored to drive. Driving his car was also a confirmation of
my ambiguous female role: a woman driving a car is still a joke in many rural
areas in Greece and comments like "don't go with her, she will have you killed"
are the rule of people's behaviour towards women drivers. Two friends of his,
Tasos and Dimos, who also played for the village's team, would accompany us in
the car. As Sotiris and I knew each other of old standing and we were more
friends and relatives than simply relatives, free ranging discussions occurred in the
car. "Don't be embarrassed by Youlie, she is one of us," he would often say to Tases or Dimos, "so do speak freely". Piquant
anecdotes and shocking stories would then be told in spite of my presence. I was
definitely regarded by them as one of the "guys", for "...in the sporting domain,
women are "masculinized" by participation" (Fischer and Gainer:1994:101) (Photos
9,10). Fischer and Gainer (ibid.) suggest that

the consumption of sports is deeply associated with defining what is masculine
and, concurrently, what is not feminine. It has been noted that participating in
and watching sports lead to a range of masculinities, and each of them relies
for its definition on being distinct from femininity.
By living in Karpenisi I encountered people daily from outside the village to whom I had to explain what I was doing; from them I was learning inversely about the way the villagers were seen by the "outsiders". My cousin, Sofia, had introduced me to some of her friends: Roula (from Karpenisi) worked in the local co-operative for ploughmen together with a young man from the village of Trano. Elpida (from a village next to Trano) has a brother who runs a building construction business with two young engineers from Trano. In spite of the fact that we started to go out together on Saturday nights, they were very cautious in not introducing me to their male friends from Trano, although they knew I was doing "research" in this village. Control of information was in their hands and I was soon about to find out that by myself. To my surprise whenever we came across the young villagers they knew, or even Elpida's brother, none of my new friends would introduce me to those boys. As Karpenisi is the only place where night entertainment (pubs, clubs, disco, local bouzoukia and a rebetadiko) is to be found, we had many times run across young people from the village whom both girls already knew. Every time my belief that we would be properly introduced proved unfounded.

The measure of my failure to encounter young people in a context outside the village soon became obvious: Thomas, a boy from the village, who worked with Toula, wondered about the sort of research I was doing, for he had never met me in the village. This statement was the reference point for the marginality I had put myself in the first months of my research: I was usually meeting elderly men and children who were hanging around in the afternoon or busy housewives during the morning. I had never properly looked at the other local institutions of public space. Many people, particularly the younger ones, usually spent their time in the main room of the hotel in the central square of the village in the evenings (Photos 11, 12, 13).

At that time, my Karpenislots siblings and their friends had monopolised all my attention: I was marginalised in terms of villageness and this attitude did not pass unnoticed on the part of the villagers. Wherever we met (in pubs, tavernas or football matches) they had observed the unwillingness of all my companions to introduce me properly to the villagers they knew. But still none would approach me: they never tried to introduce themselves by talking to me. Every time I asked the girls, whom at that time I thought were shy and embarrassed, why I
was not introduced to them, they kept repeating to me that "they are not our companions (dhen imaste parea)".

Later when I was befriended by the village's young men I was given an explanation for the girls' negligence, indeed rejection, to introduce me to other male persons: "they would never act as the mediators for young people from different sexes to meet. They were frightened of you because by introducing you to a guy from the village they would lessen the possibilities for them: they thought it maybe a potential groom less for them". So, gender was the key answer for their behaviour. As my second period of my fieldwork had began everything looked different. I did not live in the village, therefore I was an outsider in terms of locality and space. For six months I was looking at the attitudes of the Karpenisiots towards the Tranlots, rather the other way round. Living in Karpenisi made the village seemed much exotic and distant when I compared my first notes and my second ones. However, this was bound to be changed again. As the winter was coming, one of my uncle's offered me the basement of his house to sleep over nights thus saving me from coming and going in the icy roads every day. I was still keeping my rented house in Karpenisi, but I could also stay for more than a few hours in the village again. This new arrangement for my accommodation, together with my engagement in making photographs for every activity of the village merged me in the people's and the village's life again. Using participant observation and photography for anthropological research I have dealt both with the study of the social life of Tranio, and my self's relationship with Other selves. This relation underlines the differences and similarities between us.
II. The failure of some methods

The use of a questionnaire proved to be a contentious matter for this research (Project 1). Having been given a lot of municipal lists from the village's secretary, with all the names of Tranos' registered residents, I encountered names of both locals as migrants. The village, was a place where people kept their voting rights, no matter if they actually lived there or not. The fact of people's physical and immaterial presence occupied my thoughts about place, identity and the relation between them. Thus, I decided to use a questionnaire to distribute it among the summer returning migrants and record how many migrants visited the village and how often, taking for granted that the majority of them would come anyway in the village to vote every three or four years. My questionnaire was based on some data I compiled from the official documents I already had (name, surname, father's name, place of birth and residence) and some questions about the migrants' connection to the village, frequency of visits, days and place of residence in the village.

Although the questionnaire was conducted for collecting data from the migrants, everybody living permanently in the village wanted to complete one but not for her or himself: people wanted to tell me about the others. "Don't waste your time" they would tell me. "Let me tell you about my cousin, or son or uncle et.al.". Once they learned about it, they made me sit and complete it: I was bound to do so. They gave me correct details about the information I was asking. This data was confirmed later when I re-completed the questionnaires with the people to whom they referred. This unorthodox way of collecting data made me aware of two things: first, all the locals wanted to control the information about their village and its villagers or incomers, even if the questions were not directly related to them. Then, it was striking that the information they were giving me was absolutely correct even if it concerned other people. This happens because in a small place nobody can pass unnoticed. No matter how many people will arrive, still the locals will recognize and classify them as outsiders according to the degree of their relation to the village: migrants, visitors, tourists or total strangers.
PROJECT 1: THE QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME AND SURNAME

PLACE OF BIRTH

YEAR OF BIRTH

PLACE OF RESIDENCE

CONNECTION TO THE VILLAGE:
- Maternal relative
- Paternal relative
- Other relation

FREQUENCY OF VISITS TO THE VILLAGE
- Christmas
- Kalimeras (a local festival in Epiphany's Day)
- National Day (other Bank Holidays)
- Weekends
- Carnival
- Easter
- Summer
- Elections

DAYS OF RESIDENCE IN THE VILLAGE

RESIDENCE IN THE VILLAGE
- In your own house
- In a relative's house
- In a friend's house
- In rooms to let

46
The site and its locality help the villagers in this awareness. In the village there is only one road which crosses it, so there is only one entrance and one exit, no matter which direction one follows. Everybody in the village will have to move through this axis, so people are visible and exposed to the villagers' eyes. "Nothing remains hidden in the village" they keep saying. Watching and taking notice of who is going where is one of the most favourite occupations, even second nature to the villagers. The village is an open area for close observation of other people's lives. It is a place where everything will be revealed sooner or later, nothing remains secret for long and nobody is invisible or unnoticed for a while. The villagers declare that the village is "our" village and they demand their biggest share of it by manipulating information about the others.

The data is given was accurate for the simple reason of the use of space. The village is a contested area where everything occurs overtly (sooner or later). To my surprise the locals were eager even confident, in telling me information about their cousins, daughters, nephews, neighbours, etc. Everybody, nonetheless, commented: "don't waste your time going around looking for those people (concerned) to answer that.. Bring it over here to me and I will answer it in two seconds.. I'll answer you for everybody if you wish". Even if I did not wish it, they would insist on telling me about the others and watching me fill in the questionnaire properly. Filling in the questions for the others provided evidence that most villagers knew practically everything about their fellow villagers. At the same time this questionnaire aroused suspicion, together with harsh criticism. Once read, the locals did not think highly of it. "This is not as scientific as I expected it to be.." they commented disappointed. They things I asked them to answer were things they knew well and which moreover they understand. "This is simple stuff" (afita ine apla pramata) they said "we can understand it", they added bitterly. It seemed to them that a "real scientific method" should be something obscure or incomprehensible. I knew from their faces, their voices, their attitude that I had let them down.

Strangely enough this reversed way of collecting information, information related not to the self and personality of the informer but to other people whom she or he knew, proved precise, true, even detailed after cross-checking it. As people's lives in a village are uninterruptedly interwoven, they had the knowledge,
therefore they also had the ability in using it for others. Since the information was accurate, I tried to compile lists with more detailed questions. At that point, all the people of Trano, educated or farmers, locals or migrants, men or women, young or old perceived such methods as a game. The same happened when I asked people to work with a spatial map (Project 2, Wallman:1993-1994). They seemed unable to make the necessary abstractions to co-operate in such a procedure. The small children preferred to use the colours for drawing on the maps and would not relate any answers to my questions on it. I was an outsider trying to intrude in their own world of relationships with very obvious and palpable methods and nobody liked that. They preferred to have the control of the Information I was given, rather than be guided to answer something which was formally structured.

In this spatial map I was asking the children to put in each circle the members of their family according to the affection towards them, starting from the small circle, which represents the ego. I was given coloured circles with trees and houses or other landscapes of the village. While I was discussing the drawing with them I realised that the children relate love and space in only one dimension: to that which answers the question "how much do you love grandfather?" - "so much" (stated by opening their hands).
The "failure" of the spatial map to elicit information about degrees of affection for different family members could also be interpreted as a lack of understanding of what it was required, or as people's reluctance to reveal their personal feelings to a non-family member.
This dual failure is maybe related to the general Greek reluctance to participate in anything written or official. One should also remember that in the wider area of Evrytania, all the written sources were destroyed in 1944, and for many years the only tool in everybody's case has been the oral testimonies, the affidavit and giving one's word of honour (claiming it was true). All these in some cases were distorted for personal interests: perjury has often taken place here. So there is a tangible refusal to be involved in direct records that can be easily misused. This is a paradox if related to Evrytanians' awe towards whatever is written or officially recorded: "it is so written", "this is how it has been done for it is written", "this is history.. (officially recognised and presented)".

Doors opened after I realized my wish to become one of them: I became somehow involved within the community, by having a clear role. It was then that information was given more freely, still selected. My positive status in the village; that of a photographer, provided me with all the confidence I lacked in the beginning of my research. Things became easier as the Informants (who still chose to co-operate or withdraw) relaxed from my incomprehensible supervision. Many things can help information: a network of relatives and friends, or the excuse of a job or part-time work in the field. One has to be someone: recognized as having a particular role in the community. Without even realizing it, any unrelated profession other than that of the obscure ethnographer can be a great help. An ethnographer is not recognizable as a person. It is rather a character in the community's life. Still information cannot be given in the same amount from everybody. What people tell you or what people choose to do when one is around is selective. Communities are not that much willing to be "open" and observed as the anthropologist thinks. Even a long period of time just diminishes but does not annihilate their difference. People do not like to be revealed as the researcher presumes. The Informants select who are going to be in any time and period concerned. Anthropologists may think they were closer to their Informants but this demands more consideration. Sometimes by being there that long one can only achieve the exact opposite relationship: create a greater distance from some people who are not happy with those with whom one is associated more or closely. Living in somebody's house, being friends or protected by somebody in a village, just means that his or her relations are extended to your appearance. One's sympathies distance others who are initially willing to associate with the researcher. But the researcher, by living closer to some people more than others, can only became attached to the former and detached from the latter.
III. The researcher's role: professional photographer or anthropologist?

In the beginning of my research (Easter 1994), the people of the village often saw me going around with a camera or a camcorder. Many believed that I had a weird and expensive obsession "taking photographs as a hobby, like one of those silly Greek-Americans (chazo-Amerikanakia) who come every summer in the village". Others disliked the idea of me "snooping around and taking photographs" I was later told. That's why I fear that if no confirmation for my professional status had been made by one of the villagers (and not solely because I said so) then my attempts to photograph village life would have been somehow different.

During the long period I had to interrupt my research (1994-1995) I was working as a night club photographer in Athens, in the well-known tavern of Armenaki, where the Konitopoulou family was singing folk songs and their band played folk music. This was a very popular place among the various Migrants' Associations located in Athens for organising their annual dinners and dances. I knew that the time I worked there was irrelevant to my anthropological research. The only exception was a night when the Migrant's Association of a neighbouring village to Trano was having their annual dance there. That night I was very happy to work with compatriots (sinchorfanous), so when I was taking pictures, I confirmed my origin as a compatriot of them. However, that night, proved to be an invaluable asset which helped me establish a respectable reputation for my ex-profession in the village later when I re-started my fieldwork in the village.

In 1995, only a couple of months after I started research, in one of the football games of Trano, one of their ex-football players approached me and asked me if I remembered him: I didn't. Yet, he insisted we had met in the taverna, where I worked, one year ago: "Don't you remember? Last Carnival, it was when the Migrants' Association of my village had their annual dinner... I am Trifonas. You spoke to me and you took a picture of me. Then I bought the picture -I still have it- and you told me that you were going to come to Trano to stay. And ... I didn't believe you... I was mocking you: I never thought you were really going to come here. You are also a compatriot...".
He told me that we talked about my village: "I told you.. I know perfectly well where exactly Trano is.. I also know everybody who lives there and many of the migrants as well. But I am absolutely sure that I have never - ever seen you before in my life". He reminded me that I explained to him my grandfather's origin and the fact that I had not visited the village for many years. The truth is that I did not remember him or anything of what we had talked about. This is not very weird as for eight months I met 350 different people every night.

Now he was thrilled by my presence here, in the field. He went on narrating "You see.. I never believed you... I thought you were telling me bull, just for the sake of buying one of your photographs. You told me about some book you were going to write... You told me "I have been there just for a while but then I interrupted. One day I will come back". Do you promise? I asked mockingly. "You will see" you said and you are really here now!...". I had forgotten all about that; I did not remember him not even when he started narrating the story. We chatted a lot and he was definitely very pleased to find out that I had not lied to him about my origin or my purposes: I was a person to be trusted, for I had done the most incredible act. I left Athens and a very well paid job - according to the villagers' views anyway - and I came to stay in the village and write about "them", as I had already promised. His story quickly spread: our first encounter took epic dimensions. None seemed to be bored to listen once more to the story of Trifonas. Everybody asked again and again: "Tell us about when you met Youlie in the kentro". People started using my name and I was no more Sotiris's cousin or an unknown migrant from Athens. I was "the successful photographer from the village" whom Trifonas had seen, talked to, remembered and told people about almost a year ago, when he was visiting some compatriots in Athens.

My encounter with Trifonas had integrated me into the whole of the local community, which was ideally transferred into that space (i.e. the tavern) just for one night. He, one of the village's people, worked as a mediator between "us", the villagers who were having their meeting and "them", me and the "outside" world where I belonged. But the egg-timer of the identity had turned over from that night one year ago in the location of the tavern, where I was an Athenian, a person with roots from the village, still a prospective "outsider" to that day in the
football field as I had become a prospective member of the community's people. In Athens, inside a tavern with live music, the community was ideally reconstructing its identity and I was seen as an outsider. And later in the village, where I carried the exotic aroma of "otherness" I was still an outsider. Being at the same time where the village's existence occurred in many temporal and spatial contexts (the tavern or the football field) I became one of "us", even if I had never really belonged there before. That incident changed a great deal of people's behaviour. Trifonas had confirmed my presence in both contexts where the community existed. First, I was one of "them" but afterwards I crossed the boundaries and I became one of "us". From that time my photographs were welcomed and expected. I had a role, and a profession that they could understand and reconfirm. At the same time, because I had been in one of their manifestations of community at the past, although accidentally, I had "proved" my real commitment to it. Time, place and identity were closely related; now I had to try to find out how they worked. either by meticulously note-taking or by using the photographs and the video for my own sake.

People's relationships and interactions in both time and space permitted me to study their social life from a different point of view. The migrants' expressions, for instance, take various written or visual forms: the Migrants' Association magazine is a half-yearly publication and has been distributed in the village, Athens and the USA; the videos made by the USA migrants* or the photographs the incomers take are of great value and shed new light on the research of migrants' and locals' identity. As Fog-Olwig and Hastrup (1997:2) argue "(i)nstead of cultures located in a particular landscape we face a transnational culture of sounds and images."

Being a professional photographer helped my research in many different ways: people used me often for my skills and I entered places where my network did not work. The ways in which my appearance as a photographer worked in practice were many and varied according to the social context. I always had a pivotal role in weddings (Photos 14, 15, 16), baptisms (Photo 35), other social events and every day life (Photos 11, 12, 13 and 74, 75 in Chapter 9).

* Ann-Belinda Steen Preis (1997:86-100) has looked at the videos made by the Sri Lankan Tamils back home and sent to their siblings in Denmark.
I was asked to record children's parties, name day celebrations, the annual "dance" of the Cultural Association or of the Football Team, even "dances" of political parties. I was there to record elections, school celebrations (Photo 18), the events happening during the Cultural Week in the summer (Photos 40-50,57) and whatever people thought was "traditional": the pezoules (Photo 27), the cutting of wood (Photo 29), the shepherds (Photos 65, 68-71), fishing (Photo 28), constructing traditional stone work (Photos 32,33), the making of wine and tsipouro (Photos 58,59), keeping animals (Photos 30,31), the pilgrimage (Photo 34), Easter (Photos 2-5, 37,38), Carnival (Photos 19,20) and the Kalimera (Photos 78-92). I was invited to other cities for a visit, in football matches (Photos 51-56) or to follow a family on vacation just for the sake of my camera (Photos 66-67).

In this research I used the photographs I took in many different ways. Initially, as a record of events, then as a tool for understanding the minutiae details of village life. During research, the people of the village asked me to show them what I photographed: I did so and very soon I had piles of photographic albums which served a double purpose: first, there were collections of events, an archive in which all the villagers wanted to look "if they were in it", so I reprinted the ones who "were in" and distributed them. Second, these albums often provoked conversations or stories and memories unrelated to the photos. They worked as a hint, an innuendo of past things worth mentioning and remembered, therefore noticeable for recording. On the other hand, the people who looked at my photographs often commented on things in them that I had never noticed or occurred me to discuss. Later, when I started writing-up I decided to use them as photo-essays, imitating Danforth and her book "The death rituals of rural Greece" (1982) where she used Tsiaras's photographs to enrich the text.

The people I photographed asked me repeatedly to "put them" in my book. They expected me to use their photographs and when I presented them with the draft they were very glad if they were "in" and very disappointed if they were "out" of it. It was very difficult to choose what to exclude from a bulk of 1,600 photographs or more. For all these reasons, the photographs in this thesis are more than a simple tool for analysis. They become a narration of a different kind, they have their own value and I hope that in many cases weigh as much as the text.
IV. Some notes on anthropological photography

Since the use of photography was integral to my fieldwork and participation, some space will be devoted here to photography and the intention in the thesis behind the inclusion of photographs. The visual image is possibly the dominant mode of communication in the late 20th century (Edwards:1992:3). An anthropological photograph is any photograph from which an anthropologist could gain useful, meaningful visual information. Anthropologists who include the class of things that are subject to their understanding, always define reality at the moment they discover it (Crawford and Turton:1992:10). In photography the specific moment becomes representative of the whole and the general. The term "still" photograph both describes the nature of the photograph exactly and at the same time implies a misrepresentation of its nature, for its interpretation is not still. Viewers attribute a new meaning through their own cultural experience and as such a photograph is in some ways submissive. Yet photographs are not totally passive. They suggest meaning through the way in which they are structured (Edwards:1992:8). Ruby (1990:135) defines as ethnographic photography the use of photographs for recording and understanding of culture(s) - both those of the subjects and of the photographers. I have used the photographs which are presented in this thesis as a means (for myself) of understanding my Informants' culture and for them to understand my research and my role in their community. The text surrounding the photographs represents both my view and that of the informants; the reader can identify this through the use of different fonts (see the "Note on the Use of Different Fonds" at the beginning of the thesis).

The creation of a photograph is, on one level, a chemical - mechanical process. However, the technology (type of camera, film and printing technique) determines what can be recorded and how it will be presented. For example, taking a picture in a football match from the top of a car that the fans shake, obviously affects the result of it. The resulting image can represent only symbolically the subject's actual shape, texture, dimension, colour and overall context. The person behind the camera intervenes. The photographer's selection and recording of a particular moment takes it out of its context in the flow of real life experience and places it in another, possibly unrelated, context. Yet, the variables between the viewer and subject also create endless opportunities for
anthropological research. Photographs can render the exotic familiar, enhance the commonplace, capture movement in time, reveal unseen features and present remote perspectives. Photographs can illustrate subjects in their original setting, providing important information for further understanding. Alternatively, the camera can isolate subjects from their surroundings, affording new interpretations. The image freezes a slice of time, which unlike life itself, the researcher may analyse again and again.

Trachtenberg (cited in Guimond:1991:vil) has argued that the emergence of documentary photography contributes to contemporary cultural studies. The photograph is not only newly discovered in its plenitude of cultural and ideological implications but is also a cardinal site of cultural conflict, of contests over interpretation and meaning and over the social power of images to control, not only perceptions across the lines of class and gender and ethnic identity, but the perception of reality itself. However, photographic reality is never absolute, never a merely automatic or mechanical reflex, never free of local and immediate contingencies of presentation.

I have selected the photographs in my thesis in so far as they reflect the relationship between the photographer and the photographed. Our consciousness has become more global and historical: to Invoke another culture now is to locate it in a time and space contemporaneous with our own, and thus to see it as part of our world. Central to the nature of the photograph and its interpretative dilemmas is its insistent dislocation of time and space. The strength and weakness of the photograph are contained within this paradox. The photograph by its very nature is "of" the past. Yet it is also of the present. It preserves a fragment of the past that is transported in apparent entirety to the present - the "there - then" becomes the "here - now" (Barthes:1977:44). The repetition of arrested time is powerful for it allows the viewer to linger, imagine or analyse in a way which would not be possible in the natural flow of time.

The photograph perpetuates the past in an insidious fashion, denying time, presenting a timeless vision, an "ethnographic present" and as such becomes another manifestation of anthropology's alleged atemporal discourse. Closely related to a temporal dislocation in a photographic context is spatial dislocation. Photographic technology frames the world. The photograph contains and
constrains a microcosmic analogue of the framing of space which is knowledge. As such it becomes a metaphor of power, having the ability to appropriate and decontextualize time and space and those who exist within it. The photograph isolates a single incident in history. It can make the invisible visible the unnoticed noticed, the complex apparently simply and indeed vice versa.

The anthropological photography embodies expressions of beliefs, assumptions and classifications relating on one hand to the nature of humanity and on the other, to the nature of the anthropological exercise. That is why an immutable truth on the nature of historical photograph does not exist. There are no boundaries, no strictly defined limits to meaning but rather a pluralism of approach and meaning. The meaning of photographs can be guided or suggested by text, which further enmeshes them in a particular context. This is especially pertinent in anthropological context. It is thought that through the juxtaposition of a specific representational mode and caption the "types" are established or that an individual can become a generality. Controversially, a caption can give immediacy and assurance to photography. Either way, the caption is being used to position the photograph, and processes of interpretation are controlled through the interaction of image and text. All these attributes of the photograph influence its interpretation.

Photography is one of "our" ways of assimilating the unknown. It nevertheless introduces a further dimension of removal (Bouquet:1992:199). From the moment of its creation the photograph will "mean" something, reflecting the photographer's intention. This meaning may remain with it, or may be opposed to it. The photograph invokes a timelessness. Photographs can be read as broad texts which reveal these "hidden histories" rather than as individual descriptive documents (Edwards:1992:12). The visual documentation has an immense power of seduction because the distance between reality and representation has been negated (Crawford & Turton:1992:14). Scherer (1992) stresses that photographs can be used as representations that require critical reading and interpretation. Pinney (1992:90) has suggested that once photographers are brought to the surface it is we as viewers and interpreters who determine their meaning. For Gregory (1970:44 cited in Wright 1992:26) "the same data can always mean any of several alternatives objects... the number of possibilities is infinite".
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Also Scherer (1992:32) writes that neither the photograph itself as an artefact, nor the viewer's interpretation of the subject of the photograph, nor an understanding of the photographer's intention, can alone give holistic meaning to images. To conclude one can state that photographs are open to analysis and interpretation as seen through the interrelationship of the photographer, subject and viewer. The intention, in this thesis, behind the inclusion of photographs is that the researcher's view, the informants' view and their interrelationship will be better understood by the readers.
Easter in the village.
The Livas family standing in front of their renovated traditional stone house. From left to right: Illas (Elena's father), Dafne (Elena's daughter), Fotis (Elena's husband), Koula (my auntie, Elena's mother) and my cousin, Elena. The women were particularly concerned about me at the beginning of my fieldwork. It was they who made all the necessary arrangements for my stay and connections. Friedl's statement (1986:43) recognizes their power "...the women in a Greek village hold a position of real power in the life of the family, and, ... the life of the family is the most significant structural and cultural element of the Greek village..." 

(Malenou, 1996)
The general store (bakaliko) of Dimitris: there one can find anything from brooms and bread to needles and tsipouro. ABOVE: Dimitris poses for me in front of his shop. He is planning to build a traditional shop for selling only "traditional" products greatly prized by the tourists. BELOW: Inside the shop. (Malenou, 1994)
Football is a male activity. Fischer & Gainer (1994:85) assert that "sports may shape and reinforce men's socially defined gendered roles". My role as a photographer obscured my gender and I was "masculinized" by participation. I was expected to go and photograph every football game. In the winter cold, rain even snow did not make things easy for my role.

(Malenou, 1995)
The Hotel in the central square of the village and its manager.
The hotel, situated in the central square of the village, works as a coffee shop and pub, a restaurant and as a hotel. During the winter, in the non tourist period, one should visit the central room to realise that it is full of local people who are sitting here from the afternoon until late in the night, drinking coffee, shipping tsipouro, playing cards, or just talking. In many cases, they will receive telephone calls here as if they were in their houses. During the weekends and holidays, the hotel is filled also with tourists and visitors. In the summer all the activity is transferred outdoors in the square. The use of space is very interesting: during the winter the locals gather near the bar, at the back of the room. They have access to the bar and often help themselves without waiting to be served by the manager. The migrants and visitors sit near to the door and do not interfere with serving.

(Malenou, 1996)
Playing cards or sipping tsipouro: the coffee shop has its own geography, codes and symmetries. For a long time I did not take any photographs inside the main room of the hotel, that worked as the local coffee shop. One night a lot of snow covered the village: everybody insisted I should go out and take photos of the village by night in the snow (notice the car covered by snow in the background in Photo 13). Then, they asked me to take some pictures while they were engaged in their usual activities - as if I had not been there. (Malenou, 1996)
Being a professional photographer helped my research in many different ways: people used me often for my skills and I entered there where my network did not work. Here is a social event preceding the marriage: the making of the young couple's bed. Young girls make up the bed three times and all family and friends throw money on it for prosperity. I was invited to this wedding not simply as a guest but as a photographer. People expected me to use my camera and often asked me to take the pictures of the entire event instead of not hiring a local professional photographer. "Who needs one when we have Yioulie", they said. Perhaps it was not only a question of money but also a matter of confidentiality and acquaintance they shared with me. (Malenou, 1997)
When the church is near the bride’s house her family and friends “walk” her there. In some cases people bring pipes and tabors to accompany the parade. Inside the church the service will last almost an hour. "It is much better to get married in the village. Here the priest says everything", people comment. In the weddings my role was dual: that of the guest and the most important one, the photographer’s.  

(Malenou, 1997)
ABOVE: Christmas circa 1960s (photographer unknown). The people of the village attend the school's performance. I was given this photograph "as you will appreciate and use it better for being a photographer".

BELOW: Christmas, 1996 (photo by Malenou). In the school performance: the village dignitaries are seated in front. Papa-Kiriakos (the priest of the village) has grown older.
Carnival in the village of Trano, 1996. Many locals and villagers "into costume" go around hiding their identities by acting masquerades. There is always an reversal in men and women roles, as both sexes prefer to be dressed with costumes of the other gender. ABOVE: In the village. BELOW: At a party. (Malenou, 1996)
I. The "emic" telling of local, regional and national history

Evrytania is situated in the southern part of the range of Pindus Mountains and constitutes, together with other counties, the wider area of Sterea Ellada (or Rumell as it later came to be known). It is remote, isolated and unapproachable. In oral and "myth" history Evrytania has been regarded as one of the originally Hellenic counties of Greece from antiquity which has never been inhabited by or mixed with other nations or tribes, as happened to the areas of Epirus or Macedonia. Also, one of the most famous nineteenth century travellers, Pouqueville, who visited Greece stressed the purity of the Evrytans when he wrote "the area of Evrytania is inhabited from the true-born, in terms of ethnicity, Greeks" (cited in Michiotis:1990:127). It is nothing to be surprised at the local tourist guide that refers to the "true Greek origin" of the Evrytans. There are some detailed versions of the name of Evrytanla: according to the most popular, the name of Evrytanla derives from its ancient king’s name Evrytos, a man with great skill in the bow. Some others, though, insist that it comes from the Greek word "ev" for "well" and the verb "hred", for "flow" so that altogether the word "Evrytanla" means the place where there is plenty of fresh and flowing water (Michiotis:1990:58). According to another version, the meaning of Evrytanla derives from the ancient Greek verb "eryo", that stands for "tighten the string of a bow"; therefore, the man from Evrytanla (the Evrytan) is one who shoots with a bow very well and strong. All these myths strongly confirm the wish of the people living in this area to have a direct link with their "pure" ancestors.

It is proved archaeologically that Evrytanla was inhabited from the fifth century BC., although Homer refers to Dolopes, an ancient tribe of the region, who participated in the Trojan war of 1100 BC guided under Finika. The capital of the ancient region of Evrytanla, Ichalia, was founded by the king of Driopes, Melaneas, but her remains have not been discovered yet. There is a guess at today’s position, in various sites of Evrytanla: in Klafls, in Fidakia or in Domianous. In text books and encyclopaedias the ancient Evrytans were presented as the inhabitants of the harsh, mountainous area of Northern Aetolla and were considered the most powerful, and the most brutal people among all the Aetollans tribes (Nea Domi, Vol.12:264).
There is not much written about Evrytania. Giolias (1999a,b) recently presented two volumes for the history of Evrytania in the classic and modern times. His books are highly praised as the first (and only) attempts to record from myths and classical texts the theories concerning the wider area of Evrytania. He claims that apart from the Dolopes, other tribes also inhabited the area. The Aperantii, and the Agrel, who took their name after Diana Artemis, the "Agrotera", the goddess of hunting whom all the ancient Evrytans especially honoured. Special honours were attributed to Dionysos (the god of wine) and Ulysses for his ability to be cunning and inventive. Aristotle stressed the evidence that Evrytans had established an oracle at the Black Cave, in Prousos, for the benefit of Ulysses (Giolias: 1999a:31). These attributes that the ancient Evrytans ascribed to their honoured gods are not unrelated to the skills they should have in order to survive in this remote, isolated, forested and wild area. As their main ways for living were brigandage and hunting, cunning, trickery, resourcefulness, inventiveness and patriotism were the necessary talents these wild and warlike mountainous people shared. The worship of Ulysses was not just an individual's token of belief; it had great cultural connotations as it was a government's affair expressing the locals' religious attitude to heroes. For the Evrytans who were fighters and lived daily armed preparing themselves for war and robbery, honouring Ulysses was a call to help from one of the most cunning and inventive demi-gods of their time. Living in danger and depravity and feeling insecure, they worshipped Ulysses presenting both their local bonds with the hero as well as the organisation of the Evrytanian state (Ibid. 42). Thucydides wrote about the Evrytans in the first period of the Peloponnesian war (426 B.C.) between the Athenians and the Peloponnensians. The Evrytans had established a joined association with other tribes in the area of Aetoloakamanlia the kinon, becoming a potential danger for the Athenians in case they lost the War. The fear of Athenians became a reality when they were defeated because of the Evrytan militancy and organisation and due to the geographical features of the area (Giolias:1999a:50-52). Two hundred and thirty five years later the Gaul were completely crushed and their bodies were left unburied. Oral history says that for many decades, bones could still be seen lying down: Kokkalia (meaning bones) lies outside Karpenisi, still acting as a reminder of the fierceful battle between the Evrytans and the Gaul in the fifth century AC. Today, the modern Evrytans are proud of these mythological accounts; they recognize them as "true" and also as part of an inheritance closely related to the remote and wild area they live.
Giollas states that the main reason for not having differentiation in the society of the ancient Evrytans is that the means of production, self-sufficient farming and livestock (i.e. sheep and goats), remained the same for many centuries. He claims that the basic scheme for social organisation of the ancient Evrytan society was the family and kinship (yenos, siggenia) and explains the three levels of it: first, the family (ikos), which emerged from the context of the hearth (estia). Then the village developed thanks to the families' existence (chorio, komi or dhimos). Finally, the co-operation of many villages creates the state (kratos), that is distinguished by two types: the (poll kratos) and the state of kinship (filetiko kratos). The latter is representative in the case of Evrytanla. Its ancient inhabitants preserved many of the singularities of an armed military democracy. Giollas also believes that the Institution of slavery, as a mean to upgrade the social system and production relations, never occurred in Evrytanla. (Giollas:1999a:53-60). He continues writing that although the Institution of monarchy was a political reality in Evrytanla as elsewhere in Greece, there are many indications that it was abolished in due course. His conclusions are open to scrutiny and are given as statement of facts rather than possible "myth-history". But his aim is very clear; he wants to present a continuation of the Institutions related to Greek politics. He says that the Parliament and the Local Assembly (Vouli kal Laiki Sinelefsi), have been conserved and developed to the present: the Local Assembly has been evolved into what is known as the Ekklesia tou Dhimou, surviving the Ottoman Occupation up to the years of the Civil War. It is likely that during these periods the Evrytans revelled in their own self-govermental policy as well as in private their lives.

Giollas (1999a:107-119) states that from the era of Roman and Byzantine Empires only a few ruins can be found at Evrytanla. Apparently the small communities which comprised Evrytanla left very little behind through the Roman and Byzantine Orthodox Christian periods. The Roman Occupation followed the decline of the Greek city-state. The consequences for the area of Evrytanla were many. The Roman supported the aristocrats and the political oligarchy who tyrannized the other social groups. He writes that the practice of armed robbery emerged together with people's exodus from Aetolia; the Isolated mountains of Evrytanla became the asylum for many who migrated from the plains in order to survive. Here again, Giollas's objective is to confirm the repetition of another practice taken place in the mountains of Evrytanla in antiquity and modernity: Evrytania as an asylum and a refugee. He stresses that in Roman times this was
not the only time that the Pindus population would increase. He connects the two periods of history, before and after Christ, where Evrytania was offering shelter to its neighbours and protection to its locals and he concludes that the pattern for their survival has always been the same: cattle breeding and armed robbery (ibid.).

After conquering the extended Byzantine state, the Ottomans named the Greek European part of it Rumell, meaning the country of the modern Greek. The name comes from the Turkish word Rum which is the country of the Greeks (i.e. including only Central Greece in those times) and -ill, which is the Turkish word for place (i.e. Rum+ill = Rumell). That is the reason why the Turkish called the modern Greeks Romans (Romios). Herzfeld in Anthropology through the Looking-Glass (1987) explores the two terms that are used to refer to the people of Greece. The word Romios, which is also related to Romlos/inll, is used to legitimize the cultural difference experienced by the Greeks during the Byzantine and Ottoman period of their history and the word Hellenes, which refers to Hellenismos, that is the Idealized ancient and classical period of the Greeks. For four centuries (1453-1821) the Turks occupied Greece. During these long centuries of Turkish Occupation, the Greeks' faith in the continuation of the imperial destiny of Christian Byzantium, preserved and fostered above all by the Church, made it possible for Orthodox Christians in Greek lands to maintain a sense of identity (Campbell and Sherrard:1968:25).

Through this so-called Dark Age the millet system provided by the Turks for their subjects' taxation allowed the Greeks to have relative freedom in their own lives. The Turks did not re-organise the local administration, trade or education allowing this way the continuity and autonomy of small Greek communities in relation to these sectors (Woodhouse:1991:102-104). On the one hand, the Ottoman government preferred to deal with their communities under rule as entities; therefore, they used the existing local administration which was represented in every village or town by its elected village/town notables. The results of this treatment were twofold: first, among all the people of a village or town a sense of solidarity derived from the common difficulties they had to confront; then, as a consequence, the notion of patrida emerged.
Campbell and Sherrard (1968) wrote that people had merely a pragmatic rather than an emotional relationship to their native place or county: this place was connected with their family and also supported their lives. On the other hand, the Orthodox Patriarch whose position under Ottoman rule had been removed from European Greece to Constantinople, (which was the political centre of the Ottoman Empire at the time), held a detailed civil jurisdiction over the Christian community in the Empire. As family was (as today) the basis of the social and economic life for the Greeks, all its related institutions, such as marriage, divorce, dowry, or inheritance were regulated by the Church (ibid.:47-51). This ultimate control of the Church over their members has far-reaching repercussions even today.

Campbell and Sherrard have mentioned that initially the Sultan had distributed land in fiefs. However, in some areas of Greece, where the mountainous terrain did not allow extended farming like the mountains of the Peloponnese and continental Greece, people lived on an unproductive subsistence economy. The difficulty of communication made further interference by the conquerors difficult. As a result, these communities retained self-government and people were left their arid land if taxes were paid without dispute (ibid.:54).

Because of their geographical position (mountainous, remote and isolated), communities such as Mani in the Peloponnese, Sfakia in Crete, Zayorochoria and Souli in Epirus and Agrafa in Pindus managed to sustain the institution of self-government as well as the rebellious attitude of their people (Pantelouris:1987:45). It is worth mentioning here the case of Agrafa in Evrytania. The Turks named them Agrafa (meaning the Unwritten Places) for not being registered during the Ottoman occupation by the Turkish administration at all, due to the difficulty of access. This extreme paradigm illuminates what many researchers have noted about Greece: the unchallenged autonomy of the small communities in Greece and the villagers' concern about this locality, called patrida, that the locals will defend in unison against the outside world (Du Boulay:1994:40-69). In this context Campbell and Sherrard (1968:55) wrote about the Ottoman period that

(For) the Christian peasantry who had to adapt themselves as best they could to whatever variation of taxation and land tenure was from time to time imposed on them, the village community was the refuge in which they found consolation and a collective moral strength produced by an autonomous social and religious life.
During the Turkish occupation, Greek-speaking immigrants from other parts of Greece particularly the plains and highlands of central and western parts of the country appeared for the first time in the history of Evrytania. The Slavs and Vlachs who sought shelter in the inaccessible complex of the Pindus Mountains settled in Evrytania and came in contact with the locals. Predominant, however, is the Greek presence in the region, as the names of the settlements extended from Kerasovo to Karpenisi proved (Vacalopoulos:1970:14). A quotation from the local tourist guide to Karpenisi (1994:9-10) confirms the myths about the purity of the Evrytans while concealing the appearance of other tribes in the area:

During the Turkish occupation from 1453 to 1821, Evrytania proved to be the safest hiding place for refugees and those who couldn't bear being slaves to the Turks. The whole province is full of remaining schools in which famous teachers with European culture were teaching, preserving the Greek language and spirit, along with the Christian religion, during those unmemorable days. Monasteries, sanctuaries, chancels, temples, all hidden in distant rocks and caves, were real shelters for those who were working at the difficult effort of National renovation.

Many researchers have also noted the historical fact of the existence of groups of resistance in the mountainous areas of Greece at different chronological periods. The range of Pindus in continental Greece, due to its geographical position, was always a favourable place of hiding, shelter and resistance for those Greek brigands who used to take to the hills under the Ottoman rule. While under the yoke of the Ottoman Empire its subjects were not allowed to be armed, the remoteness of some areas and the lack of formal Ottoman administration made this prohibition unenforceable for the klephtes*.

---

* When the Greek word klephtes is translated in to English it means thieves or bandits; in Greek, however, this word in its historical use and context carries very strong and positive connotations of resistance and bravery.
The klephtes lived in the mountain ranges all over Greece and actively fought the Turks. They obeyed only their leaders and as Woodhouse (1991:137) stated they were “a law unto themselves”. They usually became klephtes as a hereditary profession; to them violence was a way of life. But the klephtes also "became identified with a form of armed ethnic resistance against the Muslim rulers", as Campbell and Sherrard (1968:58) claimed.

Also the ideals of klephtic life were related closely to the traditional values of Greek mountain communities. Klephts were brave, brutal, anarchic, and cunning; but men of honour in the technical Greek sense, respecting women and requiring of themselves great physical strength and courage and Odyssean cunning.

Campbell et al. (1968:57) referred to brigandage as an unavoidable practice among the people of isolated, mountainous communities who share a weak provincial administration and their loyalties were addressed to the only social and economic unit that kept them in existence: the family. Also, contested interests and open opposition among families strengthened further the need for self-protection; the traditional values people shared related to notions of prestige and honour for which preservation both enforcement and violence were necessary. The struggle for Greek Independence started in the beginning of the nineteenth century. On the 25th of March 1821, which is now traditionally celebrated as Greece's National Day, the Greeks started their revolution claiming their freedom from the Ottoman Empire by force (Woodhouse:1991:134). The Greek War of Independence lasted until 1832. The liberation from the Turkish Empire brought the modern Greek state into existence (Campbell and Sherrard:ibid:19). Evrytania became a theatre of war. In its steep slopes a few armed Greeks resisted many Turks. Battles, traps and ambushes were set up, thanks to the formation of its landscape. In the site of the Prousos, Karaiskakis a well known hero of the Greek War of Independence, fought and hurt himself then found refuge in the monastery, in which today his clothes and armoury are exhibited. Other warriors were also fighting for Greece and won glory for themselves:

In the third year of war (1823) on the western front the Turks were defeated by the brilliant leadership of Markos Botsaris, who was tragically killed in the hour of victory at the battle of Karpenisi. (Woodhouse:1991:140)
One hundred and twenty years later in the bare, dry mountain country where "rebellion was an ancient tradition" (Eudes:1970:2) Evrytanla offered shelter again; this time to the Greeks who resisted the Germans. Eudes (ibid.) wrote about the Partisans and the Civil War which occurred from 1943 to 1949 "in the liberated mountain areas of Greece, where an old epic was being reborn: the story of klephs, of four centuries of resistance to Turkish occupation, of Greece's indomitable will to remain Greek". Karpensel is the highest county town in Greece, situated at 3,000 feet; it is also one of the most isolated, in the heart of the southern Pindus range, surrounded by mountains. A single road approaches Karpensel from Lamia and its geophysical barriers explain why the Germans never occupied this area. The Germans occasionally fought in various battles and they only passed through Karpensel during their retreat from the Greeks and their allies in 1944 when they burned down the whole town (Photo 21).

Therefore, from the year of 1942, Evrytanla became transformed into a centre for the National Resistance (Campbell et.al:1968:57;Eudes:1970:11,111-113;Woodhouse:1976:187-188). This is a significant fact, not just for military reasons but also because many of the administrative methods of the Greek National Resistance (EAM) developed and were applied for the first time there, particularly those which were concerned with self-government (afrodhiiklisi) and with the people's popular justice (laiko dhikastirio) (Collard:1993:358,364). The first official Government of the Mountains (ELAS), located in a small village of Evrytanla, Vinnani, proclaimed elections for a National Committee. The Committee convened at Koryskhades, just a few miles away from Karpensel, in the school building and made substantial decisions about the Resistance war up to May 1944 (Woodhouse:1976:85, Photo 22). Armed bands emerged from the mountains but at the same time a number of rival forces entered the field. They were the National Popular Liberation Army ELAS (Ethnikos Laikos Apelefterotikos Stratos) under the control of EAM and the Republican Greek League EDES (Ethnikos Dimokratikos Ellinikos Stratos) under the leadership of the former republican Colonel Zervas. On some occasions these two armies successfully combined their forces to boycott the foreign Invader, as happened with the destruction of the Yoryopotamos bridge on the 25th of November 1942 (Woodhouse:1991:244-6) (see Photo 23).
At the same time, different resistance movements organized people to resist in the cities and the villages. The largest and best organized one was EAM (National Liberation Front), a left-wing movement led by the communists. Their primary objective was to liberate Greece from the Germans fighting both in the cities and in the mountains, with its army ELAS. Their long term ambitions were to be involved in politics, after the war (Pantelouris:1987:78). Nonetheless, EAM's membership was large and broad: young, old, men, women, refugees from Asia Minor, children and villagers broadly joined EAM; they simply wanted to resist the Nazis. EAM's popularity transformed it into a progressive social movement, where people from different social and economic classes, ages and background participated actively in Resistance (Hart:1990:96). Women played a very important role in that period of ethnic crisis (Photo 24). Many women were imprisoned, tortured, exiled or died while actively participated in the Greek Resistance (Hart:1998). By the end of the War in July 1944, a large majority of people had aligned with EAM; also ELAS had become a paramount force. The British-American allies shared a fear that a People's Republic would be established in Greece due to EAM/ELAS great influence. Campbell and Sherrard (1968:174-5) wrote that "although the majority of those enrolled in EAM/ELAS were not Communists, the ultimate control of the movement which it had originally created was never lost by the KKE" (Greek Communist Party). In December 1944 an initially planned peaceful demonstration in Athens turned into a bloody event where the communists were slaughtered by the British under Churchill's command: "Ta Dekemvriana", the city-battles which followed lasted one month. It ended with the withdrawal of ELAS from the capital and it was only the beginning of the manhunt for the Communists. With both the political agreements of Kazerta (in September 1944) and Varkiza (February 1945) all the members of EAM and ELAS had to hand over their weapons and leave internal political affairs in the hands of the allies who wanted to bring the king and his government back (Woodhouse: 1968:253; Campbell and Sherrard:1968:181; Richter:1986; latrides:1981:186).

Despite all the compromises and reassurances, unofficial right-wing persecution of the Left continued. A plebiscite concerning the return of the kingship in Greece was held in 1946. The electoral system of Greece demands of every individual to have a special voting booklet in order to register for voting on elections day, apart from the official elector registers. (When one appears in the polling station to vote, the voting booklet should be valid: no pages missing or
stamps from the last election missing). The Central Committee of the KKE (Communist Party of Greece) had decided to abstain from those elections as a protest at the terrorist actions of the far right's paramilitary militia groups TEA (Tagmatasfalites) (Iatrides:1981:183). After that, official persecution of the Left also started. The Right wing allowed the TEA to persecute the "internal enemies" (i.e. the Communists who had not voted in the 1946 elections) simply by looking at their voting booklets (showing no stamp from the polling station for the last election). In the autumn of 1946 civil war broke out. The remains of ELAS, together with the lukewarm support of the Communist Party (KKE), began fighting the right wing army in the mountains. The first round ended with the shattering of the Left in 1949 and the imprisonment of more than one million partisans; a second round of the Partisan's Rebellion was crushed by 1951 (Collard:1993:388). Evrytanla was once again on the path of the cyclone (see Photos 21-26). Both sides fought with passion and cruelty; the civil war cost thousands lives of people. The corollaries from the antartes (guerrillas) defeat by the governmental army was critical for the formation of the modern Greek state. Political power was transferred from the Left to the Right wing, while a huge wave of refugees left for the Eastern European countries (Pantelouris:1980/1987:79).

Resistance cost a high price for this county: Evrytanla suffered in the long term from devastation, poverty and abandonment. Many of its people left their houses, lands and villages either because the governmental army was evacuating the area or emigrating to more friendly countries after being stigmatised as left wing. Families were divided, as their members had fought or supported opposite sides. The people who returned to their villages had to confront the consequences of their actions during the civil war. Collard (1993:362) writes that the lived experience of the villagers of Evrytanla includes war, death, resistance, civil war and economic crisis. This form of experience forces people to think in new ways, to reconsider for example the interrelation of forces of law, economy even kinship. The Civil War occasioned a radical transformation in the life of the village, in just a three year period. It also meant the end of old times and the beginning of new times, as being the intersection for several levels of life: social, demographical, topographical, agricultural relationships changed.
The Ottoman period, as a form of myth of origin (resistance and klephtes) denotes the outset of the village life, together with the inequalities of wealth and power, the ethnic culture and patriotism, Hellenic heroism and the idea of a united nation (i.e. ethnos). In contrast to all these, the Civil War expresses the very real oncoming turbulence and the discontinuity between the past and the present (Collard:1993:379-80). However, the Resistance against the Germans is related to the resistance against the Turks and the emergence of the ethnic identity. It is worth mentioning the Greek word ethnos which is largely used to imply the Resistance against the invaders. Ethnos is related to the notion of one united Greek nation, thus the adjective describing the resistance from 1941 to 1944 is Ethnikl, meaning National. The silence covering the Resistance and the Civil War which followed is broken: the Greek ethnos celebrates the National Resistance (i.e. Ethnikl Antistas) from 1981 when the Resistance against the Germans was Institutionalised as a national holiday.
II. The need for historical sources

The necessity for the use of historical sources, both documentary and oral, is twofold: on the one hand, it is closely related to the physical characteristics of Evrytania, and on the other the historical facts are interrelated to the locals' memories and their sense of identity. The geographical peculiarity (as it has been earlier described) that various aspects of the county of Evrytania present is related to an historical singularity. The region, due to its physical protection and isolation, is well known to be a shelter in critical eras. Woodhouse clarified in his book "Modern Greece: A Short History" (1968/1991) how two distant historical periods have shared the same features. The era of Ottoman occupation (1453-1832) parallels that of the Second National Crisis (1941-1952). Groups of armed bandits (klephtes and antartes respectively) took shelter in the "wild" mountains and isolated villages of Evrytania which is part of the wider area of Rumell.

On the other hand, in Greece, history can be considered at both the national and the local level, while the interpretations between them often vary. Epstein (1978:xiii-xiv) argued that "history is providing people with a perception of their past, enabling them through the selective stressing of certain values to make positive identifications with their forebears" [emphasis added]. People's use of a terrain is selective: for example, in Scotland, mountains have not necessarily been used as locations for "bandits" and political struggles.

This way history is very important for the continuity of ethnic identity. At the national level history is related to the recognition of the role of the National Resistance (EAM-ELAS) in Greece which was established in 1942 after the regular army broke up and capitulated to the Germans. The National Resistance was not officially recognised until 1981 with the elections of the Papandreou Government (Collard:1993:388). Clogg (1983:8) reports that the synthesis of the PASOK (Pan Hellenic Socialist Movement) represents the fission of three successive historical traditions: a) that of the wartime resistance, and especially EAM (National Liberation Front); b) that of the 1961-7 Centre Union and especially the 1965-7 centre-left; and c) that of the resistance against the 1967-74 military dictatorship.
The silence covering the Civil War broke when a left wing party was elected for the first time in 1981. This is not a coincidence: Civil War was presented by the right-wing politicians who governed Greece for many years as a "Rebels War" (i.e. Communists' War, Simmoritopolemos - where the all the rebels were related to the Communists who, after the Germans Occupation, were a politically growing party, and there was fear that they may be elected and govern Greece after the Liberation). Kenna (1992a:150) has noticed people's silence at the early stage of her fieldwork: the people were politically cautious before the socialist government of Papandreou had been in power. Only after 1981 with the official recognition of the National Resistance (the Papandreou government issued war pensions to those who had joined the National Resistance), the people started hesitantly to speak about the Civil War. Campbell and Sherrard (1968:174-175) claimed that "although the majority of those enrolled in EAM/ELAS were not communists" the creation and control of these movements were held by the KKE (Greek Communist Party). This is the reason why those who had joined the National Resistance were continuously chased, imprisoned and exiled, losing their jobs and were utterly stigmatised from 1944. Handman claims that it is no wonder that under these circumstances those who were active members of EAM or ELAS (having fought for theirs patria liberation) had to defend even cover themselves for keeping affiliations with the partisans during the first or the second round of Antartiko. She argues (1990:60) that "this is how the veil of secrecy covering peoples' actions of Resistance can be explained". The silence covering the Civil War in the village where Handman did her research still "remains lively in the memory of everybody" (ibld.:58-59, original in Greek). She also comments that she never wanted to ask particular questions about Emfilio (i.e. Civil War) out of fear of spreading a sense of distrust in every issue she wanted to scrutinise. What she was hearing about the War was confusing and incoherent, nonetheless she argues that

It is obvious that the years from 1941 to 1949, but especially 1946-1949, deeply marked the people of Pournari and to some extent composed the intersection between yesterday and today

(Handman:1990:58).
Kenna, while describing her first visit in Nisos in 1966, admits she was "innocent" and brought up to speak out for those such as the political left-wing exiles who lived in the island in the 1930s. Twenty years later, in the 1980s, during her third visit she recognised the importance of people's free talk, particularly those who were politically orientated to the Left, as much as their earlier silence, which was related to a quite long period of persecutions (exile, prison, even executions of the left) by the right-wing governmental forces from the 1950s to 1970s.

In Evrytania the extent to which people suppress one section of history (the Civil War - an internal conflict for example), is related to the elaboration of another period of history. It is noteworthy that the chronology of time is not important as people may choose to "remember" a pre 1941 era. At a local level the selections and the choices of historical material or facts people opt to remember and/or to narrate are also crucial for their local Identity. Karpenisi, the capital of the county of Evrytania, has always been a scene of major conflicts. First, it was burned during the Ottoman rule; therefore, oral history became part of people's lives for many centuries. When Karpenisi was burned by the Germans during the German Occupation in Greece in 1944 - as a revenge for the Greek resistance against them - (Photo 25) all the official documents, municipal rolls, registry offices, birth/death certificates, notarial deeds were destroyed. The recovery of lost documents and the reconstruction of a lost archive prove to be one very poignant reason for the locals' enthusiasm about filling in my questionnaires for everyone else instead of themselves.

The Civil War gave people the chance to settle a lot of personal accounts (Handman:1990:63). In this context, it was easy for other conflicts with the neighbours and among the villagers to be used as pleas for the alignment with one group or faction and the quest of personal revenge to be reckoned as the characteristic of the ethnic civil war (Collard:1987:362). The deeper causes for this lie in the area's geographical peculiarity. This turned the area into a centre of the anti-nazi movement: in Evrytania, the space transformed the people who joined what was broadly known as the Resistance movement, into disciplined rebels. It did not matter if they were locals or if they were coming from other places of Greece, as they fought together against the Italians and Germans.
Here in the remote mountains of Evrytanla emerged for the first time under the Germans' Occupation the first Free Government of the Mountains (Proti Elefteri Kivemisi tou Vounou). While Greece was ruled under the Occupational Government (Katochiki Kivemisi) in Athens and many politicians who had fled the country to Cairo or London and lived in exile, members of EAM formed the Political Committee of National Liberation (Politiki Epitropi Ethnikis Apeleutherosis) in 1944, in the village of Viniani. In the short period of its government, from March to December 1944, the Free Government of the Mountains (of Evrytanla) issued bank-notes, stamps, passed bills, held elections (where the women voted for the first time in Greece), organised schools, civil services, communications, indeed established the institution of self-government. These questions are of great weight for they were applied in Evrytanla which had a precedent in local government and autonomy. After the Germans' retreat from Greece and the breaking off of the Free Government and the ELAS, many people who were active in the Resistance by fighting or as members of local Committees or who were just keen on those who supported the Resistance, found themselves involved in a conflict of either fighting in the newly reformed governmental - ethnic army their own brothers or villagers, or being persecuted as members of the left. To an extent this was the reason that the broader accession of the area in EAM-ELAS was particularly difficult (Collard:1987:361, 1993:358).

People's silence became an everyday practice. As the governmental forces took the command back patronised by foreign allies, the majority of people who had fought for Greece found it hard to give their consent about the distortion of their feelings about Liberation. The official line presented those who had fought as victims of the Reds, of an anti-Hellenic, thus, anti-national movement, and not as the heroes of a Resistance movement (as is the case of the maquis in France's Resistance against the Germans). People felt deceived, cheated and emptied of their simple pains, labours and sacrifices. As the years went by, one can track down the losses in every single Greek family due to the evolution of the Civil War: losses in property, estate, land, possessions, people's executions, imprisonment, exiles, migrations, and also losses of ideals, memories and history. For many decades oral history was recognised as the only valid historical source for those turbulent times, between 1941 and 1951; oral history was based for many years mainly on people's testimonies.
Only relatively recently people started to document their own personal testimonies and non "official" (meaning non right-wing oriented) history. That is the reason why Evrytanla's historical "facts" do not coincide with one another. People's personal interests, benefits and choices obscure, stress or alter the historical "objectivity". Perhaps the term "oral" history when and where it is used in this context is inappropriate. But there is no other term found yet, to express this eloquent silence practised for many decades by many who now have started to debate about their rights as being resistants (antisasiaki) and not necessarily reds or communists or bandits-rebels (listosimorites) or not even soldiers in the governmental forces.

Collard did her research among six villages of Evrytanla, Northwest of Karpenisi. She also wondered about the reasons why the inhabitants of the mountainous villages have chosen to remember some definite historical periods or facts (instead of others):

For me it was an enigma why only these periods had been selected from memory, while others in spite of appearing turbulent and decisive (periods) as well remained under stressed (Collard:1993:359).

Collard realised that people would talk only about some of the periods selectively, so she went on to speak about collective memory. She argues that collective memory gives certain historical elements for generating an "active" past, which are interesting enough without being substitutes for the absence of other written sources. For underlying the fact that every village has its own history, Collard (1993:357) (original text in Greek, translated by me) uses the term "concrete history", referring to a history which appertains to these villages, for every village had its own experiences from the war years. The term also referred to the way in which this history is shaped and chosen in definite ways by the locals.

While Collard was doing her research she came across three decisive periods the locals used to divide their historical past, therefore she labelled them according to the way they are related to the "concrete history" of Evrytanla (Collard:1993:358). The first was the period from the late eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century where Greece was under the rule of the
Ottomans. The second was the decade of the 1930s and the beginning of the 1940s where Greece joined the Second World War and was occupied by the Germans (1941-44). During both periods the peasants were opposed to the state and the enforced forms of "self-government". Finally, the third period is the Civil War (1946-49) a notable period of social and political turbulence, where the evacuation of the villages by governmental forces and the removal of their populations to neighbouring urban centres took place. It is the memories from the past which can provide us with some terms for understanding the historical process. At the same time, the collective memory affects this process: the identity of the village in a particular way, because the collective memory initially represents how exactly "history" is lived and experienced in reality, then how it transforms and finally how it is used in the present. For these reasons we can follow Collard's (1993:360 original text in Greek translated by me) identification of four characteristics of collective memory:

1) Firstly, collective memory is individualised and personalised; it is a kind of biography, but a biography disguised as an event with an historical context.

2) Secondly, collective memory is common to a group of people who share a history to the extent that they all agree.

3) Thirdly, collective memory is popular to an extent that it does not inevitably agree with the dominant, public or official historical representations. Nonetheless, it is interrelated to them as well as affected by them. There is no kind of chronology, they are omissions in time and dates, as they also are different scales of time. For example, the Ottoman past preceding directly - immediately the present (now), with the former which is related via a dichotomy of time.

4) Finally, collective memory is social because it emerges from the social environment: it comes not from genealogy, not from the life circle or not even from the "history of the village" (with its special seasons, festivals etc.) but it comes from the social consequences of the history itself.

Today, it is recognized that one cannot separate any part of the Civil War; no side of it, neither the right nor the left, can be isolated or silenced any more. At last, forty years later, the bits of this ethnic puzzle have found their positions.
A more realistic scene of the neglected Civil War emerges. Responsible for this is the role of all the peoples who experienced that period and marked their existence. Time and place and history and the way they feel about it broke the spell of its suppression. In conclusion, we can stress that people's exit from their silence concerning the period of the Civil War shows that the Greeks now want to create again the lost record of that muzzled period of their history. They also want to put their communities back on the map of history, the former being closely interwoven with their sense of identity: memories about themselves put in time and place.
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From: Spiros Meletzis, 1976 *Me tous antartes sta Youna*, Athina, page 46

(A Photographic Collection from the period of 1940 to 1947).

*Photo by Spiros Meletzis*

*Karpenisi burnt by the Germans, August 1944*
The school of Koryskhades, a few kilometres from Trano and Karpenisi. Here the Government of the Mountains convened their Committee for the National Resistance against the Germans, in May 1944. This photograph was taken by the researcher in May 1997. One can see in the background of the picture a modern white car parked in the street above the Museum. The School of Koryskhades has been turned into a Museum and every year in May the local authorities celebrate the National Assembly of PEEA (Politiki Epirtopi Ethnikis Apeleterosis). It is worthwhile to notice the sign attached to the Museum; it says "Epidaurus 1821 - Koryskhades 1944" and connects two different historical periods in which the Greeks fought for their liberation from the foreign yoke.

(Malenou, 1997)

The caption refers to the period between 1943 and 1944 when different Greek resistance forces were fighting united against the Germans.

EDES and ELAS guerrillas in a mixed group.
From: Spiros Meletzis, 1976 *Me tous antartes sta Vouna*, Athina, page 16

(A Photographic Collection from the period of 1940 to 1947).

*Photo by Spiros Meletzis*

1947 Evrytania: Bandits dressed in the traditional kilt of the shepherds of Agrafa in the autumn of 1946 Civil War broke out: the remains of ELAS, together with the lukewarm support of the Communist Party (KKE), began fighting the right wing army in the mountains.
In the village of Trano the school was transformed into a hospital for the Antartes of ELAS, February 1944. The villagers still remember this period although they are not very keen to speak freely about it. "What do you want (to hear) now? It's past..." (Ti ta thelis tora afta; Pane perasan...).
PHOTO 26

From: Kenneth Matthews 1972 *Memories of a mountain War Greece: 1941-1949*
London: Longmans.
Plate 15 facing page 160

Government troops on patrol: Karpenisi, Central Greece
CHAPTER 4 Migration and Identity

According to Agar the old ethnographic tradition focused on communities, where people were apparently "hanging independently in space and time" (Agar:1996:4). The "reflexive turn" in the discipline happened in the 1980s and since then the notion of the isolated group of people has been challenged as the one, moreover, delusional model for research. Agar (ibid.:6-7) writes about the new ethnography which now "considers the political and personal circumstances of the research, views the local group as a diverse crowd in a world life of blurred edges, and foregrounds how larger historical currents fill the study with life". Wolf in his book, Europe and the People without History (1982), exemplifies how for the last 500 years, so-called isolated communities have had universal interactions in both political and economic terms. Agar (1996:4) also stresses how anthropologists started by viewing the communities more as parts of the world: "Communities don't have edges; they're part of larger worlds. And communities don't stay the same; they change continuously, often in a struggle with forces well beyond their control". Even if Agar's perspective may have been somewhat naive, the point to be made is that the so-called isolated communities have had universal interactions in both political and economic terms. Their interactions emerged from the close observation of those communities under study.

The key tool for the study of those isolated communities was introduced by Malinowski in his epic monograph "The Argonauts of the Western Pacific" (1922) and later became known as "participant observation". For some anthropologists, participant observation was considered only appropriate for bounded isolated communities. Later research has proved them to be wrong. Fog Olwig and Hastrup (1997:3) have stressed that people live now in "an era of apparent globalization" but they also agreed that "the concept of cultural wholes is still very much with us". In order to avoid discarding the notion of culture under study, the anthropologist should consider "reinventing" it: the new tool they suggest is the "siting of culture", i.e. studying the experiences from the sometimes incoherent and unrelated places in which people live or even invent. Fog Olwig (1997:17) challenges the idea of a fixed space or place for culture. She wonders how the Nevisian culture "always seemed to be where I was not", stressing this way the widespread location of the Nevisians people all over the world - from their tiny
Island in the Caribbean Sea (where she initially did her research) to Leeds, England in another continent (where she continued her research). Nowadays, this global movement of populations can be relevant to other communities all over the universe. Fog Olwig's innovative approach in this context is that she looks at the various sites (which are institutions related to a settled way of life usually) where people of the same origin live and then she stresses the continuous interrelation of their presence and/or absence for the formation of their community. This new discussions for the key issues of anthropology that look to notions of identity, place and space, migration and the manipulation of the choices the people have are appropriate to this study.

For many decades, even centuries, Evrytaina's localism has always been represented in different contexts, such as those of other cities abroad (e.g. Konstantinople, Smyrna, New York, Washington DC., Johannesburg, etc.) or cities situated in Greece (like Karpenisi, Agrinio, Messolonghi, Lamia, Athens, Volos, Thessaloniki, etc.). Participant observation was the main (and evidently most successful) method for the material which I gathered by means of fieldwork (not just but also) in the locality of Tranio. I also used informal interviews and visited other places for occasional events which took place elsewhere than the village (such as in Karpenisi, Messolonghi, Lamia, Athens or Thessaloniki) where the migrants of Tranio are scattered. My attempts to apply "more sophisticated" research tools to my research, such as the questionnaire (Project 1) and Wallman's spatial map (Project 2) proved all but futile: they never worked, not in the way I had initially planned them. However, participant observation, informal interviews, questionnaires et.al. are not the only tools for the anthropologist to use: "the various ways in which people represent what they perceive as their culture" which many times seem to "reflect contested ideas" are worth consideration (Fog Olwig and Hastrup:1997:10).

Concerning Greece and Europe, migration as both a phenomenon and a process has been instrumental in the formation of the social, demographical, economic, political and cultural reality of our era (Mousourou:1991:9). For many centuries migration in Greece was a result of different factors: economic, religious or political. Many different forms of migration have been presented; such as internal or external, voluntary or forced, those of circular, seasonal or commuter, the temporary or permanent and step or chain migration (Costa:1988:180;
Mousourou:1991:19). In order to distinguish different forms of migration, the theorists have used different approaches in relation to the various aspects of life. Gonzalez (1970:11), for example, relates different types of labour migration to their effects on family organization. In this way she attempts to distinguish migration as seasonal or non-seasonal, from recurrent to continuous and from temporary to permanent removal.

Others have related migrant movement to the demand for labour. Chant (1992:10), particularly, describes four types of migration: (i) the seasonal, (ii) the oscillating or "short-term circular migration", which occurs when one repeatedly migrates for a shorter period than the seasonal (i.e. from just one day to three months); (iii) the relay migration, which happens when different members of one family migrate to work in external labour markets but at different points in their life cycle and finally (iv), the circular or return migration, that is a longer-term population movement which ends up when the migrants return home.

A quite recent and interesting approach is that of Poerregaard who uses the degree of the attachment to one's native place in her continuum, enlarging this way the classical approach towards forms of migration. In her article Poerregaard (1997:42) describes four categories of migrants: first, there is the drop-out migrant, who has left the village for good and who has no contact with his/her fellow villagers; secondly, the visiting migrant who resides outside the native village but travels and spends time there at intervals; then, there is the returning migrant, who has returned to settle in the village after a longer period of time outside; and finally, the non-visiting migrant, who has never left the village, therefore, he has no previous migration experience at all. This classification seems to fit with the categories of migrants of Trano. The majority of migrants are visiting migrants: they are men and women, younger and older. There are also a few returning migrants who settle in the village either at an early stage of their lives, young people who decided to abandon life in the city after they finished their studies or army obligations or at a rather final stage of their lives, i.e. after they became pensioners. Both categories exploit the opportunity their houses in the village provide them. They have a place to live and they already know (or they think they know) they way life in the village is.
Since antiquity the Greeks practised migration. Pantelouris (1980/1987:135-136) confirmed that "in ancient times there was always an outflow of people from the main Greek metropolis to daughter colonies - cities all along the northern coast of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea". From the middle fifteenth to the late nineteenth century migration became transformed more into a means of survival. The Greeks migrated to establish enterprises away from their native cities and they acted as a link between the Western and the Eastern markets of the Ottoman Empire (Pantelouris:ibid.). Woodhouse argued that Greek migration had started from the early days of the Ottoman Occupation, although it did not continue later, but for a different reason: the Turks used mass-deportations as a strategy for exterminating the Greeks altogether. "Hence came the movement of Greeks out of the towns, the renewed influx of Albanians into Greece and the re-population of Constantinople from Serbia, Albania and Greece (Woodhouse:1991:105). Woodhouse (ibid.) also stated that the conditions of life under the Ottoman rule were the only reason for migration: the moving did not happen merely due to the Sultans' enforcement, but it was also a voluntary act. The total indifference of the Ottoman Empire towards its subjects led the initially discontent and later desperate Greeks to migration.

Philpott (1970:11) described the migrants' ideology as "the cognitive model a migrant has about the nature and goals of his migration". He exemplified this model by the case of the West Indians who were living in Britain in the 1970s. The West Indians held a strong belief about their forthcoming (even in long terms) return to their native land. This belief, therefore, carries a dual aspect: It determines their relationships with the people who are still living back home and It also affects the whole of the home community. Another implication also emerges from the sets of expectations the migrants have. That is their impact on their adopted community. Sending money home, for example, determines not only the relations with the home community but also the way the migrant is socialized in the community in which she or he now lives. Under this light, the migrant's identity could be seen as a continuum of the migrant's commitment and orientation, on the one hand towards the sending society and on the other towards the host society. This continuum can affect the migrants' identity as the conditions in the host society one lives in can alter or prevent the attainment of its perceived code (ibid.:12).
It seems that the main reason for Greek migration (individual or together with their families) has always been the quest for improving their economic situation. In all cases, however, the Greek who left his or her place of origin remained always attached and kept contact with it. This necessity together with this attitude may be widespread: the Nevislan migrants leave their island for equivalent reasons to the objectives of the Greek migrants. A recent approach to the issue of migration is Fog Olwig's study of the Nevislans, the people of a small Caribbean island. Fog Olwig chooses to analyze the social process of migration in terms of a deterritorialized world, as nowadays people of the same origin live in different continents all over the world. She looks at the "physically present" people who in the village hope to emigrate in order to improve their social and economic situation and acquire money to build a home and support their own families, while those who are "physically absent" from the village maintain ties with both the village and their families by investing their money back and they hope that one day will return home (Fog Olwig:1997:23).

There are some similarities in her approach with my analysis about the migrants' identity. In Trano, the migrants while being "physically absent" turn into "physically present" every period of Greek elections, both national or local. Their appearance counts a lot for the result of the elections. There are more than a few who believe that the migrants' decisions which affect the life in the village, are by no means their right: "What we should do? It is them who come every time (at elections) and decide who is going to be elected. Of course, they do not live here all year round, so they don't really know what the problems really are. But there are more than us. The village needs a person to be a president) that would care for the villages' needs and not for showing off every summer when they come around". It is evident that migrants and locals claim the same share of the locality even if they are present or absent. But it is obvious that in this case the numerical superiority of the migrants over the locals will decide the outcome of elections.

People emigrated from Evrytanla in four different periods. The pioneers seemed to be those who went to Constantinople during the nineteenth century. The second period in the beginning of the twentieth century saw a quite constant emigration to urban areas of Greece, like Athens but also abroad such as the...
USA. The third stream of emigration occurred during the very dramatic political period of the Civil War (1947-51) when many of the Left migrated to Eastern Europe (Albania, Yugoslavia, Romania, Poland or the Soviet Union). The final wave, in the 1960s, was an intense emigration both to Western Europe (particularly Germany) due to its special economic needs and the availability of jobs for guest workers and also to other parts of Greece where the domestic industrial development was boosted by an influx of foreign investment.

### TABLE ONE

(Malenou, 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>DESTINATION</th>
<th>REASON</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Early 19th century</td>
<td>Constantinople</td>
<td>economic</td>
<td>only men (single/newly married)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>who were hoping to gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prosperity by leaving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 1880-1930</td>
<td>The USA-urban centres</td>
<td>economic</td>
<td>only men (single)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poverty is what the migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>were hoping to leave behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. 1940-1951</td>
<td>Eastern Europe-politics</td>
<td>politics</td>
<td>Individual / families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. 1951-1971</td>
<td>Western Europe-Athens-The USA</td>
<td>economic</td>
<td>families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. The Pioneers - First period of migration (19th century)

It is known that since the late nineteenth century (if not earlier) many Tranlots had migrated to Poll - "the City" as Constantinople, i.e. the city of the Emperor Constantinos was known (Michiotis:1990:98-99,170). They left behind them the harsh way of village life and went to look for a better future in economic terms. The first migrants of Trano were men who usually left a family and a house in the village where they returned in some cases after 15 or 20 years. If the case was that they had hardly anything before migration, they worked and saved their lires (sovereigns) in order to get married and build a house when they returned from Poll. An article published in the periodical of the migrants of Trano (/ Foni tou Meyaliou Choriou:1989-90:11-12) bears the main title "The links of the Tranlots with the City" where the villagers' continuous movement to Poll is described:

"Since 1850, and even earlier, for many of our fellow villagers who decided to migrate, Poll was their destination. In the course of time our village attained cultural and other links to the city of Constantinople. Until 1920 Poll was almost the only place for emigration for the Tranlots; nearly one out of three men emigrated there to "get rich". In one period of the last century between 1880 and 1915 almost two out of three young men went to Poll for shorter or longer periods hoping to gain prosperity. Under the weight of the economic degradation of Greek provincial life, emigration to Poll was considered as a necessary evil. Just a few months after their marriage, many village men left for foreign lands leaving behind them newly married women and unborn children who would not be acquainted with their fathers for many years - 20 or even 30 if they were lucky! For a voyage to Poll approximately 45 days were demanded: travelling by cart and with muleteers all this time...).

Today, in the village of Trano there are many descendants of those early migrants who can confirm these stories. They live in two floor stone-houses that were built by their ancestors from the money they earned in Poll and brought back to the village. The extensive building activity of the two floor stone-houses in the village during the first two decades of the twentieth century is evidence of
the widespread strategy of migration during that period. The influence and impact of the Turkish mentality and of the culture that the migrants obtained in Poll is obvious and visible in the architecture of many manor-houses in the village. For example, the construction of high walls as a fence for the house resembles those which surrounded the houses at Poll, for keeping the women out of the male's sight. Only the houses built with the money of the migrants from Poll have until today high stone fences. The majority of them kept them low in order to communicate with each other.

Migration from the village of Trano to Constantinople was largely exercised by men during the nineteenth and the early twentieth century. This phenomenon has not only been happening in the area of the Sterea Ellada: there are a lot of accounts of migration to Constantinople from different regions of Greece; between the latter half of the 1800s and early 1900s many regions were not yet annexed to Greece, but still their inhabitants followed the migration route to Constantinople. A reference in Costa (1988:168) who studied the case of the island of Cephallonia shows that "a direct relation existed between the external economic and political events and the trend for migration from the island" during that period (Napier cited in Costa). Costa writes about the middle classes who left Cephallonia in order to set up businesses elsewhere in Greece or abroad (Rumania was a favourite place for many Cephallonites); before they reached their final destination, however, they first went to Constantinople or Athens following this way "a step migration pattern which developed from earlier traditions of migration to these cities" (ibid.:1988:170).

Dubisch, writing about the Island of Tinos in which she did her research, notes that after 1856 a decline of the island's population commenced. She states (1977:69) that "it is difficult to say how old a pattern migration is for Tinos" and adds that in some areas of Greece as others had also stressed (Campbell 1964; Andromedas 1968), migration had been occurring for centuries. Dubisch (1977:70) also mentions migration to Constantinople: "most of the island's migrants at this earlier period went to "the City" (as they still call the city of Instabul), even though this was a Turkish city and Tinos was no longer a part of the Ottoman empire". The point to be made here is that in "the City" a very big community of migrants from all over Greece lived a very prosperous and successful life for many centuries until the Greek defeat in Asia Minor in 1922. It was at that time that emigration to
Constantinople ceased (Dubisch:ibid.). After the Catastrophe of Minor Asia in 1922, many of those who were living in Poll alone or with their families returned to re-establish themselves permanently in the village in fear of the Turks' reprisals.

The catastrophe of Asia Minor is worthwhile mentioning here. After the Greek liberation from the Ottoman Empire, the new Greek state was aiming to re-unite all the lost territories around the Sterea Ellada. For a few years and with the Interference of the Great Powers, many treaties were completed and the Greek state appeared to be growing. The beginning of the new century (20th) found all the Orthodox Christians spread around the Aegean Sea trying to be united with their motherland. Keeping pace with the "Great Idea" the people who lived in the coastline of Asia Minor and Constantinople believed, together with the Greeks who lived in the mainland, that the time for unification had come. Clogg (1992:3) stresses that

this vision, which aspired to the unification of all areas of Greek settlement in the Near East within the bounds of a single state with its capital in Constantinople, dominated the independent state during the first century of its existence.

As Greece appeared to be an emerging political power among Eastern Mediterranean countries, the realisation of the "Great Idea" seemed no longer a fantasy (Clogg:1992:73,85). The Asia Minor campaign involved many Greeks who fought there in order to win back their lost territories. The Greek forces managed to march as far as Afyonkarahisar, but they were defeated by Kemal Ataturk's army on all their fronts. The grand vision for the "Great Idea" collapsed as the march of the Greek army ended in disaster. The Nelryi and Lausanne Treaties dealt with the emergency movement of populations: while 400,000 Turks and Bulgars left Greece (Mousourou:1991:27), one and a half million refugees from Asia Minor were forced to enter Greece (Hirschon and Thakurdesal:1970:187; Mousourou:ibid.). Their "Exodus" from Asia Minor in 1922 is still recognized as a black moment for the history of Greece. All the Greek hopes for uniting the widespread Greek speaking and Orthodox communities into one ethnic state were annihilated. The wave of refugees in this period should be looked at in comparison with the general context of the Greek population as it was in the 1920s (estimated to 5,000,000). This also meant that the Greek state was now faced with tremendous settlement problems due to the compulsory exchange of
population that followed; the formation and development of modern Greece have been affected by these events. Hirschon (1970; 1978; 1981; 1982; 1983a; 1983b; 1985) who did her fieldwork among the Minor Asian refugees in Piraeus in the 1970s notes that the Asia Minor refugees, while primarily identifying themselves as Greeks, were also expressing their different cultural backgrounds. Their use of space revealed both continuities and flexibilities.

II. Urban Centres and the USA - Second period of migration (1880-1930)

The second period of internal migration is related to the early urbanisation of Greece, which was already observable in the late 19th century. Migration to the USA was also a product of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The main reason for migration in this second period remains the same as in the first one: the lack of opportunities in Greece and the quest for better ones in the USA. Saloutos (1964:1) has written in a lively way about emigration from Greece stating that

(t)he immigrants came from a country that had a population of slightly more than 2.5 million, a land that was scenic and appealing, the possessor of a proud history and traditions, but also a nation of peasants and poverty.

A characteristic of this period is that men migrated individually for the larger part of their actively productive life but the immigrants were expected to return to their homeland (Saloutos:1964:21). The farmers were forced to leave, due to the lack of economic opportunities in the area and were attracted by job opportunities elsewhere. This period can be sub-divided into three different periods. During the 1880s 2,300 people migrated to the USA (Mousourou:1991:31). Between the 1890s and the 1920s 330,000 people migrated in total, of whom 95% were immigrants to the USA. This mass exodus was due to the worsening economic situation of the Greek state. It is also significant that at that time the Greeks were the last European ethnic unit to emigrate to the USA. The Irish, the Italians and the Polish had preceded migrating there, leaving the Greeks with a
dual disadvantage: they were not Anglo-Saxons, therefore they could not speak English and they were later delayed so they found fewer opportunities. Migration to the USA meant men's entrance to the lowest rank of working class. For these reasons the American officials living in Athens expressed considerable fears about this extensive migration: the Greek immigrants were uninformed, disorientated, without any knowledge of the language and without particular expectations about the culture in which they were going to integrate, i.e. the U.S.A.

The Greek knows nothing of the desires and wants which in other countries led men to give up home and friends in anticipation of better things to be gained in the New World. (Saloutos: 1964: 26).

Saloutos (1964: 45) also presented some figures describing the Greek migration in the USA as a geometrically increased progression: 15,979 people migrated in the 1890s, while from 1900 to 1910 their number proliferated to that of the 167,519 people. Obviously, the biggest boom in the initial wave of migration occurred between 1907 and 1920, then declined, possibly as a result of the abrupt change in USA immigration policy after 1921. In 1922 under the influence of the drastic measures the USA government took for controlling entrance in the USA, the Greek overseas migration diminished and the Greek migrants turned to other places such as the Canada, Australia and African countries or other transoceanic lands (Mousourou: 1991: 32; Clogg: 1992: 136).

On the one hand, the emigrants' remittances replaced visits and became an important source of income in the area (Saloutos: 1964: 39). Philpott (1970: 10) has also stressed the fact that migration can work as a factor in the maintenance of "traditional" societies when the interrelation with the migrant and its village is not interrupted and the migrants' efforts are directed to both their families' and villages' utility. In this way, migration to the USA in its early stage helped many mountain villages to maintain their traditional ways of life (Mc Nell: 1978: 87 cited in Collard: 1987: 360).

At the same time, the great distances involved made the return to the village impossible, a fact which had economic as well as social consequences. The extent of transportation costs is another factor which affects the selectivity of migration. Philpott (1970: 10-11) argues that
when the provision of passage money by initial members for family members left behind becomes established as part of family obligations, the result is "chain migration" and the degree of selectivity may be considerably reduced.

In Greece many male migrants were married before they left, often leaving a pregnant wife in the village. Others, who could afford to return to the village, became married to local girls, who were, nonetheless, usually left behind when the emigrant returned to his adoptive home. In some cases, a boy from the village could later go and join his father abroad. This practice was common for both those who migrated to other cities in Greece - who returned to the village quite regularly - and those who had taken the larger step of migration to the USA.

On the other hand, women were forced to undertake the full responsibility for farming the family's land, as often they did not see their husbands for many years (Saloutos:1964:27). Consequently, farming became largely the women's responsibility; or sometimes that of the growing family (many illegitimate children were born while the men were absent). This explains how production was maintained over this period in spite of large-scale emigration. It was possible for women, with the money sent home by their husbands, to hire labourers if they were available, enabling them to maintain an acceptable standard of living.

Generally, the norm was for a young woman to work in both her own fields and her husband's, with her mother-in-law and her sisters-in-law, whilst also relying on moneys that their husbands managed to send home. A common complaint from women who spent their lifetime in such a way was that they didn't feel married to their husbands but rather their mothers-in-law (Collard:1987:359-360).

Kasdan (Spencer:1970:2) in his Introduction enumerates Numelin's six "stimuli" of migration. Written in 1937 by Numelin "The Wandering Spirit" gives, as a first factor for migration, the geographical conditions of an area which, when in combination with the need of food, drive people to migration. This applies to the already mentioned poor and underdeveloped county of Evrytanla where a permanent conflict existed between those who relied on agriculture and those who practised animal husbandry for their subsistence (Collard:1987:258-359). In the northern part of the county of Evrytanla, the Sarakatsani who were the nomad shepherds studied by Campbell (1964) used the grasslands of Agrafa for grazing.
their flocks in the summers. In the 1930s a government policy of Metaxas encouraged the shepherds to destroy their flocks through subsidy; the reason for that was the scarcity of working hands for the newly established industries. Millions of goats and sheep were slaughtered all over Greece. Consequently, the traditional shepherds became unemployed and abandoned their villages to look for a job in the city centres (Collard:1993:371).

The consequences for the gender division of labour for male migration were many for the local communities in Evrytania. The most important is that women became fully responsible for their households. First, they started working outside, in the fields, cultivating their crops; then, they raised alone (i.e. without a husband) their children; and finally, their families stopped growing. There is a joke still told in the village about that period: "Before the war, there were only a few old men living in the village. All the young had gone to find a job elsewhere. But, in every village remained one strong man, who irrigated the fields (neroforos). And because this work was to be done at nights, he was a very lucky man, for he was wanted not just for his water but for ... other needs the married women in the village had. It is a shame that a nice profession like this eclipsed!"

With this anecdote, one can understand the extension of the male migration of that period and its consequences for the local society. The most important aspect, still remains women's labour at the fields in those times and elsewhere later when the economic profile of these communities had changed. That is perhaps why later, in the other periods of migration, all the family followed the individual's departure.
The Civil War - Third period of migration (1940-1951)

The post-war migration expresses the political and economic turmoil the world had been through during and after the Second World War years (Mousourou:1991:34). The changes in the details and in the characteristics of the post-war overseas migration are observable also in Greece. While, since 1821 to 1940, 511,191 people left Greece of whom 91% migrated to the USA, from 1946 to 1977, 507,465 people left Greece to go and live in another continent of whom only 33% (168,067) migrated to the USA. This striking decrease of the flow to the USA comes along with a turn for emigration to Australia: during the 1950s and the beginning of 1960s, almost 200,000 Greeks migrated to Australia. This migration happened in two waves: first the men (mainly single) left, and then the women (again mainly single) followed.

With regard to the population of Evrytania, this has steadily increased, approaching its highest point in 1940, that of 53,474 people. A dramatic decline occurred during the next three decades when about 24,000 people left Evrytania. This third period of migration was instrumental in depopulation for the mass of Evrytania. Between 1940 and 1951, 12,803 persons left the county and another 10,183 between 1961 and 1971 (Collard:1987:359). The first of these periods was closely related to the German occupation during the Second World War and it could be divided into two phases: in the first, the majority of the villages of Evrytania were evacuated by the Greek national army during the period of 1947-1950 (Collard:1989:93; 1993:367). The aim of this evacuation was to deprive the partisans' left movement of the source for potential recruits, supplies, and information. By then thousands of refugees had moved to Karpenisi and Lamia. The second phase, which is closely related to the first, was the immediate post-civil war period (Collard:1987:361).

From the perspective of the migrants' movements, the consequences of the war and the subsequent evacuation were two-fold. For many, especially women, this was the first encounter with life in the city and their first experience of a different way of life. Thus, when the government began the recolonization of the villages, in 1950, many people did not return (Collard:1989:98). However, the main reason for the depletion of the population had a political basis. Many left-
wing patriots were persecuted, imprisoned or exiled whilst others escaped to Eastern Europe, where they remained during and after the Civil War; others were simply afraid to return to their villages (Collard:1987:362, 1993:365). The upheavals caused by the polemic period and the human losses did not help agricultural production when the peasants finally returned to their land and from that period onwards cultivation and cattle-breeding declined.

IV. Internal and external migration - the final wave (1951-1971)

Migration began as a result of the assimilation of the downgraded rural areas into an expanded and wealthier nation-state, itself a consequence of a particular conjuncture of economic, social and historical forces, which are related to developments of the rest of Europe (Mouzelis cited in Collard:1987:363). In this context of governmental policy, migration abroad relieved the problem of rural unemployment (Collard:1987:363). This voluntary mass-migration characterizes this period but differs from earlier migration, in both cause and process, although the outcome, which is the depopulation of the Greek countryside remains the same (Costa:1988:159).

The Greek political leadership of the 1950s and 1960s committed a serious mistake by not taking advantage of Europe's revival, but instead, encouraged the traditional Greek attitude towards migration. There was a tendency to believe that people from particular areas of Greece such as Evrytanla, Laconia, and the islands of Kithira and Ithaka emigrated solely by tradition; this was not an unfounded allegation for in fact people from these areas had long ago practised migration. Other co-villagers had established an extensive network in distant wealthier areas (such as Constantinople or the USA) thus enabling others to follow for only one reason: to create a small fortune within a few years and then return to support their close kindred back home. The vast majority of them were led to leave for abroad because of the vision of a quick possibility of wealth. During these decades the state showed an unforgivably and offhand attitude towards the negative consequences of emigration, such as the devastation of the countryside and the loss of working potential for the country. The main
characteristic of this last period of migration was that it became more a matter for the whole family. Instead of the previous norm of solitary male emigration, men did not migrate alone, but increasingly they were followed by their wives and families; even the unmarried migrants returning to their village married local girls who also followed the migration route.

As a result of the civil war, people who lived in the countryside were confronting problems of unemployment and poverty. Emigration continued at a steady pace and with a great satisfaction migrants took advantage of the opportunities that the economic growth of Western Europe offered in the early 1960s. Between 1955 and 1977, 1,236,280 people left Greece of whom 61% (758,351) migrated to Western Europe (Mousourou:1991:48). The last wave of migration increased again during this period. Experiences from the war era sustained the development of a severe breach with the traditional way of village life (McNeill: 1978:93 cited in Collard:1987:362). Post-war modernisation, particularly the establishment of electricity in many areas of Greece, contributed to these changes. Migration to Western Germany, which took place in the early 1960s, further exacerbated the decline of agricultural production and, in fact, it created a labour shortage all over Greece (McNeill:1976:93 cited in Collard:1987:363, 1993:365). Stavrakis (1987:12) claims the reasons for this "ethnic haemorrhage", the extended Greek migration, are not unrelated to the war’s consequences and the complete tolerance if not encouragement by the state itself. Clogg (1992:137) concludes:

Whatever its form and geographical direction, constant emigration from Greece - mostly of able-bodied men - has profound effects on Greek society. Side by side with the losses of the war and frantic urbanisation, this emigration is at the root of the present demographic decline of the country.

In the 1970s the policy of migration changes for both the host countries and Greece stemming this way the tides of Greek migration. The economic conditions of the host countries create new conditions to which the prospective migrants adopted. Also in Greece, shifts in the political scene (i.e. the fall of the Colonels’ regime) change the social and economic status. For the first time, after the Civil War the frontier to the Eastern Europe "open". Some of the political migrants decide to return in Greece. However, the situation worsens in Evrytania. In 1991
its population has diminished by 10% compared to that of the 1981. Less than 20,000 people live there. Opportunities are difficult to be found in underdeveloped Evrytania, so still people move to the urban centres of Greece.

V. The Greek Diaspora

Many sociologists (Mousourou:1991; Stavrakis:1987) argue that in the 1990s another third of the total Greek population of twelve million people, i.e. four million live in Diaspora. According to Stavrakis the majority of the Greek emigrants, mainly those migrating to the English-speaking countries, as time goes by, feel alienated from their initial thoughts and dreams of a permanent return residence in Greece. He writes (Ibid.) that the main reasons for this phenomenon are first, the gap between the different way of life the emigrants experience between their mother country and their adopted one; secondly, the painstaking bureaucracy is something that migrants cannot easily cope with if they return and there is a paradox of an enormous taxation on real estate (the capital gains, i.e. the profits made from the sale of investments or property are relatively high) therefore, the Greek state does not attract migrants to invest in Greece; third, many migrants feel a kind of vigorous insecurity due to the geophysical position of Greece and the prospect of a forthcoming war (the geographical position of Greece has always been at stake due to the Turkish Intentions for the Aegean); and finally, there is a great deal of difficulty of professional adaptation by the repatriates. Perhaps these reasons refer to the second or third generation of migrants who are born abroad and only visit Greece occasionally.

Ylannaras, in his book "The Modern Greek Identity" (1989), writes about the Greek Diaspora, that in spite of its abandonment of the "ethnic centre" (i.e. the Greek state), it still remains quantitatively central and dynamic. This is a common statement among the migrants who live abroad. "You have forgotten us" say every time the conversation turns to this issue. And by "You" they mean not only the state but also the Greeks who do not regard them as much as Greeks as they regard themselves. Nevertheless, the universality of
Hellenism does not stop at the numbers of its Diaspora; Hellenism is what the modern Greeks have inherited as a model of life for expressing their identity. Ylannaras (ibid.), in his collection of articles, discusses various topics of Greek state and identity in relation to the religion and language, to the West and the past periods of Greek history, such as the Byzantium and the Ottoman Empire. Herzfeld (1987) argues that the modern Greeks' attitude is strongly rooted in Byzantium and also in the Orthodox ecclesiastic tradition. The Greek Orthodox Church and the Hellenic language blend together to create the character of the modern Greeks.

The migrants from the village of Trano will be extensively presented in Chapter Six. I collected the data from different sources, i.e. registers for water supply and irrigation, registry office catalogues and parish register catalogues, voting catalogues and topographical surveys which I combined in order to locate people and places, helped me to make clear that people having (or claiming to have) a village identity were dispersed all over the world. Apart from those who lived in the village permanently, there were others who came from time to time to Trano from other cities of Greece or abroad, as well as those who lived in the vicinity of Trano (like Karpenisli), or those who came after their retirement from the urban centres to live permanently in the village.

The village life expands during the summer because people take every opportunity to visit Trano for vacations, and shrinks in the winter. My fieldwork area in many cases was not just the locality of the village. I travelled elsewhere to participate in events related with the village life. The implications of this were multiple. I found out that identity was contested and not fixed and its changes are related to time and place. Many Tranlots living permanently elsewhere, they have a second house: one, in the city where they lived and another, in the village where they came from. For this reason their interests did not coincide with those of the locals. The latter claimed that "we live here" but the former said "we are more locals than the locals for we return here". The locals, who live all year long in the village, do not have another place to go to. By owning only one house, they definitely segregate their leisure time from their everyday lives. Houses, land and the village are all integrated in one (still contested) identity. While the migrants, who are interested in two contexts, turn over their egg-timer of identity more often. Perhaps this is the reason for stressing their locality as bigger than
that of the locals. By sharing different times and places they care "more" than the locals.

Also, the migrants' influence is dramatic. They make their presence obvious by being active and interfering everywhere: in the village's aesthetics, in culture, in politics and in tradition. Still, they share different views in terms of locality from the locals. Perhaps this happens due to their seasonal timing. The migrants arrived in the summer to organize and participate in the Cultural Week, combining leisure and staying in their birthplace. But in the winter, when they stay in the urban sites they live a different kind of life. The migrants are not concerned about the city's politics or aesthetes; tradition is to be presented in the village and not there where they live.

In Evrytania the environmental conditions affected people's mobility: first, second, third generations of migrants, even temporary migrants, live all over Greece, in Europe, in Africa, in the USA and in Australia. Their styles of livelihood vary but they share a parallel pattern in the construction of their identity. The Evrytans both define themselves and are recognised by others through space; their identity is not confined to the process of integration in their new country. They are committed to a place: their birth place or place of origin. My ethnographic enquiry shows that localism is a mode of resource management that regularly outweighs other social or economic resources. As Okely (1997:218) stresses "Anthropologists no longer focus on a spatial unit as a self-contained isolate ... part of the picture (are also) ... earlier migrations and histories". For many years the Evrytans lived in different contexts. Therefore, localism has not just a geographical focus. Okely (ibid.) expands further on that by underlining that "(a) recognizable place is not made by parish boundaries and census returns, but through aesthetic vision, magnificent brushwork, and daydreams".
CHAPTER 5 Place and locality

I. The particular local characteristics of the area

Land is the natural context, the reality where the dominant Greek context reproduces his/her social existence. Without the land, actions for survival cannot be perceived by humans. Land has been the primary factor for production capacity. Thus, it affects and determines peoples' endeavours in order to organise their lives. In a particular land mankind has to detect and establish the prerequisites for self-preservation. At the same time, one has to shape the cultural institutions for the society in which s/he lives, according to the conditions of this particular land.

People initially struggle to meet their own requirements for their basic and fundamental needs of survival: food, shelter and clothing. But people do not have only these material needs. They also have intellectual and cultural pursuits. People strain to see their own self-fulfilment through the economic and social level, as well as through the intellectual, cultural and moral level. For this reason mankind establishes institutions, constitutes education, sets up rules of justice, generates moral and cultural values. In one word, mankind seeks to structure his/her two-fold existence: the material as well as the intellectual one.

In the case of the aforementioned, it can be argued most strongly that the geographical peculiarities of Evrytanla have pivotal meaning. The natural environment of Evrytanla dictates (and to a degree imposes) the terms of the production process on its habitants. At the same time, the Inhabitants react to this environment by establishing their survival according to their productive actions. Between mankind and nature exists an endless network of interactions and Interdependencies: this is the accumulated knowledge mankind has over itself and over the environment one lives.

Evrytanla lies exactly in the middle of Central Greece: it is also an extension of the Pindus range. That range starts from the borders of northern Greece and functions as a geographical spine of the Greek peninsula. This spine
forms a solid geomorphologic unity which has common characteristics and peculiarities. The mountainous character of Evrytania is widely recognised: It is an undoubted fact. The implication of this is that the connotations are not simply geographical but also economic: Evrytania is the space where people's actions and needs confront the geomorphologic features of the landscape all the time. The mountains and the rocky terrain stand out and the usual incline is steeper than elsewhere, ranging from 40% to 100%. Those steep slopes are responsible for the majority of rocky and barren terrain. Due to these extreme inclines and in relation to the formations of the rocks, the Evrytanian terrain suffers continual erosion and great landslides in large measure. These erosions mark a remarkable feature here: a vast network of ravines, gorges, currents and streams are unfolding in this area. The Evrytans learned how to take advantage of them. They developed their own methods of cultivation in order to live as a self-sufficient basis of their economy. The pezoules - the terraced fields for cultivation of barley, wheat, etc. made in the vertical slopes supported by stone walls - are the best indication of their methods: today abandoned, once the only means for people's subsistence (Photo 27).

In contrast to the bareness of the land and territory, there is a rich water supply in Evrytania: the river of Acheloos, the river of Megdovas, the river Karpenisiotis, the river of Krikellopotamos and their tributaries flow all over the county. There are also here many streams, spring waters and waterfalls and many pools, ponds and lakes which are naturally formed. People used to build stone bridges in order to cross them. In 1965, a grandiose project, a dam was constructed collecting the waters of the rivers Acheloos, Tavropos and Agrafiotis into an artificial basin: the lake of Kremasta, which is 80,000 stremmata (a stremma is 1000 square metres) an extent and the level of the lake rises to 153 metres. Without any doubt Evrytania is the land of abundant waters. Many researchers have claimed that even the origin of its name comes from the ancient Greek adjective evrytos which means an area with abundant and unpolluted running water. This fact of the superabundance of water enabled the construction of many water-mills. Almost every village in Evrytania owned its own water-mill; some maybe had two or even three for the needs of the locality. Today, they are abandoned but still they attract many visitors (Photo 63 in Chapter 8).
From the early stages of its emergence in the history of the ancient Greeks, the Roman and the Byzantine era to the Ottoman period and the new born Greek state, the culture of the water-mill became widely known, practised and used in this region. The Evrytans possessed a comprehensive tool for the development of their local economy: the water-mill. This ancient technique, is magnificent in its conception and simple in practice; it also formed a determining factor for the power sources. Particularly, in pre-industrial societies where the existence of various energy sources were connected with the development of the local economy, the water-mill represented an important increase in power for the status of local culture and society.

The Evrytan waters were exploited in many other ways than the construction of the water-mills. Their productive potential was used in water-driven projects, such as the water-driven wheel which brought a great deal of changes and technical improvements in the lives of the inhabitants: in metallurgy, in forging and in ironworks, in the process of the textile factory, even in pumping. However, water is not the only factor that affects the lives of people in a locality. There is another important factor related to people's welfare: the climate. The climate conditions affect the establishment of the settlement, the way houses are built and constructed, the methods of farming, the cattle-raising, the mode of clothing, even the way communication and commerce are developed. Climate is a multi-faceted phenomenon: it affects people, animals and plants. From it, mainly depends the health of the people concerned and therefore their capacity for production and efficiency.

It is worth mentioning here that Karpenisi, according to oral history, was built in the most well-protected slope of the mount Velouchi. The shepherds, who had first lived in the area circa the 11th century, left bits of raw meat in three different parts of the mount's slopes in order to see where it would had gone bad first. In the north-west slope where the meat went bad last they decided to build their permanent settlement, Karpenisi. Today the city of Karpenisi has been extended in all directions. Ksirias, the eastern extension of the city, confronts the worst conditions of the harsh winter: snow and ice, cold and winds are freezing the people of this quarter. Ayil Evrytanes, the southern parts of the old city, are also exposed to the bad weather conditions. Only the old settlement Langadhla, is wisely situated as mentioned above.
The frequent rainfalls have a positive influence on the cultivation of the land. There is an interrelation between the quantity of the rain and the sunny days for cropping and harvesting. The frequent rains do a lot of good to the development of vegetation and of the grassland where the flocks graze. On the other hand, the dry spells or the ice aggravate the land's cultivation and consequently people's welfare. People's vulnerability to the forces of nature are beyond question. The climate in Evrytania is a typical Mediterranean mountainous one. The climatic periods here are separated in two: first, the wet and frozen climate during the winter and then the dry and hot climate during the summer. From late November to early May mountains are covered by snow. Snow has its effects on people's lives: it slows down production activities and nowadays promotes tourist activities (winter sports, such as skiing and long weekends) with which the local supplement their incomes. At the same time the richness of flora and fauna in the Evrytan landscape turn out to be a natural heritage for Evrytania. These together with Evrytania's cultural heritage transform the area from an isolated site to a remarkable locality.

Evrytania is a unique region, having many particular characteristics that makes it distinctive from the rest of the Greece. Its terrain (2047 sq. km.) is, on the whole, mountainous with the majority of it at 3000 feet. Quite often it is referred to as the "Greek Switzerland", both for the ridges, which are covered with snow for many months of the year and for its rich vegetation, extensive forests and abundant water, such as springs, brooks and rivers. Due to the lack of extended human intervention Evrytania is regarded as one of the cleanest environments in Europe. Quite interestingly, an introduction to Evrytania in the local tourist guide highly praises Evrytania both for its natural resources and its people's attributes.

Surrounded by high fir and chestnut tree forests, just in the heart of continental Greece, rests the province of Evrytania, motherland of proud and friendly people (Karpenisi Tourist Guide 1994:4).

In Evrytania the concept of space is jointed to its historical destiny. The geographical features of the country such as the successive mountain chains, passages and passes, closed secluded valleys and barren lands occasioned a very singular way of life. The shortage of products and the hardships because of
the life of privation shaped the culture of this area and the traits of its population: alertness, inventiveness, struggle for survival (Yiannakopoulou:1995:257).

Notwithstanding, Evrytania is also considered, due to the lack of industry, to be the poorest Greek district. The mountainous highlands, the limited terrain and the traditional methods of cultivation combined with the lack of easy communication are the main factors that make the county of Evrytania the most underdeveloped county in Greece, in economic terms. The only town is the capital, Karpenisi, with a population of 10,000. The National Census of 1971 showed that there are less than 25,000 people dispersed in 87 villages and 160 settlements in the region (Collard:1987:350-1).

Trano, the place where I conducted my research, is a village of 339 permanent inhabitants and about 80 households, while a large number of people (more than 200) return during summer (1991 Census). At the centre of the Greek mainland, 200 miles north-west of Athens, 300 miles south of Thessaloniki, 50 miles from Lamia and only a few miles away from Karpenisi lies the village of Trano. It belongs in the county of Evrytania (nomos Evrytanas). High mountains rise around it: mount Kaliakouda, mount Helidona and in the distance the mount of Velouchi. Trano is located at an altitude of 2500 feet (750 metres) in the north slope of mount Kaliakouda (20,203 feet=2,101 metres). It overlooks the river of Karpenisiotis, which determines the orientation of the road system and the traffic in the valley. Trano is directed down a valley, the so called River valley (kiladha tis Potamias). Secondary roads and agricultural paths criss-cross the community's territories connecting them on the same and the opposite side of this valley. One small bridge crosses the river and connects Trano to the lower part of the village, Sparos.

The community's terrain consists of 14,000 stremmata more or less (one stremma stands for 1000 square metres). The majority of this terrain is mountainous and only 10% of it is under cultivation. The village of Trano, although it contains three different settlements, is considered to be one community (kinotita). The community of Trano is both a territorial and an administrative unit. In terms of territorial unity, the village consists of three different settlements but close in the vicinity. These are the actual villages of Trano, Sparos and Petra.
a) the village of Trano, just two miles from the main road, on the mountain consists of the traditional old village with its stone houses and its new extension towards Ftelia with its modern buildings; here the majority of the village's population lives.

b) Sparos which has always been a living part of the village and is as old as the actual village of Trano. Located by the river Karpenislots it is situated on the main road that connects Karpenis to Prousos just half mile away from the village.

c) Prosilio is a newly built settlement, mainly from people who used to live in another village some 10 miles away. Because of the landslides in the old village of Prosilio, people abandoned it. Today the old village remains devastated and its people moved to a new location; this new settlement was called New Prosilio as opposed to Old Prosilio and is just a small community which lies opposite to Trano on the main road just before Sparos.

These last two hamlets, although apparently detached from the actual village, still remain politically and administratively linked to Trano this way creating all together one administrative unit. This means that the inhabitants of these three settlements are registered in Trano, voting in Trano and claim their interests in the locality of Trano. This is evident from the following sketch map (Sketch Map 1) that shows the places around the locality of Trano. (Here, I would like to thank the civil engineers of Trano, who helped me in the making of all topographical information of this thesis. Without their knowledge and assistance, the sketches and maps concerning locality would have remained only in my mind).
A plan of the village of Trano and its three settlements: the old and the new village of Trano (and Ftelia), Sparos, Petra.

PROJECT 3: SKETCH MAP 1
II. Local Economy

In the steep slopes of Kallakouda mountain, once cultivated but nowadays abandoned, fir-trees, walnut-trees, chestnut-trees, beeches grow in a luxuriant vegetation. Many plane-trees also grow next to the river. The colours of nature around the village are breathtaking especially in the autumn. The soil is fertile due to the abundance of water, springs, torrents and rivers in the area. Many different crops were cultivated in past years. The flora is rich and typical of a mountainous area, with a variety of evergreens and plants able to grow in the altitude and withstand the cold winter. Mountain tea, camomile, thyme, oregano, greens for salads, mushrooms and a variety of wild flowers, some of them Indigenous can be discovered in the wild every season. The fauna is also rich: snakes, lizards, hares, foxes, badgers, roe-deer, even wild-cats, wild-boars and sometimes even wolves are spread in the area. Many different birds can be found. Migratory species such as woodcocks, webbing, thrushes, wild-ducks, et.al. or non migratory, i.e. partridges, blackbirds, nightingales, magpies, etc. Wild trout and other fish can be fished in the river. Some villagers hunt for sport, but more frequently than not they returned empty-handed, or when they are lucky return with a hare and / or some small birds. Sometimes in the winter they can form groups for hunting the wolf which damages the flocks of sheep grazing in the area.

Despite the forbidding incline of its terrain, Trano has succeeded in maintaining self-sufficiency of products for centuries. Small fields were cleared on the mountains creating the distinctive character of cultivated land in the area, well known as terraces (meaning the terraced fields called in Greek patosies or pezoules) where wheat and barley were sown, supplying the village with bread, indispensable, for the Greeks. Small gardens within or around the village produced corn, potatoes, tomatoes, onion and other sorts of greens. Cattle-breeding (sheep and goats but only a few dairy cattle) has also been important for the local economy, as well as bee-keeping. A distinctive feature of stock-raising is that it was exercised by locals who lived on a semi-nomadic basis, i.e. in Kallakouda mountain for the summer and in the plains of Agrinio during the winter, and not from the Vlachs as in other parts of Greece. Today there is only a small number of shepherding population that exercises no more semi-nomadic
livestock breeding because since then the preconditions for it have been improved.

Trano was considered to be one of the largest villages and it has always been an important economic, social and political centre for the dispersed villages and settlements of the area in the past. Pouqueville (cited in Michiotis:1990:97) travelled along Sterea Ellada at the beginning of the nineteenth century. He referred to it as Trano (I refer to it by using a pseudonym for the locality of the village) and spoke of a population of 150 families living there in 1810. Even before the Second World War, Trano used to have more than 3,000 people living there. But after the War, as a result of extended migration due to both political and economic reasons, its population decreased to today's numbers. It must be said that it still remains one of the biggest villages in the area, progressively developing during the passing years. Trano was never considered a remote or an isolated village: from the beginning of this century, many villagers migrated to Constantinople and returned a few years later carrying money and a new ideology. Later many of the villagers migrated to Athens or the USA where they kept links with the locality, sending remittances and visiting Trano whenever possible.

The unity of the region is determined by its topography, which affects the lines of communication, the patterns of migration as well as the resettlement of population. The mountains, although a closed, isolated area are connected by permanent, transitional and seasonal demographic movements as it has already shown. At the same time, many villages migrated to Poli (i.e. Constantinople) where siblings or fellow villagers lived. Communication with other parts rather than their village took place for a long period of time. Trano is a village that has never been considered as an isolated one. A majority of its population moved to Aetoliko (near Agrinio) or to Constantinople (Ylannakopoulou:1995:258), while later migration to Athens and America widened more the horizons of this mountainous community.

Commerce is a determining factor in the activity of Evrytans. The pattern of migration in the cities of Thessaloniki, Konstantinople, even in Vienna, Vlachla and Philipopoli is also a colony pattern with singular traits: it does not result in demographic decay. On the contrary, it seems to preserve to a large extent the
social stability and has beneficial influence in the society. The economic development is present in the construction of luxurious houses and richly decorated churches in the area (Ylannakopoulou:1995:259). In the past, the practice of trade occurred in many contexts: the cattle breeders exchanged their livestock products (milk, butter, cheese, meat or wool) for oil, salt, household goods, and tobacco that were not produced locally. Trade routes followed the movement of the population.

A few miles from the village of Trano is the famous monastery of Prousos, that attracted hundreds of Christians for a pilgrimage due to its wonder-working icon of Panayia (i.e. the Virgin Mary). Prousos still remains a major attraction of the area and the old path has now became an asphalt street, although a narrow one. Until the early 1980s all roads in Evrytanla were dirt-roads. The only exception were ten miles that lead from the county of Fthiotida to the capital of Evrytanla, another fifteen miles from Karpenisi to Agrinio and another ten miles that led from Karpenisi to Sparos. This last part of asphalt road is significant: from all the 87 villages in Evrytanla, Trano had the lead due to its location and development. In the 1980s many of the dirt roads became asphalt at last. Today almost everybody in the village owns a car (usually a transporter) and young people may also use small motorcycles. Taxis and a bus service, which originates from and returns to the capital, Karpenisi, three times daily, are available. The villagers occasionally visit siblings in other towns or even doctors for a specialised or even a better medical treatment than the one available in Karpenisi. Although, the Karpenisi County Hospital is a modern one, some specialists do not exist; so women, for example, have to travel to the nearest cities, like Lamia, Agrinio or Athens, in order to visit a gynaecologist or even to give birth safely.

Geography and history, migration and the tax system, trade relations and the loan system, the klephts and the armatoloi (men-at-arms), the organization of communities are important issues which have greatly affected the local economy. The main products of the county are potatoes, cherries, chestnuts, walnuts, butter, mitzithra cheese, oregano, fir-trees and timber (Photo 29). From the late nineteenth century the economic model of Evrytanla appeared to be subsistence agriculture, in combination with stock breeding (sheep and goats); this also applied to the village of Trano (Photos 65, 68-71). By and large, for the county of
Evrytania, migration was already practised. However, from the beginning of the twentieth century it has become more and more apparent. From 1940 to 1951 Evrytania's population decreased by half, while in 1991 it diminished by another 10.10% compared to 1981. A huge wave of emigrants has moved to other cities of Greece or abroad.

It seems that the primary reason for emigration from Evrytania was not the lack of land, but rather its infertility, which created difficulties for subsistence farmers. The topology of the area means that slopes must be flattened in small fields for fear of erosion and landslide, caused by heavy rain and snow. In combination with this, the mountainous formation of the terrain limits the size of the plots to an average of 1000 sq.m. (about 1/4 of an acre) to 1500 sq.m. Consequently, there developed a shortage of cereals and grains, a common phenomenon for the mountainous areas of Greece.

As for Greece, Costa (1988:172) describes her so-called modern period (i.e. from 1864 and onwards) as one period in which the local economy has been deteriorating and voluntary out-migration has been occurring in large waves. Costa (ibid.) refers to the economy of Greece, as being underdeveloped, which means that it "is characterized by the export of raw goods and human labour and the import of manufactured goods produced in industrialized foreign countries". The fact of the matter is that until the late 1950s the wheat, corn, barley and rye produced in rural Greece was generally of poor quality, suitable only for cattle fodder; as a result, cereal production became uneconomical. This, together with the government policy of the 60s, were the main causes of migration that occurred all over Greece. Particularly for the county of Evrytania which had always been suffering from poverty and underdevelopment, migration which for many hundreds of years had always been a practice for the locals, once again seemed the only way out.

Nowadays, in the village of Trano people do not usually cultivate cereals; they tend mainly to keep some fruit-bearing trees and a small garden which will provide the family with the essential groceries for the family's consumption. Their notions of productivity and consumption are expressed in their Ideas about wealth, good management and land ownership. The villagers exercise a traditionally applied recycling: in terms of family consumption which means that "nothing is
Food left-overs will feed the rabbits and chickens which every family in the village keeps (Photos 30, 31). In return the chickens will provide the family with their eggs and the rabbits with their meat; in some cases, a goat will be also kept for the family’s milk and butter.

The villagers’ sources of income vary in relation to their different occupations. Usually the elderly people, who were involved in farming in the past, are entirely dependent upon their agricultural pensions from the state (O.G.A), which are very low and nobody is expected to live entirely on them. By having their own garden and cultivating other agricultural products, such as chestnuts or walnuts (which in some cases they collect and sell for cash) people manage to supplement their way of living. The majority of the active male population (married or still bachelors) is engaged in building construction, either having their own business or working for somebody else (Photos 32, 33). The married men who run their own working parties managed by the means of government subsidies to build some rooms to let. These rooms are mainly their wives’ responsibility but this income is considered as merely supplementary for these families. Only a few families run a tourist shop in the village on which they are entirely dependent. These businesses may be a restaurant, a tavern, a coffee-shop or even a general store (in the past) which today has been transformed by selling "traditional" consumer products as well as trachanas, hilopites, tsipouro, home-made desserts, etc. "Traditional" products used to be the organic products produced and consumed by the villagers in the past for family’s consumption. Today, the citizens from the urban centres who visit the countryside look for local "hand-made" food in every place they go; they are not only consuming it but they also buy it and bring it back in the cities. In the village there are family enterprises, who sell "traditional" products (there are some cases that these products are not really hand-made but the tourists never realize this); usually only close members of the family are engaged in this selling activity.

Finally, there are only three families who are entirely dependent on their flocks for their living. One of them exercises transhumant pastoralism, which means that they move to the plains from October to May and return to the village for the summer (see Photos 69-71 in Chapter 8). The other two live permanently in the village while one of them has also a cheese-dairy shop in Karpenisi (Photo 68 in Chapter 8).
There are also a number of retired migrants who decided to live in the village permanently or at least for the greater part of the year (from Easter up to January) and they are referred to as Incomers. They may leave the village just for a few months to escape the harsh winter; these are dependent on their pensions and other income (such as renting another house in Athens) for their living.

III. Regional language, ethnicity and religious character

The spoken language in this area is Greek, the pure *neohellenic* language (*dhimotiki*). Even in the dark era of the Turkish Domination the people of Western Fthiotida and Evrytanla maintained the Greek language contributing this way their own ethnic consciousness. Many researchers refer to the bond between the existence of the Greek language and the Greek ethnic identity. Today one can track down words arriving directly from the mythological era of Homer, a living testimony that the area has always been a site of at least one of the many Greek tribes that lived in the area during that mythological time, three thousand years ago (see Michiotis:1990:146 in APPENDIX I). There are claims and asserted pedigrees of direct and unbroken connection with Ancient Greece and Homeritic times for the Ancient Greek words rooted in everyday language of the area. These words which were gradually transformed into the modern language are not unmixed from the historic mutations from the invasions of various people during the post Byzantine era.

Local site names in the mountains attest to a considerable Turkish and Slavish presence in the past. For example, Ambilani, Adranova, Arahova, Viniani, Vitoli, Gardiki, Goura, Granitsa, Domnista, Zelenitsa, Karitsa, Kerasovo, Lastovo, Megdova, Beza, Roska, Selo, Sivista, Smokovo, Ternovo, et.al. However, Slavic and Turkish families are known to have lived in the region whatever traces they may have left in toponyms.

The remnants of these influences are obvious: both in the village and in the larger area of Evrytanla people have unique vocabulary and pronunciation which
help them identify to each other, and to the outside world. Whether or not these claims are directly linked to Homeric times is not important here. What is really significant is that such claims are made by the locals in order to create a different identity from those who do not live here.

The regional dialect of the area, distinct and not exactly the same as standard Greek, is still widely used particularly among the elders and the middle aged inhabitants. Some consonantal or vocalic peculiarities are also used by the young (APPENDIX I). However, the educational system, where a different and usually young teacher with a standard Greek language teaches every season in the school of the village, is eliminating these differences nowadays. The non-local school teachers using standard Greek, are educating the children so that local dialect words and pronunciation are being slowly eliminated. "Our children do not speak choriatika anymore" the locals say. According to Michiotis (1990:143-153) some of the more obvious usage of the local pronunciation are:

a. Cutting vowels within a word and the endings of the syllables. Michiotis (ibid.) claims that cutting vowels mainly happened because of the topography that shapes the area. Solid mountain ranges, deep canyons, dense forests and running waters prevented the clear transmission of sound especially if there are many vowels to be heard! Therefore, there is a belief in the area that the elimination of vowels is a necessity due to the reverberation which prevents the communication among the people living in the particular landscape of Evrytania. I believe that this bizarre claim whether true or not, is just one of many other explanations for cutting vowels within a word.

b. Changing e (ε, α) to I (ι) (which sounds like in I for Nick). So erchete sounds like erchi (ε=s/he comes) or pedi like pidi (= child).

c. The ending is usually cut, so "ti kanis" (=how are you?) will be said and heard as "ti kan's".

The population of the village is now thoroughly Hellenic and homogenous. All the inhabitants are Greek Orthodox; there are no Catholics or Jewish people in the area. These Greeks are devout Christians. Greek identity is strongly related to the Orthodox ecclesiastic tradition. The Greek Orthodox Church and
the Hellenic language also blend together to create the character of the modern Greeks (Kenna:1976a:33). During my research in the village I felt I had to follow the village’s codes and behaviour towards religious behaviour; although I was never a devout person because I was a woman and living in the village meant attending Sunday masses, fasting, going in funerals, name days and festive occasions, as well as participating in pilgrimages to the monastery of Prousos. Every year on the 23th of August many people all over Greece arrive at the renowned monastery of Prousos to worship the Virgin Mary of Prousos whose presence is commemorated this day. Her miraculous icon, dating from the 13th century, is believed to be responsible for healing or other miracles. On the eve of the 23th, many women from the village organise a pilgrimage to the Monastery. They go on foot and this excursion is very popular in both the locals and the migrants. People participate just for the attainment of grace by the Panayla tin Prousiotisa or in order to repay a vow (Photo 34).

In the village, people live according to the church’s commands: they christen the children in church according to tradition, that demands that the first child takes the paternal grandmother’s or grandfather’s name, while the second would have the maternal grandmother’s or grandfather’s name (Photo 35). They prefer the church wedding (Photo 16) to the civil wedding, they observe fast-days before important religious celebrations (Photo 36) and they attend the Sunday service often. The sign of the cross is profoundly sacred and used in special events only (Photo 37). Candles are used on every occasion of religious activity: in everyday liturgy; in special days like Easter (Photo 38, 39) or Christmas, in the weddings, the baptisms, the funerals, even in the pilgrimage when people make a vow and then they offer “a wax candle as high as one's height” (mia lampadha isia me to bol tou/tis). Many researchers have studied pilgrimage and its importance for Greek women in different places all over Greece (Dubisch:1995; Hirschon:1983a; et. al.)

An interesting case of naming is presented here to stress the village’s peculiarity and interrelation to local history, harsh landscape, memory and identity. It is the story of Electra Stoumaras from Trano. People who suffered the loss of their relatives during the Partisan’s Rebellion (Antartiko) refer to the facts and not to that period. It is the reality of the event that surpasses anything else, so details such as dates or years don’t matter to them. People, who are
now breaking their silence concerning the Civil War, have a remarkable memory in giving me detailed stories. They are aware of the significance of these events and also of their consequences. But in their minds, (consequently in their narratives, too) time is blurred, an unfocused second in the past. The first time I listened to the tragic story of Electra I thought that maybe she was a shepherd. I was never given a concrete date from her family even for events which were nowadays widely recognised and mentioned by them. They preferred to say: "Then... you know...". Every time I tried to find out when this had happened I was coming across answers such as "a cold winter night", "a freezing January night", "a night of poor weather", "a night particularly full of snow". Her brother, Christoforos, had never realised that he had not mentioned the year of this event to me.

Mitsos Stoumaras had two children from his second marriage: Electra and Christoforos. Electra Stoumaras died after the Partisans left the area of Trano in the winter of 1949 during the turbulent years of the Civil War. Her story was similar to other youngsters from the village, but the end of it was different. She was only 19 years old when she had initially joined the partisans. After they withdrew from the area, she returned to the village. The departure of Partisans was followed by the arrival of the Right wing troops who were after the Partisans. When she was informed that the TEA were on their way to the village, she left the village and tried to hide in the mountains then covered with snow. She was afraid that someone would inform against her and she would be executed. So she was frozen to death 10 miles from the village in a clearing, up in the mountains where she had found shelter one January night. Her brother, Christoforos Stoumaras (14 years old at that time), never forgot her. When he got married, he named his first child who was a daughter after his dead sister's name (i.e. Electra). By breaking the custom of naming the first child after his parents' name, he kept her memory alive, still mourning after all these years.

There are also a number of features which are linked to the themes introduced earlier in this thesis. These are: the reluctance of local people to mention dates or controversial historical periods, the harsh environment, with freezing winter weather, the significance of keeping memory alive within a family by naming. First, the villagers' reluctance to inform me about their local history. For understanding this, one can follow the characteristics of collective memory, as
mentioned in an earlier chapter: Collard (1993:360) writes that collective memory is individualised and personalised, that it is common to the point that the people who share it agree with it, that it does not necessarily coincide with the dominant representation and finally, that it is social for it comes from the social consequences of the history itself. The villagers of Trano do not always share common memories of history with which they all agree. This happens because many of the villagers who live in the village today, moved into it a few years after the Civil War. Perhaps their reluctance to speak to me about it was due to the fact that it is very difficult to describe events of that historical period without revealing a politicised stance. After they came to know me better, some of them "open" their hearts to me. Their insistence that I had to make up my own mind about that period without being prejudiced by their narration, is surely related to the fact that collective memory in Trano is not in agreement with other public or official representations of history. There are gaps in chronologies and different views of the timing for those days by the locals. The other thing emerging from all this was the importance people put on the environment in which they lived: the environment and its harshness provides a limiting context for some activities. Surviving, for example, during the Civil War it would have been easier if the place was an island or a plain instead of the mountains which surround it. Finally, keeping not only the memory but the idea of the self alive through the generations has paramount importance for the making of Tranlot identity.
Due to Evrytania's mountainous and rocky terrain, steep slopes are formed with extreme inclines. The Evrytans learned how to take advantage of them. They developed their own methods of cultivation in order to depend on the self-sufficient basis of their economy. The *pezoules* - the terraced fields for cultivation of barley, wheat etc. made in the vertical slopes were supported by stone walls - are the best indication of the locals' methods: today abandoned, once the only way for people's survival.

(Malenou, 1997)
The Traniot men enjoy fishing in the river. Locals and migrants, young and old seize every opportunity (work or leisure) to go catching trout. Usually in groups - from two to seven persons - they go fishing with the fishing-spear. In some cases, they use nets, but this demands a lot of practice. The water of the river is cold, even in the summer, due to the spring waters or the snow melting from the mountains. They wear a rubber wet suit to protect themselves from the cold for they maybe stay in the water as long as six hours. The first time I followed them, I dropped behind the group of people who went on ahead - in order to take some landscape photographs. I was also wearing a rubber suit to protect myself from the cold water and I was carrying various "supplies", like coffee and biscuits apart from my camera and films. Suddenly, I caught up with them. I saw several people bent in an apparently rude position: bent in two, they revealed their backsides in the air like human kind of rocks protruding from the river bed! I burst into laughter... Nobody told me that the water in the river was so shallow that one cannot actually lie under it and be covered like fishing in the sea! Because of this, many villagers who cannot swim at all enjoy fishing, for they never have to swim under water.

(Malenou, 1997)
In the village the Local Co-operative exists for the exploitation of the forest. Many locals are members. Every year they are allowed to cut down a number of trees and sell them for wood. However, some times they cannot gain as much as expected for the prices of wood are down. They cut the trees in the summer; they work together all day long from morning till late at night when they return home for a week. Up in the mountain of Kaliakouda where the Co-operative worked, many insects, attracted from the juices of the cutting wood, gathered and buzzed around the researcher and the workers. I was bitten repeatedly by a particular kind of insect, called davani in the local dialect, to which I proved to be allergic. After getting excessively swollen, I had to go to the hospital and I was given two intravenous injections. (So much for the dangers of the fieldwork!).

(Malenou, 1996)
ABOVE: The villagers keep chickens and rabbits for their own consumption. "Food tastes better when it is home produced" they say. BELOW: Rabbits for consumption. (Malenou, 1996)
The majority of the local men work in building construction business: they build houses, streets and engage in strenuous manual labour. **ABOVE:** The building of a "traditional" stone made fence. **BELOW:** An extension of cement added onto a traditional old stone house. (Malenou, 1996)
Every year on the 22nd of August many women from the village go on a pilgrimage to Prouosos. Locals and migrants walk the fifteen kilometres road to attend the morning mass of Virgin Mary of Prouosos. The group usually consists of women and children (over 10 years old), and a young boy will follow the group, in order to "have a man in the group fit for company" (na echoume enan antra yia parea). Sometimes even thirty five persons will join the group. Everybody anticipates this trip and organises for it some time in advance. The women leave the village at midnight for they want to be present in the morning service that starts at 5:30 in the morning. The group gathers outside the priest's house and leave the village with everybody's blessing: "May God help you" (Voithia sas). In some cases, one or two will walk all the way to the Monastery bare foot for they have taken a vow; others maybe carry wax candles to offer to the Monastery. During the trip a lot of conversation occurs but never of religious character. People do not comment on their vows or on miracles. "I will be going every year as long as my feet are keeping me going", Koula, a sixty five years old woman confessed "It is very good for everybody to go". In the photo, the women have stopped to rest; they have still some miles to go. (Malenou, August 1996)
Baptism is very important for Greek Orthodox Christians: the naming is related to the Greek sense of identity via family and property. The first son in a family is named after his father's father or his father's mother. This is the one who will usually inherit the family house. Many migrants prefer to come to the village for their child's christening. "Here, we really feel the baptism" (Edho tin katalavenoume tin vaftisi) they say. All the villagers are invited to the ceremony, but only the family and the close friends go to the reception that follows afterwards.

(Malenou, 1996)
The majority of Greek villagers are very devout people. However, the practice shows that usually women and just a few old men attend the Sunday mass. On name days, when for example St. Dimitris is commemorated, men called Dimitris will arrive at the morning mass to attend. Here is the church of St. Dimitris in Trano, which on the 26th of October is opened just for the occasion (it is a very small chapel). These two men entering the church have venerated the saint by kissing the icon of St. Dimitris (situated in the wooden frame), dropped some small change on the table (at the right of the photograph) in order to buy a candle and light it in front of the icon. They wear their best clothes for they celebrate the day: they are both called Dimitris.

(Malenou, 1996)
The sign of the cross is sacred for the Orthodox Church as for other Christians. People use it in specific circumstances. The Greeks make the sign of the cross when they enter a church, when they kiss an icon, when they take a vow or when they exorcise the evil eye. There are some special occasions when they use it on their houses. In Trano, the villagers marked their doorsteps with a cross from the holy light they brought home after the Easter service. They also have a local custom, when one is married, to sign the doorstep with a cross before entering the household. In this photograph, the granddaughter and grandson of Christoforos Stournaras are making the holy cross on the lintel of the doorway to their grandfather’s house with their Easter candelas.

(Malenou, 1996).
Easter is particularly celebrated all over Greece. People seize the opportunity to return to their villages. During Holy Week the villagers are busy making preparations for Easter, attending the masses in the evening and fasting as well. On Good Thursday the housewife paints eggs red for Easter. The red colour of the eggs is related to pagan customs and symbolises life; the Christians accepted this symbolism and retain it up to our days. Another custom of the Greek Easter, the roasting of the lamb, derives from the Bible where the lamb symbolises purity and the sacrifice of Christ. Here, the granddaughters of Koula helped her painting the eggs red. On Good Saturday, the family gathers to go to the Easter service and it is very common for an extended family to go to the same church and afterwards celebrate in one house all together. When the Easter service is finished people kiss each other and then return to their houses for the traditional Easter feast. Before sitting at the table, they make the sign of the cross with smoke above the door step for God to protect the family and its house for another year. Then, they smash the red eggs and they eat a special kind of soup, i.e. *mayiritsa*, cheese, bread and maybe roast lamb. Every kind of food stuff is welcomed, especially from those who kept the forty days fast of Lent. Family friends and visitors are always welcomed to join the party.

(Malenou, 1996)
During my research in the village I had to follow the village's codes and behaviour towards religion; although, I was never a devout person, by being a woman and living in the village meant attending Sunday masses, fasting, going in funerals, name days and festive occasions, as well as participating in pilgrimage. I was told to wear skirts instead of my usual trousers (for women are not allowed to enter a monastery or church wearing trousers as men do) but in many cases I forgot all about this. On these occasions I was forgiven for three reasons: first, for "being an outsider who did not know our customs", second for being an Athenian and third, for being young. This photograph is taken by a friend: we are going to attend the service of the Epitafios on Good Friday. I am walking in the middle of this extended family and I am holding the youngest member by the hand. The grandfather, the grandmother, their children, the husbands of their children and their grandchildren are going together to the church. "We all go together", they say, "this is a family occasion".

(photograph by D.T., 1996)
CHAPTER 6 Origin, Politics and Identity

I. General aspects of identity

Greece is politically divided into fifty provinces or nomarchies or counties, while the county of Evrytanía, is one of them. The county (nomos), which is a politically appointed unit, having its own prefecture and administration, is further subdivided politically into municipalities and communities. Karpenísi is the only municipality (dhímos) of Evrytanía; the village of Trano and its outlying settlements are considered as one separate community (kinotita) from the many which constitute the county of Evrytanía. This division carries some very interesting connotations concerning the political identity of Greeks. Collard (1987:367 my translation from Greek) argues that "Greeks who originate from villages do not sever their links with home". Origin itself is a decisive feature of Greek culture. Herzfeld (1986:229) argues that

Greeks experience their national identity at both the national and local levels, for in reference to the larger national context the village is both a microcosm and a part.

Greek identity is articulated at two or more levels, as people distinctively identify themselves at a local level with their home community and the particular region in which the village or town is situated, and at a national level with Greece (Herzfeld:1985:xii). Those nested identities of various degrees of locality compose the Greek identity. Because of the dynamic character of the various levels of social reality, which are both supplementary and subject to continuous interpretations, the process of identification does not lead to a fixed identity, but as Loizos and Papataxiarchis (1991) argue, it formulates contested identities.

Anthropologists such as Barth (1969), Epstein (1978), Wallman (1978), Cohen (1985), et.al. have been concerned with the issue of identity in the context of ethnicity, of the "self", of its boundaries. They have discussed how a sense of identity is generated and transmitted, how boundaries are marked and maintained, how identity persists and how it is transformed or disappears. These have yielded to other forms of identity. The Macmillan Dictionary of Anthropology (Seymour-Smith:1986:145) defines identity as

139
the psychological self-conception of the person but also the social, cultural or ethnic identity which is the identification of self with a specific social position, cultural tradition or ethnic group. Also group identity is the identification or self-conception held in common by a group of people.

So, a special emphasis is placed upon the individual, who already has a concept of him/herself. This notion of "the self" shapes everyone's identity; the self could be part of the family or of a group. Leach (cited in Epstein:1978:100-101) argues that no-one "has just a single identity", for "identity is essentially a concept of synthesis". Living in a society means that one has different statuses, roles and experiences, which are integrated in the coherent image of the "self". Kosmin (1979:430) also states "no single identity is all-embracing for an individual". Wallman (lectures 1993-1994) says that various identity options apply in different kinds of environments, settings, contexts, which encourage an alternative option in terms of another. While the individual has a choice one is, also, constrained in this choice because of her/his feelings of belonging to one group. People structure their environment and define their relations with others through systems of social classification. According to Mitchell (cited in Epstein:1978:11)

people seek means of reducing the complexity of social relations with which they are confronted ... by classifying those around them into a restricted number of categories.

Identity, the sense of being identified with or separate from others is a process of classification that involves at least two parts. Epstein (1978:xii), Cohen (1974a cited in Shore 1993:782) and Wallman (1978:200) write, "in order to define "us" there must be "them" against "we" recognize ourselves as different". According to these authors the classification is continuous and dynamic, as people are responding to the need to respond to the social world, and identity is seen as a process.

Epstein exemplifies how ethnicity is the separating out and pulling together of the population into categories defined in terms of "we" and "they". Ethnicity serves to categorize people by the use of ethnic labels. For Epstein (1978:14) "the delineation of social categories is always a two-way process; in differentiating others one is also defining oneself". Therefore, the dual aspect of ethnic categories is being "at
one and the same time both “objective” (external to or independent to the actor) and “subjective” (internal to the actor) a perception of the self” (Ibid.). Because the social environment is continuously interpreted and changing, Epstein argues that ethnic identity formation is a psychosocial process of the interplay of internal and external factors within it. For Epstein (1978:99-101) three features characterize identity formation. Firstly, it is always psychosocial. Secondly, it is a concept of synthesis as one’s various statuses, roles and experiences are integrated into a coherent image of self. Therefore, ethnic identity is considered as terminal or primordial, for it embraces lesser identities. Finally, identity is powerfully affective as it is both contemporaneously cognitive and unconscious, especially when it is more inclusive. One must be aware that Epstein draws his conclusions from theories and definitions of psychoanalysts’ material rather than empirical data.

Wallman (lectures 1993-1994) says that to create identity takes two sides in identify. Splitting creates differentiation, i.e. identity, the way "I" or "we" see or/and classify ourselves. Lumping creates identification or stigmatizing, how "we" classify and/or see "they". This classification is not always the same; it depends on politics, power, purposes, contexts, etc. The "we"/"they" notion in every act of identification implies a boundary. Wallman (Ibid.) asserts that in real life many kinds of difference are significant but they also depend on the context in which people interact. So, all the social boundaries are symbolic and consequentially, situational. People differentiate as the social boundaries change with the situation as well as through time. Thus social boundaries are flexible in contrast to fixed boundaries which are ascribed. Ascriptive classification can depend on environment, region (location), law, good intention or category markers such as language, religion, race, appearance etc.

Barth’s work investigates the ethnic boundary which defines the group, not the "cultural stuff" that it encloses (Barth:1969:13; Epstein:1978:96). Barth (Ibid.) defines ethnic ascription as

a categorical ascription .. when it classifies a person in terms of his basic, most general identity, presumptively determined by his origin and background.
For Epstein (1978:14) stereotypes have a dual purpose as they reinforce one's perceptions of others and they imply a definition of oneself. Mitchell (1956 cited in Epstein:1978:13, 94) argues that tribal stereotypes (e.g. the African tribes of Bemba and Kyusa) are not just categories of cognitive classification neutrally charged, but they are also charged with affect. However, human identity is multifaceted and people can refuse or deny a particular label that is put on them. The features of labelling and contrast are dynamic, subject to contextual reinterpretations and exist variously at different levels. As Kosmin (1979:430) states "boundary making is not independent of structural or historical context".

Boundaries established by both labelling and contrast do not prohibit individuals from moving back and forth between respective groupings or categories, nor do they prohibit peoples from identifying or being identified differently as they move back and forth. Therefore, the boundary process is reactive. Wallman (1978:204) stresses that a) classification acquires meaning according to the classifier, so the significance is at the boundary and b) "the significant objective difference" depends on the person perceiving and on the context in which one perceives.

If I am I, simply because I am I, and thou are thou simply because thou are thou, then I am I and thou are thou. But if I am I because thou art thou and thou art thou because I am I, then I am not I and thou are not thou.

The "if I, if thou" puzzle by Rabbi Mender of Kotzk (cited in Epstein:1978:1) implies what many anthropologists, like Wallman (1979) and Cohen (1985) have stressed about boundaries. Cohen (1985:58) writing about the boundaries of community emphasizes their inherently oppositional character: "the boundaries are relational rather than absolute; that is, they mark the community in relation to other communities". Wallman (1978; 1979; Lectures 1993-1994) also asserts that social boundary involves two sides and two kind of meaning. One side is differentiation, the decision as to what makes a difference for "us"/our purposes/inside Identity (e.g. female villager). The other side according to her is "lumping", the feeling about "them"/their purposes/outside Identity (e.g. male migrant). The two kinds of meaning are interface and identity. That is, respectively, the point of change in what goes on between two systems of activity, organization or meaning; it is also objective, structural or organizational, to the extent that outsiders can see it,
therefore, It marks the edge of the social system. Identity, in contrast to Interface Is subjective because it Is inherent in the experience of its members; It marks the edge of one social system, so it Is the point at which members can be identified.

E.H. Erikson (1968 cited In Epstein:1978:7) who wrote that In dealing with questions of identity formation one Is dealing with a process that Is "located in the core of the individual and yet also in the core of his communal culture". Cohen (1985:20) argues that the understanding of the notion of community Is what It appears to mean to Its members, It Is the experience of Its members that illuminates the community's structure. This Is what Geertz defined as actor-oriented anthropological interpretation. According to Geertz (1973:12) "culture consists of socially established structures of meaning". He introduces the term "thick description" (ibid. 6) to describe how anthropological analysis penetrates and uncovers the complex conceptual structures that inform the subjects' acts that the ethnographer studies. Geertz (ibid:10) continues that human behaviour should be seen as symbolic action because people impose their own meanings.

Cohen (1985) demystifies the argument that Industrialization and/or modernization and community do not go hand in hand. Community "exists in the minds of its members" (Cohen:1985:11,98) and It is not necessarily constructed In terms of locality but In the sense of belonging. The use of the word "community" expresses the opposition of one community to others; It Implies simultaneously both similarity and difference. Therefore, the discrimination Is on the boundary (i.e. Its relational character) which may be perceived differently by both people on opposite sides and on the same side. In the community, people learn to be social, interact with each other and through their experiences and commitment to symbols make the community alive. Here again the community depends upon the symbolic construction and embellishment of Its boundary, In which (a) the commonality of Its members coexists with (b) the variability of meaning. Because of the contemporaneity of these two last characteristics Cohen (1985:13-16) defines community as "a boundary-expressing symbol". Ritual symbolsm has a dual efficacy: It creates communitas, moreover, people find different meanings for the same ritual In which they participate (Cohen:1985:55).
Through what Peters (cited in Cohen:1985:43) calls "flourishes", Leach (cited ibid:42) "aesthetic frill" and Cohen (1985) "ritual occasions", the structural basis of the boundary reasserts its boundary symbolically. All these forms are, also, in themselves symbolic for they communicate at both the group and the individual level. In the former, their meaning is about the relation of the group to the others, in the latter it is about the individual's relations to his group and to the world as mediated by his/her group membership (Cohen:1985:54).

To conclude, Shore's (1993:782) criticism of the anthropological discussions of identity is that pioneers such as Barth have tended to emphasize how ethnic boundaries are marked and maintained; while the later work of Cohen (1974a) and Wallman (1978) have shown how they are generated. For Shore (1993:782) three features characterize anthropological approaches to the process of identity construction: First, identity's dualistic concept of "us"/"they" involves the notion of boundary. Second, the functionalist approach, where the segmentary-type model, in which different orders or ascending "levels" of belonging are connected, implies an inter-group cohesion and integration and bounded, integrated and unitary identities. Shore (ibid.) criticises this model for it takes "too much for granted about both the complexity of centres, and their relationships to peripheries" and also because "it conflates identity with power and authority". Third, recent research, by Lolzos and Papataxiarchis (1991) and MacDonald (1993) about the contested and ideological nature of identity shows that a functionalist approach has drawn upon uncritical assumptions about identity.
II. Greek identity and politics

Greek identity is articulated at two or more levels, as people distinctively identify themselves at a local level with their home community and the particular region in which the village or town is situated, and at a national level with Greece (Herzfeld:1985). This is clearly expressed in people's attitudes towards elections. The Greeks have taken a great interest in politics since antiquity. There is a Greek saying that says "man is a political animal"; from this, one can conclude that the modern Greek thinks, plans and acts as a "highly political animal" in all his/her life. Politics, just like family, are part of the Greek outlook and social life. Legg (1997:128) writes:

Today, all Greeks aged eighteen and above are required to vote unless they have legally valid reasons for not doing so. Greece was one of the first countries to institute universal male suffrage. Women, however, were not given the right to vote until 1956, which was relatively late compared to other democratic countries.

This is not absolutely correct: as has been earlier discussed, women voted for the first time during the National Resistance against the Germans in when the Free Government of the Mountains called elections in the autumn of 1943 (Variamis:1997:234). In these elections more than one million people participated; among them many women. Political reasons prevented women from voting in the next two national elections. As the memories of the Resistance and the Civil War are stirred and people's silence becomes narration; thus history, women should be looked at under a different light: the light of this troubled era. Today, one should acknowledge their previous political power and active decision making from the 1940s.

Greece is a parliamentary republic. The one-chamber parliament (H Vouli) has 300 members directly elected by proportional representation for four years. The president without executive power, is elected by parliament for five years. The council of ministers is responsible to parliament. It is headed by the prime ministers, appointed by the president on the ability to gain support in parliament. Legg (ibid.) explains the polling system of Greece that is relatively different from the other European countries:
Once registered the voter is given a booklet, which is presented at the polling place as identification. Electoral officials stamp the book, thus preventing multiple voting and proving compliance with compulsory voting laws.

There are many political parties in Greece: Pan Hellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK), New Democracy Party (Nea Dimokratia), a coalition of the Left (Sinaspismos), the Communist Party of Greece (KKE), the Green Left Party (Ikoloyli), et.al. The electoral system of Greece allows every person whose residence can be proved for a period longer than two years, to vote in this locality (a community or a municipality either). More importantly it allows everyone to keep or transfer his/her voting rights to his/her own place of birth or origin. Legg (1997:128) states:

There is one unusual feature in that residents of one district may choose to vote in another. These are the so-called heterodemotes. These voters, primarily recent migrants to the city, choose to return to their districts of origin to vote. Although city dwellers, they maintain clientage ties to the deputies representing rural constituencies. For example, Thessaloniki, with over 400,000 people, has fewer than 170,000 voters. Indeed given the relatively small populations of some rural constituencies, the migrant vote can be significant. (emphasis added)

The heterodemotes or the migrants are in many cases the same people. As many Greeks are deeply interested in their birthplace, by holding many different connections (such as land, house, relatives or just memories), they are also attached to the villages or cities where they themselves or their parents and grandparents were born. By keeping their political rights to vote there, they affect the local community for a longer period than that of their visits or vacation. They are important, their absence notwithstanding. It is not uncommon for a couple during elections to be separated, travelling to different places in order to vote according to each one's birthplace or their different parental residence. This is further stressed by the word which is used: the Greeks say that they are keeping (not having) their voting rights somewhere (maintaining my political rights in the village = krato ta politika mou dhikeomata sto chorio). The Greek emphasis on keeping instead of having his/her political rights in some place, exemplifies the
Importance of the location or a place for the Greek identity. For it is already known that everyone has the right to vote; however, it is the interrelation with a special site (i.e. the place of origin) that has been emphasised and by no means should be interrupted or broken.

The franchise of the *heterodemotes* back in their place of origin is very important in both the local and the national level. Every four years general elections take place when the government is elected according to the people's preferences; later the prefect (*nomarchia*) of a county is appointed by the central government. Every four years community elections also occur, when the local president of the village or the mayor of a city is directly elected by the people. These two forms of elections, which do not necessarily happen simultaneously, carry with them different notions of political identities for the peoples' decisions. Their importance for the local level is significant: in reality, fewer people live permanently in the locality than the effective total number of voters. This means that the president (*proedros*) or mayor (*dhimarchos*) is going to be elected thanks to the existing political alliances every family forms. The permanent resident population is going to increase by the number of their incoming siblings who may come to the community or the municipality just for the occasion. The families bring pressure upon their visiting members. At the same time this has different consequences for the other locality, where these migrants permanently live but do not vote. For that local level, it means that people who confront everyday problems in the place where they live permanently choose to ignore their rights and power in that place and move elsewhere to vote. All of a sudden, the big city empties and fewer people than its actual habitants vote there. Moreover, at the national level, the meaning of this transference of one's political rights has considerable significance. When one votes back in one's birthplace for general elections one follows one's own political beliefs. But for the communal elections one votes according to family political orientation and alliances.

Collard (1991:122) has noticed how the patronymic groupings influence various notions of culture and among others that of the politics; she also argues that political alliances are formulated according to the families. This seemed to be the case for Klirakos Tsekouras who comes from Trano. Klirakos is a thirty year old migrant who grew up in Athens, studied in Crete and lives together with his wife in Thessaloniki for the last six years. All these movements did not prevent
him from visiting the village quite often (particularly on Bank holidays) and as it was expected to keep his political rights there. His closest friend in the village is Mitsos, who is the same age but lived all his life in Trano, except when he was a student or when he was serving his military service. During the 1995 communal elections Mitsos offered himself as a candidate for the village's council in a block of progressive parties. In order to make a strong coalition to challenge the right-wing president and his council (who were members of the opposed candidate party of *Nea Dimokratia* - New Democracy), all the democratic forces of the village united together to confront the right-wingers who had already elected the president of the village in 1991. The majority of the people who formed this coalition were PASOK members, as was the village's president in 1988. Mitsos, who is a member of the socialist party of PASOK, joined the coalition as one of the youngest candidates. Up to this stage, Mitsos and Kiriakos shared a mutual understanding of the village's problems about the "dirty business" some of the ex-presidents of Trano played on their own behalf. While Kiriakos's family were openly supporting the right wing and the New Democracy party, Kiriakos himself was not fanatical and shared Mitsos's views concerning the communal elections of their village during the past years. This time, Mitsos asked Kiriakos directly if he was willing to support him. Kiriakos said yes initially, but in spite of his promises he finally did not vote for Mitsos. Against his word and their great mutual friendship he voted for the other combination. The reason was simple: he was told to vote what his family supported - not just the party but the individual persons his family had chosen to support. After the elections, Mitsos found out that Kiriakos had changed his mind. He never forgave him for doing so: two years later when Kiriakos was going to be married, it was his time to ask his best friend a great favour: he wanted Mitsos to be his best man. But this time, Mitsos (against all predictions) refused and he provided some poor excuses. After the betrayal by his best friend, he never felt as close as they used to be. And as Kiriakos had chosen to follow his family's wishes, so did Mitsos. He alienated Kiriakos by not turning him into family with the strong bond of *koumbaria*. Kenna (1976b:351) explains the importance of this Greek notion:

In a situation where co-operation and trust are thought to be possible only between members of the same nuclear family household, and where ties outside the family are essential to maintain it, trusting and co-operative relationships outside the family are only possible if they are phrased in the idiom of family and
backed by moral sanctions which are strong and, in many cases, stronger than those of kinship.

The bond of friendship between Klrlakos and Mitsos had been decisively broken. Klrlakos chose to follow his family's political decisions, and Mitsos also followed his family. Political alliances proved stronger than the innocence of their youth. Collard's (1991:136) point makes it clear:

Despite significant changes in different historical periods many social relations at the village level continue to be mediated through kinship, though the form of this mediation has altered. The continued existence of patronymic kin-groupings exerts an influence on a number of aspects of social life: on the social composition of the village, on residential patterns (though only to a limited extent now), on the formation of political alliances and the mobilisation of support.
III. A contradiction in terms of political orientation

There is an interesting difference between the number of left-wing voters in general elections and those in communal elections. The left wing party of Papandreou, PASOK, had been always elected in the village at general elections. One very active representative of PASOK had been repeatedly elected since 1981: Tsiyaridas managed to raise capital from the PASOK government for projects of public benefits in the underdeveloped county of Evrytanlia which was very poor before the 1980s. Many villages lacked electricity before 1985; the only asphalt road before 1981 was the national road which connected Lamia to Karpenisi; another 14 kilometres from Karpenisi to Trano was the remaining asphalt the county had. The improvement of road communication was crucial for this county in general.

In 1988 after two four-year periods under a left wing Government, PASOK lost the elections and New Democracy (right wing) took the lead in government. This shift of government helped Pavlos Bakoylannis (whose place of origin was a remote village in Evrytanlia), as a member of Parliament and son-in-law of the President of “New Democracy” Mr. Mitsotakis, to withdraw a considerable amount of money from his right-wing party to fight forcefully against Tsiyaridas. People still comment in Karpenisi how some right wing persons appeared with Jeeps during the elections (which they retained afterwards) in order to go around and persuade their fellow villagers to vote against PASOK and for Nea Demokratia.

Many people shifted their political positions not at general but at their local communal elections. Therefore, a right wing orientation emerged in the last ten years in the county that in fact promoted the New Democracy policy in the region. The unfortunate event of Bakoylannis’ assassination in 1990 made him a local hero, and his wife Dora Bakoylanni (also the daughter of the New Democracy president Mr. Mitsotakis) was elected in 1992 in general elections to represent Evrytanlia as a deputy. The promotion of the New Democracy party continued. In September 1996 during the last general elections, she withdrew from the deputyship for Evrytanlia for fear of competing with the opposing and still strong party of PASOK. At this point Tsiyaridas had stood down for another rising young politician not leaving entirely the political arena, for he has his supporters. After that, she decided to stand as a deputy in one of the municipalities of Athens where she was finally elected. It is obvious from both the
local and the general shifts people exercise in Evrytania, that the stake for their villages is somewhat different from that of their political parties. The same can be said for the political parties' leadership.

So it is possibly not surprising why in the village in the general elections between the two major parties of PASOK and New Democracy, a PASOK majority always wins, while in the communal elections, for many of the four yearly elections the right-wing Selliotis succeeds. Spiros Selliotis who is a right-wing candidate, used to be a president for many of the last four-year periods. He is the father of today's president Nikos Selliotis. In the communal elections, the current president Nikos Selliotis is elected thanks to the migrants and due to his family's influence. In the last elections he was elected for a second four-year time after an adventurous campaign and the withdrawal of the left-winger candidate under obscure conditions (a dirty agreement with the candidate of the opposite left-wing party).

His father, Spiros, also used to be a president for many of the last four-year periods, where he used this character for obtaining more than he was permitted: grabbing other's people property and earning more power within the village. The local supporters of PASOK* complaining about their co-villagers' attitude who shift their political beliefs for fear that Selliotis will fight them personally if they not support and elect him. They say "this is not to do with your political beliefs. They do exactly what Selliotis will say to them". In fact, Spiros Selliotis visits all the powerless individuals (widows, old men, pensioners, or people who have no extended family to stand for them anymore) in the village the night before the elections and he persuades them in order to vote for his son (or for himself in the past). This is not secret: he gives them a closed but already marked envelope with his preferences and asks them to find it in the ballot-box. "And if somebody says - yes I will vote for you and don't, they will always find out who it was" the locals say "because votes are all fixed or in the bag" (metrimena koukla).

* The written style for quoting the Pan Hellenic Socialist Party (PASOK) is following the way this party uses capital letters for its name and is widely used elsewhere; see Clogg (1992), Legg and Roberts (1997), Campbell (1968), Eudes (1970), Woodhouse (1968/1991) et.al.
TABLE 2  
(Malenou, 1999)

LOCAL ELECTIONS IN TRANO, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People registered</th>
<th>487</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of votes recorded</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Votes</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3  
(Malenou, 1999)

VOTES PER PARTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Democracy</th>
<th>PASOK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men voters</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women voters</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>198</strong></td>
<td><strong>175</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4  
(Malenou, 1999)

NATIONAL ELECTION IN EVRYTANIA, 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Democracy</th>
<th>PASOK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Votes in Evrytania</td>
<td>12.407</td>
<td>12.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes in Trano</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interesting thing here is that in the national elections PASOK wins locally, while in the local elections New Democracy is ahead of PASOK (Table 4). The political balance is shifting due to the large number of the migrants who form political alliances according to their patronymic groups and do not vote according to their political ideology or conscience. Their egg-timer of identity is turned over as they change context: being PASOK, living in Athens, they support PASOK in the village for the National Elections. Being PASOK, living in Athens, having a house in the village, they vote for the Local Elections according to their loyalties and patronage that may be different from what they usually support (as Kiriakos above did).
Every ten years the Statistical Greek Service conducts a census. From the late census of 1991 only 339 were recorded living in the village in contrast to 469 living a decade before (in 1981). The village's prominent migration has led this number to dwindle but not to nothing; this is evident in Table 5:

**TABLE 5**

(Malenou, 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another survey of the population can be based on the number of households that exist in the village. I used a map of the village for locating all the families who owned a house (see APPENDIX II: 284 houses), also, the official number of the houses that are given water by the community counts 324 households. The difference between these two numbers is because in one house there may exist two households, one at ground level and another on the first floor; one should notice that the two housewives are not sharing a cooking hearth as Hirshon (1983b) has described. These two numbers cannot be correlated for in a two storey house, two different households are situated usually within one expanded family (the mother and father and their married daughter or son). At all events both locals and incomers by retaining a house in the village, have an interest in the locality. From my research I discovered that this should be counted as an active number that affects the population not just quantitatively but also as qualitatively: the locals' and the migrants' presence reflects the embodiment of this place in their identity (Table 6).

**TABLE 6**

(Malenou, 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSES IN THE VILLAGE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOUSES OF LOCALS</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSES OF INCOMERS</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NUMBER</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another survey for the number of the population is the number of the electorate. In 1994 487 persons are registered in the electoral registers / check lists of Trano (Table 7).

**TABLE 7: Voting (Malenou, 1996)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>PERMANENT</th>
<th>MIGRANTS IN GREECE</th>
<th>MIGRANTS IN EVRYTANIA</th>
<th>LIVING Ghere/6 there</th>
<th>MIGRANTS ABROAD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less than half of this number live permanently in the village. The rest are migrants living dispersed in different cities of Greece such as Karpenisi, Lamia, Athens, Thessaloniki, Patra, Volos, Agrinio or abroad in the USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Africa. From them 253 are men and 234 are women; they are distributed in groups according to their ages as it their birth certificates were recorded in the list (Table 8 and 9).

**TABLE 8: Electorate (Malenou, 1996)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>PERMANENT</th>
<th>MIGRANTS IN GREECE</th>
<th>MIGRANTS IN EVRYTANIA</th>
<th>LIVING Ghere/6 there</th>
<th>MIGRANTS ABROAD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9: ELECTORATE (Malenou, 1996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>PERMANENT IN GREECE</th>
<th>MIGRANTS IN EVRYTANIA</th>
<th>MIGRANTS ABROAD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81+</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Still this number is not completely accurate for it does not include children under 18 years of age who are not voting and are therefore not recorded in the electorate of the village. The number of the children and youth of Tranioots are 139, from which 25 are local boys and 21 are local girls; the rest are incomers. According to my data collected in 1996 the total number of the village's population is 626 people (Table 10).

Table 10 (Malenou, 1996)

THE TOTAL POPULATION OF TRANIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>PERMANENT IN GREECE</th>
<th>MIGRANTS IN EVRYTANIA</th>
<th>LIVING 6here/6 there</th>
<th>MIGRANTS ABROAD</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81+</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to my sources in 1996, the locals (222 people) are distributed according to their age groups in proportion, in relation to the total population of Trano (Table 10 - Diagram 1).

**Diagram 1**

*Malenou, 1996*

**Age Group of Locals**

- 1-10: 11%
- 11-20: 11%
- 21-30: 12%
- 31-40: 9%
- 41-50: 12%
- 51-60: 9%
- 61-70: 17%
- 71-80: 12%
- 81+: 9%
From my sources in 1996 I present diagram number 2 where the migrants (404 people) are distributed in proportion according to their age groups in relation to the total population of Trano (Table 10).

**DIAGRAM 2.** (Malenou, 1996)

**AGE GROUP OF MIGRANTS**

[Image of a pie chart showing age group distribution.]
From my research it emerges that the number of males and females is well-balanced, as shown in the table 8 and 9. From a total of 487 people, 253 are men and 234 are women. However, the distinction by age groups shows certain peculiarities. First, at their productive age men outnumber women (31-50 years). As they both get older, men die first, while women live longer (71-...), (Graph 1).

**GRAPH 1: THE ELECTORATE IN 1996** (Malenou, 1996)
Second, as the electorate of locals shows, there is a striking difference between the number of men and women at the age group of 21 to 30, in favor of men. The reason for this is that the local girls are looking to marry anybody outside the village in order to escape from the closed community and the control it dictates to its residents. Thus, after marriage, they follow their husbands to the city centers. For the local boys this is a continuing drawback for life in the village: "We are short of women in the village" they will say. Here is also evident the longevity of women who reach a riper old age than that of the men (Graph 2).

**GRAPH 2: THE ELECTORATE OF THE LOCALS (Malenou, 1996)**
Third, the electorate of migrants (Graph 3) shows the shifts in the policy of migration according to the periods described in Chapter Four. The people born before the Second World War, now in their sixties or older, were migrating alone working in order to support their families back home. The next generations migrated either alone or as families. One can notice the striking number of people who left in the 1950s and 1960s due to the political crisis that deeply affected the population of Evrytania. As for those who were born after the 1970s, women are more keen to leave the village than men for the reason explained in Graph 2. That is because they look for a "better" place to live. In some cases they also feel the restrictions of the village's social life in repressing them, as in the village women's roles are differentiated from those of the men who enjoy more freedom before marriage.

GRAPH 3: THE ELECTORATE OF THE MIGRANTS

![Graph showing the electorate of migrants by age groups.](image-url)
Of course, one should consider that the relation between households, elections locals and migrants (heterodimotes Incomers and / or just migrants who do not vote here) is difficult to discover. There are many people who have a house or just land in the village and do not vote here. From the total number of the village’s households, (counted from the water supply and irrigation lists) 94 households have not any political interest here. There are also people who bought a house without having a special bond in the village: no friends or family or land. They go there only for vacation. What sort of identification fits them? Both migrants and locals use the term “foreign” (xenos) for them, as if they come from another country. Together with the question about population emerges the issue of identity, as waves of migrants alter the number of the residents of the village in different periods during the year.

The question concerning the population of the village is: which number is considered correct in demographic terms? The number of people who live permanently here, the number of people who vote here or the number of people who own property here? There are also cases of people who live six months in the village and six months in the city (i.e. pensioners who prefer to spend the harsh winter in a milder climate), as well as cases of people who come to spend their whole summer in the village. All these people have found a tricky way to manipulate the census conducted every ten years by which the government will decide how much money will be permitted for the community or the municipality (SATA, Siloyiki Apofasi Topikis Aftodhikisis, KAP=Kentrik Aftotelis Port) as a subsidy for its existence. In every census, all the Greeks travel back to their birthplaces or places of origin affecting in this way the number of permanent residents (i.e. the locals). This manipulation of the population’s numbers is officially recognized. The revenues of the community are increased following the increase of the number of its residents and are decreased when the census diminishes. This is definitely related to the migrants’ interest in the survival of the community in economic terms. The migrants’ return for voting also declares their interest in the locality’s politics and these two measurements are both expressions of their identities. Thus identity is very flexible in terms of actual residence, kinship loyalty and political loyalties.
CHAPTER 7  The Struggle for Power

The following examples confirm the significance of migrants' groups in the original and migrant locations. The struggle is enacted in various ways as the next cases show and control of the local politics and power appear in different forms.

1. The case of the Cultural Association

The clash for the acquisition of political control and power in Trano is enormous within the migrants and the villagers. The Cultural Association of Trano (Politistikos Silloyos) has its central offices in Athens. This society is quite an old institution founded in 1878 for all the migrants of the village of Trano. It has been a very active society for many years, gathering money and building or equipping different projects in the village. The central hotel, that includes coffee-shop and restaurant, is just one of their donations. Nowadays the members of this association still remain very active. Every year they organise a dancing night in a prestige music restaurant in Athens; they also publicise a trimester periodical called "the Voice of the Village" with short stories about the old Times and a few comments about the recently deceased, births or married migrants. It is widely distributed, apart from the village, to all the main cities of Greece where migrants of Trano live (Athens, Lamia, Volos, Thessaloniki, the USA).

Their main activity, however, remains the organisation of the Cultural Week, a happening that occurs every summer in the village. It has been established since 1988. From my first encounters with the local youth of the village I became conscious that the summer festival was a hot issue but nobody really gave me any details. They kept saying "wait until the summer and you'll see for yourself what's going on". This sounds very familiar to Kenna's experience (1992a:152) where during her encounters with the locals, prevarication and "promises that all would be revealed another time" were continuously made. Whenever I was trying to put my finger on it, people did not help me at all: perhaps a rather mysterious fact had taken place and people were too embarrassed to mention it to me.
On the other hand, they kept narrating stories about the Cultural Week and how they won volleyball and football matches; these stories were repeated so often that I learned them by heart in the end... Still, this was confusing for me for I could not perceive how they could criticise something in which they had willingly participated with enthusiasm. The peoples' reactions towards the problem of the Summer Festival were the same as those they had when questions about the civil war were made: a sheer unwillingness to give any detailed context for the festival (or the war). At the same time bits and parts of many personal stories, accounts and deeds relating to these disturbing, unfocused, blurred times were discussed sometimes in a rather irrelevant context.

Some research in the library of the Folklorist Museum brought to light some old copies of the migrants' edition "Voice of the Village" with photographs of some of the local boys playing volleyball in 1985. Some insisted that the summer festival had been introduced officially in 1987. The explanation for the confusion about the introduction of the summer festival was due to its patterned performance in the following years. Time and control were the key issues here: for the first two years (1985 and 1986) the summer festival was unofficially organised by both the local and migrant individuals for their entertainment. The original idea for it had emerged one year earlier. In 1984 a backgammon competition took place between the migrants who "were just going to have some fun and were killing their time" (vla na dhiaskedhasoume kai na perasoume tin ora mas) and the locals who "were doing what they used to do" (kanoume oti sinitos). The backgammon competition lasted one week. Groups of two were playing and the winner continued to play with other winners until four people reached the semi finals and only two competed for the finals.

Nikos, a migrant who had taken part comments: "I was having a great time... At last I had something to do in the village and not get bored waiting for time to go by! When I did not play I watched other people playing: my brother, friends or relatives. Only my wife was complaining that I locked her up that summer...". His wife says "The point was that this game was focused on men, therefore it was only they who were having all the good time. I had nothing to do in the
village but get bored. Nikos would waste all his time in the square. He would not leave even for a walk if a game was on". The "backgammon festival" proved to be a great success, in terms of participation and interest. Thus the following summer other activities were also organised bringing entertainment for both women and children.

For a week, backgammon, chess, Volleyball, Painting Competition, Cooking Competition, etc., were unofficially organised and everybody participated with enthusiasm. For a couple of years both migrants and locals co-operated to make the preparations for pastime activities during the one week in August: football (very popular indeed), volleyball, chess, painting competition, and backgammon of course monopolised the people's lives this whole week. In 1988 decisions were made by the "Cultural Association of the Village" for a proper set up. This year counted as the fifth non-institutionalised year of organisation but as the third year of the Institutional (i.e. "official") Cultural Week of Trano. This explained the informants' mumbling about how many years the festival was on. In 1988 the migrants took complete control: their committee made all the necessary arrangements, together with co-operation of the president of the village, Spiros Selliots. At that time, sponsorship became a condition for this occurring. It is hardly a coincidence that the majority of the members of the Cultural Association belong to the right-wing party, like the president of the village. Kenna (1983:272) records the power exercised by another Migrants' Association, from an Island where she conducted her research. Her comments perhaps have similarities for every Greek Migrant's Association; they definitely apply to the "Cultural Association of Trano":

The Association provided successful families with an audience to applaud, praise and assess and it enabled its officers and Committee members to approach ministry officials for aid to the island and at the same time to widen their own contacts with influential people. The Association replicated the island social hierarchy. (Kenna:1983:272)

In the summer of 1996 the pattern had changed very little. The migrants preferred to arrive in the village when the Cultural Week of Trano was on (Photos 40,41). This Festival is advertised locally and people from other villages register for it. Apart from the various competitions and sport activities, a big fiesta is also
organised on the last day of the established week (Photos 42,43). Eating, drinking, dancing and music in the main square of the village take place for the whole village to celebrate, but in fact not everyone is there.

The main reason for this is the use of this panyiri, in order to promote the New Democracy party (a right wing oriented party), where the organisers (both the committee board of the Cultural Association and the president of the village) belong (Photos 44-47). They invite all the important officials of Evrytania to attend their gienti but they distinguish between the left and right representatives. So the prefect of the county, the mayor of Karpenisi and the Police Commissioner who happen to be members of the New Democracy party (at the time) will be present, while the District Commissioner who is a member of the Socialist party (PASOK) is not invited (Photos 48, 49). In 1996 and in 1997 Mrs. Dora Bakoyianni (the right wing deputy representing Evrytania in Parliament) was invited; she honoured with her presence the closing of the festival, but curiously enough she was introduced only to the right-wingers by the president of the village who escorted her from table to table. Cowan (1990:144-146,184) notices that among other civic associations there also exists the Soholan Migrants' Association and that "It is around these that the community social life revolves". She also distinguishes three features of these civil associations: first, all of them are controlled exclusively by adult men, then "that these associations, through ostensibly "civic" and thus exempt from activities in the political realm, tend to become "politicized" (in the strict sense of national party politics, kommatopilimen)" and finally, that "this politicization must be both denied and asserted by the civic association's ruling faction".

The summer festival has became a quite well known event in the locality but there is much discussion about it. Many of the local youth do not believe in this Festival anymore as they have discovered during the years that the organisers took advantage of boys' and girls' activities just to show off only the children whose parents are related to the committee officials, e.g. the daughters of the president Nikos Selliotis (Photo 50). Their expectations broken, they boycott it by not participating anymore.

However, the majority of the locals do not contradict this openly: they keep a low profile and use excuses when the organisers ask them why they don't participate this year. They don't like the idea that the festival is specifically
organised for political reasons and for showing off the organisers and thus to help promote the interests of a certain right-wing clique that dominates the village, namely: the president of the Cultural Association Yerasimos Trihas, the local president Nikos Selliotis (who succeeded his father) and the New Democracy party in general. People say of Yerasimos Trihas who is a very active and enthusiastic organiser that "he has no children, no dogs, no worries, so what the hell, to do? He does this for showing off" (Pedhia, skilia, dhen echl... Oute alles enies.. Etsi me ti sto kalo n' ascholithi; Ascholite me afo yia epidhidix').

As far as the president of the village is concerned, people comment in the village he also uses his daughters to show off. His daughters will usually win the first prize for something. "See..." the locals say when they show me the photographs published in the migrants' magazine "Here is Popi Sellioti (the oldest daughter of the president of the village) winning the first prize in the painting competition... Here is, Litsa Sellioti winning the writing composition competition... See, here they-are both in a Taek-Wo-Do demonstration the night of the Festival's awards especially designed for these two, who had started Taek-Wo-Do lessons in Karpenisi that year". At the same time, many of the children of the migrants look forward to this summer festival: they participate fanatically but apparently they are not very talented like the Presidents' daughters.

Today many of the women migrants also help in organising events. They take a keen interest in every thing that has publicity but they do not like carrying out chores. The priest of the village, Papa-Kiriakos complains: "What do you expect? No good at all... They run after social activities and stuff and they don't help me or my wife to open the museum for instance. All year long I have the key and I open it every time a tourist wants to see it. During the summer when so many of them are coming to rest here they should at least care for it and not just for showing off.. But what do you expect from those fat ladies!" (Ti perimenis; Tipota kalo.. afes trechoun piso apo ta kinonika ke ta tetia ke dhen voithane katholou emena i tin papadhia. Pare yia paradigmata to Mouslo: olo to chrono to
Papa-Kiriakos is on the right: he is not paid for the services he performs and in many cases some of the migrants have also complained about him. He is not sarcastic in his comment about the migrant women; he just means that the migrants are coming here to have fun, and as some may be overweight they do not seize the opportunity to do anything tiring as he and his wife do. On the other hand, the migrants who come in the village to enjoy themselves, sometimes they (i.e. the migrants) do not care if they interfere in the village's affairs.

Kenna (1992a:156-157) comments how while she was continuing her fieldwork in Athens with migrants a few years after her first research in an Aegean island, she became aware of the close and complex ties which bound the two communities together. She states that "I had previously accepted too easily the islanders’ description of themselves as far from God" and now it was time to understand the role of the migrants and their association in the island's affairs; by "investigating the life of migrants, I became a pawn in a power struggle between two categories of migrant, now struggling for control of the Migrants' Association". This seems to apply to all kinds of Associations in similar contexts.
II. The local Football Team

Football is very important for the Traniots. For many years now they have a local football team called "Potamia" (Riverside) which plays in the last category of the professional football championship (Photo 51). Despite being amateurs, they are highly motivated and usually play with a lot of passion. In 1996 they came very close to rising to the next category: the third division of the professional football is considered as a proper and real professional division in contrast to the fourth which is a downgraded division for those who descend into it, still a step to the "glory" for those who are fighting to ascend from it. The locals are very proud of this team but people from other villages or Karpenisi are sceptical about it.

A very bad reputation follows the team which is linked to both the players' and the spectators' attitude, as they appear to be very aggressive and fearsome. "Yes! We are wild because we are real men and not little boys", Antreas said (MALISTAL EMISTAL ALITHINI ANTHRES KAL OCHI TIPOTA PEDHAKIA). But the Karpenislots have a different opinion: "Who? The Traniots? Those savages? They are no better than barbarians..." (PIOL: I TRANIOTES; AFTI I AGRI; AFTI INE SKETI VARVARI...) (Photos 52, 53). As this was considered a hot issue for the locality I had to discover how the Traniots made a reputation for themselves and what sustained this reputation. The emblem of the "Riverside" team is the wild trout which lives in Karpenisiotsis river. This river comes across the valley of Potamia starting from Karpenisi passing Sparos and ending in Prousos. Many wild trout and other wild fishes survive in it. The selection of the wild trout for the Traniots' Football Team emblem is related to their notion of being wild and undisciplined. From anthropological knowledge it is well known that the environment is selectively perceived by cultures. The Traniots impose order and meaning on the world but the question is how. The social constructionist's approach suggests that classification plays a large part in the way humans organise their world. Douglas (1966) explained that systems of animal classification reveal the nature of concepts of pollution. In the case of the Israelites holiness involves correct definition, discrimination and order: it keeps distinct the categories of creation, requiring that different classes of things should not be confused. The individual should conform to the class to which they belong.
Okely (1983:77) suggests that the Gypsies are an independent group; they are not passively "copying" the beliefs of the dominant society but they retain their own ritual beliefs. Their difference is expressed by the pollution beliefs of the dominant society but they retain their own pollution beliefs which reinforce their ethnic boundaries. Okely (1983:80) argues that the Gypsies' treatment of domestic space, classification of animals etc. express the Gypsy - Gorglo political and economic relationships. The Gypsies' classification of animals depends on the animals' position or use on both Gorglo and Gypsy space; what is "wild" or "far" for the Gorglos is "home" for the Gypsies and vice versa (ibid.:90).

A parallel could be made with the Tranlots' perspective of wild animals: by adopting them as their emblem they symbolically stress their difference from others. Animals' distinctions cast light on the Tranlots' symbolic body and lifestyle separation. The "wild" trout symbolises the Tranlot self and the Tranlots' role as represented to the migrants. For the local Tranlots identification with the "wild" is both a symbol and a covering for their Inner selves. The classification of animals into wild and domestic by the society creates a symbolic boundary, which gives the locals preference over everybody else and preserves Tranlotic identity, as well as the unity and solidarity among them. It should be said that this reputation is related to the general behaviour of the male Tranlots concerning hooliganism in football as much as brawls in the night clubs (Photos 54,55). As the Tranlots explained to me "we do not particularly enjoy fights but when one of us is in trouble, everybody gets involved to help him even if he is not in his parea" (otan enas apo emas bleksi, oli tha trechoume na ton voithisoume akoma kl an dhen ine sti dhikl mas parea). "One for all and all for one" seems to be the Tranlotic motto but this applies only in the case of the locals against the "outsiders"; those who threaten the solidarity of the group: migrants, the people of the next village, the Karpenislots, the visitors, the referees in the football games (even if he might be a Tranlot as well).

That is the reason why players from other teams of the county, referees, even the fans, refer to the team of Potamia as "the team of the savages". The Tranlots are proud of their reputation and they often confirm it "we are the wild ones... Nobody can beat us" (Emis imaste agril... Kanis dhen bord na mas ti vyi). As a result, every boy in the village is involved in playing football:
he is expected to join the village team when he grows up, even if he is not a very good player. His commitment to the group is more important than his abilities in football. Young people who are not involved in football playing are stigmatised: "what do you expect from Tasos?" (he is Titika's son, the local painter who emigrated from Athens to live in the village) "He is weird... And he never comes to play football with us. They say that he was playing at the cemetery. I don't think he is normal". True or false this latter comment only stresses that discrimination against the migrants grows when a person is not willing to engage her/him self in the habits of the local culture: being wild with everybody else is one of the attitudes expected.

The Football Association of the village was established in the 1980s. Consequently, all the men in their mid-thirties were playing football at some stage of their youth and some of them still do. Others are members of the team's board of directors. There are also two people who left the village a few years ago to become professional players for small but well known teams in Athens. Football makes things hum in village life. One way or another, by playing, by being members of the football committee, or by just watching (which is the only activity the women are involved in) the locals are interested in football matches. Women do not play but they are very tolerant towards the members of their families who are going to play football every Sunday. Wives will not ask their husbands to go for a visit while a football match is on; sisters will replace their brothers usually in tasks related to tourism, such as coffee shops, rooms and taverns, and mothers will be prepared to lose a helping hand in the same sort of job, for all of the local enterprises related to tourism are run on a family basis.

The football season starts in October and finishes in April highlighting this way the dull winter season when nothing much really happens. A whole family will bother to go and watch the Sunday match if it is held in the local field and if there is a "dead" period for tourism. The kids will ask their parents for permission (and get it) to follow the local team elsewhere. The young unmarried women support their team quite fanatically whenever they get the opportunity to watch it. The young girls will usually arrive in the local field in large numbers, having come all together on foot; on their way back, some truck or car will pack the whole lot of them back to the village; however, they will not follow the team to other villages by bus or by car. When the team plays in another village they will rent a
bus just for the occasion and if there is no room in the bus for all of them (athletes, committee and fans), those who have a car will follow the team to support it no matter how far away. Women, obviously, remain in the locality but on the other hand, they appear to be much more selective than men for their companionships, their entertainment and their time management. They will retain their independence of movement by choosing themselves where they want to go, with whom they want to be or what time they are going to get back: they will never hang purposelessly around. Fischer and Gainer (1994:85-86) write that there are other forms of sport consumption apart from participation: watching and following the news, for example. In their study of masculinity and the consumption of organised sports, they stress that although sports seem to be both masculine consumption and domain, still femininity has to be studied along with masculinity. They argue that all the feminist writers focus on research about women, while men are conceptualised as an abstract category; therefore "only women appear to be gendered beings and the idea of gender as a relational process is lost" (ibid.).

The local players claim that they are playing just for fun and they are not interested in the result of the game or in the points they collect every season for the championship of the fourth division of Professional Football. Most probably they do not lie: their attitude concerning their team is very relaxed. They did not bother to train properly during the week; however, all of them are very fit young men who work in laborious jobs every day: "I will never give up a Saturday-night entertainment for the sake of tomorrow's game" (Siya mi dhe vgo apopse to vradhi, epidhi pezoume avrio, i.e. tin Kirlaki). In fact, at every game at least one player is playing with the handicap of a hangover, or without having slept the previous night at all. They usually play quite passionate games and their statements that they don't care about the result because they play just for fun belies the fact that they are heartbroken if they lose. At the beginning of every game they are cool and relaxed; this attitude continues if the result is in their favour. But if they lose, they take it very seriously: everybody has to do his best to overturn the result of the game. "It is as simple as that: we win or we die" (i.e. poll aplo: I tha niki soume i tha pethanoume). Of course, nobody dies but they actually mourn afterwards. After the end of the game, the players will gather in the local coffee shop to "analyse" the game. This usually happens when they have played in the
local football field. Free talk, jokes, taunts, comments and stories will be narrated as the players and the fans drink coffee or beer. This happens in the case of winning or equalising. A sense of solidarity and enthusiasm is in the air. But if the team loses, then the silence following the traditional get-together sitting in the coffee shop is overwhelming. No jokes or idle conversations take place. They will still be bound together to this (nobody will sneak out of the way) but no camaraderie or any discussion will break out. The occasion is adequate only for grief. Grief so heavy that it recalls that of the grief following an actual death: “We are seated as in a funeral” (imaste san kidhla). Stewart did his research in Naxos, a small island in the Cyclades. He writes (Stewart:1991:32) that football matches seem to be a substitute church service in the Naxiote context where he worked:

Occurring on Sundays, sometimes starting before noon, football matches parallel church services. This connection was drawn implicitly by young fans who chanted, “Come to the playing field, so that you may revere Pannaxlako” (name of the team meaning “Naxos United”). The verb “to revere” (proskyno; lit. “to bend or bow before”) is marked by its use in religious contexts. In particular one reveres icons and by extension this verb frequently denotes attending church or going on a pilgrimage where the central action involves entering the chapel, making the sign of the cross three times, and kissing the principal icon(s). Sporting events are emerging as a sort of secular ritual to replace a religious ritual, the Sunday liturgy, which has decreased in importance for the younger generation. Such games continue certain features of religious practice although by different means. Contests promote solidarity of a group by setting it against a notionally foreign group. In religious ritual social unity is created from within through communal prayer and the sharing of bread, either in the form of communion or as blessed bread distributed at the end of the service to all attendance.

As the Tranlots play to win glory (via na dhoksastoun) or they mourn (penthoun) after a defeat I tend to agree with the comparison of sporting events to religious rituals which Stewart suggests in his research.

Because of the popularity of the football in the village and of the appeal it has over both the locals and the migrants, they gather and organise small teams to play whenever the latter come in the village for vacations. Of course, football
matches are expected to be organised during today's famous Cultural Week during the summer.

Every year an atmosphere of great rivalry between the two groups grows as everybody awaits with enthusiasm mixed with agony the sports meeting among the locals and the migrants (Photos 40, 41). The football matches are organised in such a way that different football teams are competing with each other for a few days. In the last game only two winners who have beaten all the other teams will play for the trophy. Usually the locals (who are far better at football than the migrants) win and a team from another village is their opponent. Here, an interesting shift occurs: as the locals have to play against teams from other villages the whole village supports in unison "their" team (i.e. the locals) forgetting just for a couple of hours how the locals as much as the migrants usually separate themselves from one another. This is related to the attitude of these two groups against another team. When and where the migrants and the locals technically share the same space (i.e. within the village) they both mutually separate from one another but the "we" / "they" barrier changes outside the locality. This shift creates another "us" / "them" barrier, where "us" now means the previous separated groups now united (Traniots, who are born, living or married there or elsewhere) and "them" is a new group of people containing everybody living outside the village. As Herzfeld (1985:16) comments

In a social universe which is organized conceptually on segmentary principles and articulated by a single dominant opposition between insiders (edhich) and outsiders (ksen), the performance that captures the greatest number of levels of social bounding at once will be taken the most seriously.

Every summer several events happen making clear the differences within these two groups. Thanks to the huge publicity from the radio and the posters and also to the previous years' success, this summer cultural festival invited many more interested individuals and teams to join the games in relation to other years. Many people and teams want to compete and play with others. The entries were collected in the hands of the board committee of the Cultural Association. They are organising the games and reward the prizes. In 1996 entries for the summer festival were still advertised by the local radio station until the very last day of the festival. The reality was that one week before the beginning of the festival all the
places for entries had already been completed. Before any announcement (from the prospective players of the team) Yerasimos Trihas, who as the President of the Migrants' Association co-operates in organising the Festival every year, and the president of the village Nikos Selliotis, decided to enter only one team to represent the village for both the football and basketball competition and they named it "Trano Village".

Their Initiative aroused rumours and complaints from everybody: the common tactic for a team's entry to the list of competitors is to write down the names of the players who are willing to participate in a team and then declare it to the secretary's office for the competition. But they (for the first time and with their own initiative) introduced a "phantom" team without a list of initially declared players. This was perceived as a declaration of their power and command over this Festival: "They can do what they like" Fedonas said "it is their Festival anyway..." (kanoun oti theloun afou to festival ine dhiiko tous). Shortly, this open list was filled with both locals' and migrants' names. But the criterion for joining each team was one's connection with the president of the Village or the president of the Association. These people enrolled as soon as they found out about it, having spoken before to the person "responsible" for organising it. Yerasimos entered and filled the other places for basketball and football competition with teams from other villages.

In the summer of 1996 the participation was so great that they had to extend the cultural "Week" to ten days because they could not finish the games and the matches earlier. Six football teams and another six basketball teams were enrolled in two different divisions, where they had to beat each other until the preliminary game and the best of each category would compete in a final game. Usually these games took place during the afternoon, for many people who participate are working. To run this festival the committee of the Cultural Association asks for sponsorship from the local enterprises and they also collect a large amount of money from the last night fiesta of this festival. The "gleniti" offers music, food and drink when you buy a ticket for it and usually the majority of the village participates in it (Photos 44-49).

The decision Yerasimos and Nikos made about the village's team was crucial because this time it created an open clash between them (as the decision
makers) and the people who wanted to participate (migrants and locals). It also confirmed the former's control and power over one of the village's superficially harmless issues. "Who first of all was supposed to play football, for example, for the team of Trano?" (Pios ipolithethe oti tha protepeksi bala yia to chorio;).

The demand for the local team of Potamla had already fulfilled the number of the 11 basic and another five auxiliary players, as combatant, auxiliary or veteran players from Potamla team wanted to play football against the migrants. On the other hand, the migrants who come to the village in some cases just for the sake of this festival would also have liked to play but this time they did not find a team "of their own" so they had to compromise by playing with and not against the locals with whom were usually opponents. "This is no fun at all... Why should we play with other villages and not play among ourselves as usual? Many people want to play. This is our Festival. What business do they have here?" (Afto dhenechi katholou plaka... Yiati na peksoume me ta alla choria kai na min paksoume metaksi mas opos panta; Afou oli theloun na paroun meros. To Festival ina dhiko mas. Ti dhoulia echoun ta alla choria edho;). The reason obviously was the demonstration of power of both Presidents ("they will see who really runs the Festival", Yerasimos said) and the contact with other villages in the area for political reasons. Elections were to come in a couple of years. Stewart (1991:31) notices (also see my Photo. n. 56):.

Football matches, local festivals, and political rallies are all contexts for extra village contact. Several of the larger villages field their own soccer teams, which play against teams from other Naxos villages as well as from other islands. The matches are displays of community pride when two Naxlote sides play, and a good deal of taunting and verbal abuse may pass between the respective supporters. In matches played between a Naxlote side and an away team, this verbal aggression often degenerates into physical violence.

The speed with which the news spread was critical: those who found out about it quickly made the necessary connections with the presidents, but a lot were left out. Finally, it was the president's choice as to who was going to enrol in this team. In the end, the football team was made up of a mixture of a few
locals and more migrants players. Their choice had been made partially in accordance with their competence and ability in football and mainly by their connections with Yerasimos and Nikos. It was the funniest mixture ever of all possible players as migrants who had not kicked a ball for ages were in the same team with athletic youngsters who were playing regularly for the local team. Everybody's choice was based on economic, social or political reasons: Yerasimos and Nikos wanted to please their supporters by patronising the making up of the team. An illustrative example is the president's choice for the goalkeeper of the team of "Trano".

Dinos Lemonis has recently migrated from Athens to Trano. He is a house painter and relies on the president's recognition for having more jobs. He also has an extended family and all his relatives support (politically) Nikos Selliotis as they did Nikos's father before. Dinos was born and lived with his family in Athens and he did not pay frequent visits to the village as a small boy. He started to come during his teenager summers a decade ago and since then he enjoyed returning on every occasion. At the age of fifteen, he left school and started to do several jobs for earning money. He ended up as an assistant of a house painter and he worked for some years in Athens before deciding to go "back" and live permanently in the village. There he could run his own business as his uncle who is a building constructor who could help him to find jobs. His family (mother, father and two younger brothers) still live in Piraeus, so he lives alone in a house that he rents in the village. He is quite satisfied with the decision he made: "the cost of living here is so low. Take the coffee, for instance: 300 drachmas here but 800 drachmas in a good cafeteria in Piraeus! I did not regret coming here". He is having a good time, he does not work very hard but he knows that he has secured the necessaries for living. While he has his "own people" in the village his position within the local youth is very ambiguous. As he admitted once to me; "here people do not see me as one of them". While he can feel their disapproval of his attitude, he honestly admits that he does not do things according to the local standards and he does not want to change it. He is, therefore, accepted by the local community of the young people, but not necessarily respected.
By choosing Dinos (an ex-migrant and a today local well known and with friends in both groups), Selliotis managed two things at once: firstly, he thanked the extended family of Dinos for their support in the last year’s elections and secondly, by introducing Dinos as a basic member of the team he used Dinos’s dual identity to absorb the complaints he expected to arrive for not having this year at least, the usual two teams which every time represented the social mixture of the village: one for the migrants and another for the locals.

For in the past, other teams appeared to participate in the football games of the Festival based on peer group, like age or old schoolmates, or even on families ties. Nikos Selliotis chose for joining the team other locals whose father was important for him, but he left out the better players who were expected to make up the team. Dinos, the goalkeeper, who could ask for some better players for the team’s line of defence, kept silent and miraculously was chosen again to join the basketball team as well (even if he is not a very good player).

The local players who were left out became angry and asked Yerasimos directly to "let" them play, instead of the migrants he chose: "This is our village too! We play all the year football in Potamia, so we are in a good shape and we can beat all the other teams... We will lose the trophy and people will laugh... We will be subjected to social ridicule!" (To chorio ine kai dhiko mas! Olo to chrono pezoume bala stin Omadha kal imaste se forma, yia afty boroume na tous nikisoume olous... Tha chasoume to kipelo mesa apo ta cheria mas kai tha yelane... Tha kseftilistoume!) (Photo 41). Here one can notice that the notion of "belonging" has multiple meanings and is acted out in a "game" or serious struggle. Football enacts the splits and the divisions of the village life. The "game" is used here to play out rivalries, uncertainties, conflicts and loyalties.

The intricacy here is that everybody: migrants and locals, locals who make fun of the festival or those who have lost their interest and faith in it, young and old, men and women, pay a lot of attention to "the trophy" of the game. Medals and trophies are widely distributed to the winners and the participants on the last day of the festival celebration. It is generally expected that "the best team or individual to win should be from the village, so all the trophies will remain in it" (I (kaliteri) omadha pou tha nikisl, prepi na
In every local house I visited, the commemorative medals or papers proving participation in this festival were usually placed in a prominent place, next to wedding pictures or other framed certificates. Yerasímos excused his decision to the locals in this way: "they (i.e. the migrants) should play as well as you. Their reason is that they come here and expect to enjoy themselves and participate, not just watch..." (Afíl -i metanastes- prépl na peksouν opos epísis ke esis. Yiati otan erchonte edho theloun na dlaskedhasoun ke na simetechoun se ola ta pechnidhia ke ochl mono na kitane...). And this is exactly what he actually does: while he is complaining that nobody helps him to organise and run the festival, at the same time he安排s to be the referee or the assistant for every game. Moreover, he systematically refuses to let anybody else to blow the whistle at a match or to give awards to the winners at the glentl on the last night of the festival (Photo 48).

Both the locals (as far as football was concerned) and the migrants (as far as basketball concerned) asked Yerasímos to register one more team representing the village; with another team, more people could participate in the events. Yerasímos refused by saying "we can't have TWO "Trano village" teams, can we?" (Dhen boroume na ecoume DHIO omádes pou na iegonte Trano). By saying that the village should appear in unison, he also implied that he was the one to decide how many teams the village should have and that he had decided this year that the village should have only one. He stopped the conversation there, angering all the people trying talk to him: young and old, mothers and sons, migrants and locals. His power and control over this issue proved that the climate of the festival has changed over the years as the locals had previously complained. The festival does not take place for the village's sake anymore but for the promotion and showing off of a concrete political party which happens to support the board committee of the "Cultural Association of The Village" (Photo 57).

The rest of the local football players were alarmed as the time for the festival to begin was coming. It would have been the first year for them that they had not participated in the festival, and while they wanted to boycott it because of Trihas' attitude, on the other hand they wanted to join it in order not to lose the
fun. The solution they came up with annoyed them more than if they had not participated at all. They simply went to the neighbouring village, Prasino, and asked the team who already had an entry for the festival if some of the local players of the Potamia team, who were left out of the newly formed festival team, could join them playing against "Trano" and the other teams. This team who did not have very good players accepted hoping to win the trophy from Trano this year. The newcomer Traniots players suggested they rename this new team formerly "Prasino" now "Antartes", which means Resistance Fighters and carries specific connotations and memories from the disturbed era of 1946-51.

This renaming was an open statement to those who made the arrangements for football and excluded them that, as real "rebels", they had finally found a way to participate in the festival against all odds. Their demand to change the team's name from "Prasino" to "Antartes" drove Yerasimos frantic: he as a devoted right wing person still refers to the original Antartes by using a negative and intimidating tone full of disgust. The Antartes fought in the mountains of Evrytania initially against the Germans and later against the governmental (right-wing) troops. They were characterised as left wing oriented people although many of them had not been communists. The conflict of 1945 to 1951 is referred to by a dual term: the right wing people use the word Bandit's War (Simmoritopolemos), underestimating this way not just the open clash between the two parties, but also the resistance of EAM-ELAS during the German Occupation in Greece 1940-44, which were joined and fought later as Antartes. Neutral or left wing people when they speak about that period, use the word Civil War (Emfilios Polemos). This explains the appalled expression in Yerasimos' face when he was asked to enrol a team called "Antartes". He commented: "Antartes?!... What sort of name for a team is this..." (Antartes; Ti soi onoma yia omadha ine aito). But, finally, he had to write them down, as well.

The final game was between the team of "Trano" who won in its category (as it was expected) and the team of "Antartes" a winner again in the other category (which, surprisingly, was not expected). The whole village of Trano young and old, men and women, migrants and villagers were gathered in the field forming one of the biggest crowd I had ever seen. When "Antartes" came on to the field the majority of the people started to shout "Betrayal", "Judases" to
them (Prodhotes loudhes). As the whole story for the "pre-organised Trano team" was not widely known, people were not informed about the compulsory exclusion of many of the local and migrant players from the team and the games. The introduction of only one team was seen as an attempt at collaboration by both parties: "This is a good thing. We should play against the others and not among us" (Afto ine kalo. Tha prepi na pesoume me tous allous ke ochi metaks! mas) many commented. So, their reaction was due to the obvious fact that some of the local Tranriot players were playing with another village team. Although people recognise the struggle between the two or in many cases more than two groups, they are not willing to admit it publicly. Conflicts should remain in the closed space of the village and not be stated openly in the outside world. The few who tried to stand for the minority of the Tranlots playing with "Antartes", were family or close friends of them. But the vast majority, which had never heard of the details (concerning the compulsory "only one Trano team this year" attitude) forced them to join the other team which was shouting and insulting them during the match. After a dramatic game the final score was 2-1 in favour of "Trano", a big relief for those who blamed "Antartes" and endangered their position by declaring before the match: "we will beat you, we will eat you alive, etc.". (Tha sas skisoume, tha sas roufiksoume to ema, ktl.). For another year the fame and the honour of Trano was saved, although some whispers about unfair refereeing were spread in the following days.

This festival was born 12 years ago. The idea derived from a bunch of people - mainly migrants - who were fanaticallty engaged in backgammon games. Every afternoon they were sitting outdoors in the main square of the village playing with each other; so they organised a tournament of backgammon. A couple of years later, football and volleyball tournaments followed. The successful idea of gathering for a specific reason instead of hanging aimlessly around in the summer holidays attracted many migrants the following years. From the very first time a competitive group game (e.g. football) was organised, a critical division appeared. Two teams were automatically created: one of the locals and the other of the migrants (I have stressed that the division was something expected and introduced at the same time from both groups for both groups, although there is an exception in this rule). It became very clear to me, that a football game was not just a game. It was a "game" between the rival groups that shared the locality. The migrants and the locals of Trano use the
football or the basketball match as a mean for enacting their conflicts. The division between the insiders and the outsiders, their rivalries, moreover, even their loyalties often turn an innocent game into a serious struggle. The notion of locality is constantly contested. It is also interrelated to resistance and rebellion because of the historical context of the region. In Evrytania, resistance and rebellion are part of landscape, past and memory. It is for this reason that being "wild" is also becoming part of the real self and original local identity.
ABOVE: In contrast to the winter, in the summer, hundreds of migrants arrive. In the football field boys and girls watch the football matches. BELOW: On the cement wall the locals state their presence by writing TRANO. It is "their" field and everybody should recognize it.  
(Malenou, August 1996)
Backgammon competition in the central square of the village. Migrants and locals compete with each other. ABOVE: Kostas Tsamouras (right), who is the local electrician still wearing his overalls, plays with a migrant from Athens. BELOW: Two locals while playing early in the afternoon: they prefer the games to be organized after they finish their work.  

(Summer 1996, Malenou)
Live music is expected on the night of the glenti of the Cultural Festival. ABOVE: The migrants arrive first and occupy the tables in front of the circle. BELOW: When the tables are full, the migrants occupy the first rows of seats, thus, symbolically stating that it is "their night". (Malenou, 1996)
The big fiesta organised by the Migrant's Association at the end of each Summer Cultural Festival. ABOVE: Live folkloric music is played by a traditional folkloric band. BELOW: Traditional folkloric dancing by the migrants; the President of the village is holding the first man who dances; that is a great honour. (Malenou, 1996)
Members of the New Democracy party were invited in the fiesta of the Cultural Festival. The president of Trano, Nikos Selliotis (next to his wife) belongs to the same political party. BELOW: The sponsor of the year, Katerina Farmaki, awarding the winners; Yerasimos Trihas presents the events.  
(Malenou, 1996)
Popi Selliotis is thirteen years old. She leads the line of girl dancers at the fiesta (*glenti*) of the Summer Festival. Her presence reinforces her father's political status. Nikos Selliotis is the president of the village.

(Malenou, 1996)
The football team of the locals: "Potamia". This is the only photograph I made with the players posing for me. Being a rebel is an attitude applied to everybody. They do not obey any kind of order, therefore, they hate orders and commands. "Hey! Guys! Come here to pose for a picture" was a futile hope for more than two years. The members of the team are wearing sport tops with an advertisement of "the Regional Waterboard of Evrytania", which had been their last sponsor the previous year.

(Malenou, 1997)
The football players of Trano often get involved in a brawl. The referees and spectators are prepared to intervene to stop it. However, the locals are very proud of their attitude: "We are real men" they say. ABOVE: the start of a brawl. BELOW: The intervention of a spectator.

(Malenou, 1995)
ABOVE: The player is angry because he feels that the "Potamia" team was hard done by the referee. BELOW: The police enter the field to stop the brawl, other players also get involved; it is interesting that this particular player is one of the calmest people in the village, but football has transformed him. (Malenou, 1995)
The referee stops the match and leaves the football field followed by the officers. In order to take these photographs I climbed on to the roof of a car. Other spectators and fans of the football team, *Potamia*, which were playing on their field, were going mad because they were not allowed to enter the field and hit the referee. Then, they started to shake the car I was standing on. This is the reason why my photographs from this brawl are getting progressively blurred.

(Malenou, 1995)
At the night of the *glenti* all the state and local dignitaries are seated together at the same table. Their positions are according to their status within the Association of the Migrants or the local affairs. At this table, "the table of the dignitaries", those seated do not stand up when people come to greet them. They declare their power with their bodily posture.

(Malenou, 1996)
Hobsbawm and Ranger (1983) examine the invention of tradition as a social practice in societies undergoing change in a collection of articles. Their conclusion is that the invention of tradition structures parts of social life in the modern world as unchanged and invariable by establishing continuity with a suitable historical past. During the last two decades people who live in big urban centres but whose origin is from different villages and cities all over Greece, invented "tradition". The emergence or the re-evaluation of tradition has been promoted from these people who live in a city but whose origin is from a village.

The quest for hand-woven rugs and crochet, home-made dessert spoons and marmalade, local honey, cheese, tsipouro or wine worked as a mechanism for the differentiation of those who were visiting their places of origins from the urban citizens who had no connection with villages, hardly even visiting them (Photos 58-59). Gradually, the repetition of coming back to the village meant that any one who could afford it would restore or build a house in an inherited plot in this way changing the notion of the isolated and backward village to a traditional and valuable site. This was never the case for the village of Trano as the network, ideas and income developed due to its Diaspora. While before, people were answering the question "where are you from" with the cliche' answer "from Athens" (although, from the beginning of the 50s half of the population of Greece moved from rural areas to the city) denying this way their "country-bumpkin" (vlachiki) origin, now it is a resource to have roots, relatives, a house, some land somewhere "back" in a village.

In this way the migrants adopt a traditional way of life according to what they believed or guessed to be tradition; in reality they were inserting consumer models in the society of the village as they buy or restore a second house there. The vast majority of the Greek population are already owners of a house in the place where they usually live (i.e. a city). Those who wanted to differentiate themselves from the other citizens expanded their city identity to the village. This urban elite used heterogeneity for serving their aims in the context of the city where they lived e.g. Lamia, Athens, Thessaloniki. Tradition was recreated not from the villagers but from outside the village. It was also not addressed to the
locals. The middle-class people constructed ideas of "authenticity", "originality" and tradition, in reality, as a demonstration to the cosmopolitan citizens with expensive taste and villas to prove that "if you have the money we have got the tradition". In the Folklorist Museum of Trano many "original" objects are in display. The Museum was founded by the Migrants' Association in the 1980s; the aim and objectives of the migrants are to re-invent tradition according to their needs in contrast to the locals' ideas about tradition (Photos 60, 61, 62).

On the other hand, an E.E.C. policy, started in the mid 1980s, provided the locals with allowances and interest free loans, in order to prompt them to the tourism business. This is related to the emergence of internal tourism, as now Greeks are discovering their own country. While in the past the only suggested place to visit was a person's place of origin or an island in the summer, now people travelled all over the mainland which earlier was mainly visited by its migrants. The locals started to realize that they could make some money with the internal tourists or migrants who seized every opportunity for a weekend in the countryside. In many cases the business could be a small scale shop with local products that operated only during weekends and vacation periods. Usually, it is run by a female member of the family such as a wife or a sister who sells "handmade" products like rugs, jam, honey, tsipouro, oregano and tea or decorative objects. It could also be some rooms to let in the second floor of the family house, or next to it. In Trano after the governmental subsidy mentioned above, a few of the local families built five or six rooms to let, that are usually overseen by the wife, the mother-in-law or the sister of the man in whose name the enterprise is. This income is just supplementary for the families with a couple of exceptions, and a lot of fair or unfair competition takes place among them.
I. Importing Aesthetics in the name of "Tradition"

There are two families in the village who are entirely dependent on their tourist based enterprise for their living. They both run taverns in Sparos. The first couple is the owner of a restaurant (a more appropriate definition for this sort of *taverna*) called "the Horseman". "The Horseman" is situated in Sparos neighbourhood which is less than a mile away from Trano. Sparos used to be a considerable suburb by itself in the past, as the existence of a lot of shops (abandoned now) shows. It is still a very favourable site having many old stone houses situated on both sides of the main road which comes across the valley of Potamia.

"Potamia", meaning river-side, is the valley of which its physical boundaries starts from Karpenisi and ends at *Klidhi* (i.e. Key) a few miles from Sparos. The river Karpenisiotis running across this valley and parallel to the main road provides a unique setting and very fertile land on both of its sides. There in Sparos is the tavern of "the Horseman": an old stone-house recently restored. Today many flowers planted in tree trunks and tables placed under a wooden shelter attract the passing driver's attention. The owner of this house is a member of the extented Pappous' family who were located in Sparos 60 years ago. Jimmy is a migrant in the USA, who like other migrants, retains no interest in restoring it or using it for any purpose nowadays.

The idea of transforming this abandoned house into a restaurant was that of the Livas couple. Elena and Fotis live in Lamia but have also a house in the village and keep close bonds to the village. They knew both Jimmy (the owner of the abandoned house who is also a distant uncle of Elena) and the couple of Flakos who were interested in running a business in the village. Antonis Flakos, the husband of Afroditi Vorias, lost his job in Karpenisi in 1989, when a factory in Karpenisi closed down. The company compensated its employees with an sufficiently large amount of money. Antonis who was already married to Afroditi and lived in Trano, in his father-in-law's house, was looking for an opportunity to run a business in the developing area of the village, where his wife comes from. Afroditi was willing to work too, for they had no plans of having any children. The way women are seen when they work outside their houses is accurately stated
by Kenna's remark (1990:148): "For women to work for wages, outside the sphere of reciprocal labour for kin,... was evidence that the family's resources were small". On the other hand, when one is "running her/his own business" this connotes the self-sufficiency of the household.

The Livas couple took the initiative asking Elena's uncle to rent his abandoned house to Afroditi and Antonis, for setting up a business. Uncle Jimmy agreed and on one of his summer trips back in the village, they made all the necessary arrangements for the agreement. He let this place to them on condition it was restored and run as a tavern for ten years. They named a token price for the rent of this place. People usually follow this tactic of token (simvoliki timi) in Greece whether concerning a house or a plot, but necessarily between relatives or close friends of their relatives as in this case. Afroditi's and Antoni's obligation was to keep it in good shape and at the same time use it as a tavern. The intervention of the Livas couple is crucial: without them the business would have never been set up. The importance of kinship emerges here; through the enactment of kinship relationships other relationships such as economic or political are generated. Evidently, Elena's relationship with her distant uncle is still important: it works as a factor that enables people to do or not to do things, no matter how distant or useful are. Being somebody's relative brings automatically some credit and mutual trust on both sides. However, another issue is important in this case. This is not irrelevant to the emergence of tradition, as this is recently influenced by the incomers (migrants, returners and visitors) in Trano.

"The Horseman" is the second restaurant in Sparos. It is advertised by a beautiful handmade wooden signpost situated on the road, painted by a "local" artist. Titika is a divorced woman who migrated from Athens to live in the village with her son just a couple of years ago. She makes her living by painting signposts for advertising the various local enterprises, such as hotels, restaurants, grocery stores or tourist shops in the village and in Karpenisi. Her status is ambiguous to the local people: trying to support herself and her son, Tasos (who seems distinctly different from the rest of the village boys) she charges extraordinary amounts of money for small pieces of her work, that are not seen as worthwhile by local standards. Her first orders were from clients from Karpenisi or from migrants who visited Trano. Her image has been progressively established and there are three criteria that underlie her reputation as an artist.
First, the originality of each of her projects is related to the sort of enterprise her client runs, and the pattern would never be repeated, whether it concerns handmade signposts or cards. Second, the fact that when one orders something one has to wait for ages in order to see it finished, surrounds her with a really artistic touch. She indeed takes her time in finishing it. Finally, the high prices she asks for her projects make people see her as a real artist as "art should be rewarded". Only recently the locals started to order some signposts from her. This is not because they now value her work but because of the inter-village competition. Once one of their competitors in the village has a signpost made by Titika it is time for the other one to order a different one for his/her place. The idea hidden behind this is twofold: it shows that the other person can also afford the expense of it and also shows that the modern trade is being followed. Tradition here has been created for the benefit of a new-comer (i.e. Titika) and because all the other incomers but not necessarily the locals expect it and can "really" appreciate it.

From the very beginning, the Livas gave strongly advice to Afroditi and her husband about the decoration of this place. The former informed them that if they wanted to do "real business" they should not hesitate in spending some money for making their place look traditional. Afroditi and Antonis were very sceptical about it. They did not think that "decoration" was so important. They were afraid and not willing to spend money just for the sake of turning the old stone house into something which would have the appearance of a traditional place; "a traditional place where all the important people would arrive, eat, enjoy the environment and suggest it to other friends", as the Livas have suggested. However, the Livas insisted on it and because of their involvement in the agreement of this place they were listened to. Therefore, they expressed a very strong opinion about everything: from the way the place would look from the outside to the smallest detail inside, such as the napkins the restaurant should use. They insisted that the tablecloth should be made from cloth and not the usual paper or plastic tablecloth which is widely used everywhere else. It is noteworthy to stress that a change is taking place in the other taverns of the area where now the majority of them have a fabric tablecloth underneath the plastic one that is put over it as soon as you give an order. Inside the tavern are not more than 15 tables and a small but cosy fireplace on one side of the room. The stones have not been whitewashed, and
handmade curtains hang from the windows. The kitchen is separated from the rest of the shop by a false wall. An old wooden wardrobe with its door removed has been transformed into a place where several bottles of spirit are kept and a lot of dried flowers and plants are stuffed in the empty spaces. The wardrobe was bought from Monastiraki, as other decorative items, one of the Athens' famous sites for tourists at the foot of Acropolis that lately has become a popular open market for "old" objects (like Portobello Road in London) (Photo 63).

The idea was a "traditional" appearance with nice wooden tables and chairs (instead of those plastic things), even outside in the yard. And it works, at least for the tourists and the migrants and some people from Karpenisi who consider dining at the Horseman's as a very prestigious act of showing off. But from the locals' point of view a very poor quality of food is served there. The cook is seen as a failure by the locals because the tavern he worked in before closed down. They also say of the husband of Afroditi, Antonis, who also helps in the kitchen that he "doesn't know a thing about cooking, so what the hell is he doing in there..." (Aftos dhen kseri tipota apo kouzina, opote ti stin efchi kani aftou'). The "traditional" home-made desserts (glika tou koutaliou) are bought in Lamia and the wine from Mesoeyeia (a famous place in Attiki where all the good quality wine is made); Gefou-Madianou (1992:114) who did research among the Messogia people, describes the vineyards and the wine they produce as part of their social identity. The owners don't reveal the former but they are proud of the latter. Masses of tourists swarm into "the Horseman" during the weekends or the holidays and sometimes one has to book a table in order to find a place.

The notion of the use of space emerges here: the different expectations and ideas the locals have about the functionality of a place is opposed to the ideas of the visitors or the migrants who are looking for something nice and necessarily traditional (Bourdieu:1984). So, the kitchen should not be exposed to the common view but should remain hidden behind a "traditional" hanging rug working as a curtain, which is newly bought in Monastiraki. Afroditi and her husband had no previous experience of cooking or even serving at all. They had to employ a cook and when a lot of people arrived, Afroditi's nephew or brother would help serving. The locals insist that the quality of the food is poor; their disappointment about the taste of the food is apparent by their absence: it is
unusual to see any locals sitting there. Their comments were later understood by me: by the end of my fieldwork when extended consumption of home-made food and a few kilos of wine strengthen Okely's statement (1994:58) about food tastes in France

I could not acquire her lifetime's subtle taste, but I had witnessed and shared the tastes of others in ways which could not be easily conveyed solely by language and at a distance from the meat table.

On the other hand, the Livas and their friends, other migrants or visitors, hold a strong opinion about "the Horsemman"; their tastes are differentiated according to their lives in the urban centers. These nuances of cultural contrasts in the locals' and migrants' social expressions of identity address what is significant in seemingly the most trivial but vital things of this culture.

A few metres from the "Horsemman", 300 feet further down the road, another tavern (renewed and extended in 1994) exists. It is called "The hunter's place" because it was and still is originally situated inside a hunter's and fisherman's house and next to the local trout farm. It has been there for the last 20 years or maybe more. It belongs to Pistolas' family and is famous for its well cooked trout, not just from the trout farm but also the real wild ones (caught from the river). Lefteris's father and now Lefteris goes fishing, and Lefteris's wife, Marika specializes in making the authentic home-made pumpkin pies or cheese pies the locals usually serve together with their "proper" (i.e. meat) food. Other dishes can be also found here. This used to be a small, smelly taverna where old unstable tables and straw-bottomed chairs were gathered, almost packed around an old smoky stove in the same room with the kitchen where you could see the mother-in-law making the pie and the wife cleaning the handpicked mountain greens. At the same time in a table next to yours, the children would be doing their homework for school while the grandpa was drinking his little afternoon tsipouro. The shop was actually the front part of the house, while the family lived in the back, so washing children's clothes in the sink next to the one they were washing the dishes was hardly an innovation. When the "traditional Horsemman" appeared they put all the money they had in order to extend and renovate their business for being competitive.
The old place was demolished and today on the ground floor there is a big room full of tables, a separate kitchen and in the summer one can sit anywhere outside in the front yard or in the back balcony that surrounds the place and it has a spectacular view over the river. The family now lives on the first floor of the building. The "Hunter's place" also has a fireplace, but as the main hall is bigger than the "Horseman", the atmosphere is not very cosy. In order to expand their business they joined the rooms of the former house and tavern into one and then demolished the high stone walls for a better view of the mountains and the river. They also built a second floor for the family's needs, but because of the cost of the construction, after pulling down the old building for re-ordering the space, they used bricks for the extension and what remained from the old stone house had to be whitewashed with the rest of the new construction. They did try to give a traditional aspect to the shop by hanging a few new rugs and parts of a loom on the walls. The place now is decent and clean and has a nice view but has no atmosphere of tradition at all. The food is still regarded by the locals as high quality food as "Lefteris is the only one who knows how to make trout fried with butter, while anyone could make it on the coals" and "Only Marika can make a decent pie...". The locals also comment that this place is clean and they are close friends with Lefteris. "I go to Lefteri not just for the food but because he is also a close friend of mine" the lads of the village say. "We go together fishing, hunting, we go out. I'd like to support him" (Paeno stou Lefteri, ochi mono yia to fayito alla yiati ine filaraki: mazi paenoume yia psarema, yia kinyi, vyenoume ekso. Imaste fili, ke thelo na ton (postirikso).

The consumption of food and drink by the locals is not solely an act of survival. It is also important in terms of space and time, for "eating and drinking fill the hours as well as the stomach" (Okely:1994:60). When the locals referring to Lefteris' place they use his own name (Let's go to Lefteri = Pame stou Lefteri), while the new tavern is always addressed as its title "the Horseman" (Pame "ston Kavalari"). Perhaps the owners' identity and the preparation and the consumption of food in a particular social context is relevant to the notion of space, time and identity among the locals, the migrants and the incomers. Okely (ibid.) speaks about different people but her conclusions seem relevant to our case:
The preparation and consumption of specific types of food and drink were a powerfully symbolic, rather than merely functional, feature of the people’s lives, both in the past and in the present, if only in memory. The former petits agriculteurs (small farmers) had in addition been closely engaged in the production of food and drink, including that for their own consumption, during their working lives.

Apart from its symbolic character the choice of food, its preparation and consumption could also demonstrate the division of classes. On some occasions close friends of Lefteris can find there big or small game on the menu. Sometimes the locals who fish trout for themselves, organize a feast (tsibousi) for their parea in Lefteris’ tavern where he would fry the wild trout but he would also prepare pork chops, veal steaks, lamb cutlets and other choice morsels: that is meat snacks like kokoretsi, kontosouvli, etc. as a meal without meat is not regarded as a meal at all by the locals. All these together with salads, pies, chips, feta cheese and katiki (a local product of goat milk, like tsatsiki) will be washed down with lots of local wine (usually of poor quality). In the end they will pay simply for what Lefteris had in his shop and served only, but not for the trout’s preparation. Lefteris does not charge them for the trout that they caught themselves.

The locals are very keen to consume meat. With the smallest occasion they will go out for dinner, even if in some cases they have already eaten at home: "you can always eat something like a snack" they say. A lot of times they do a deal with each other or with foreigners over dinner, which usually means lots of red meat, snacks and wine. Some taverns in Karpenisi and this one in Sparos by Lefteris during fasting days serve Lenten and vegetarian (i.e. meatless) food, as the majority of the local women and a few men still keep the tradition of fasting; a week before a saint’s name day or more weeks before Christmas or Easter. In contrast, "the Horseman" does not have and vegetarian plates to serve for it is addressed to incoming tourism. Bourdieu (1984) contrasts the tastes of the urban and working classes but not as adequately as Okely did. Okely (1994:56) underlines the distinction in taste between the urban and the rural food consumers, as the latter produce themselves what they consume: "the taste and consumption of home-grown produce are strongly flavoured by symbolic associations with person and place".
II. Handling locality as means for expressing identity

The interest of the migrants in the old, damaged even demolished stone-houses during the last 10 years affected the local market increasing dramatically their prices. Today the value of a stone house, no matter its condition, has literally taken off. This increase is definitely related to the outsiders, incomers, and migrants whose demand for "traditional" houses grows bigger every year. Yet, the owners of the stone houses (both locals and migrants) still prefer to keep them, even if selling them in some cases would mean salvation for the house's condition. The house or even the ruins of the house are still a bond that people hold to the village.

When the migrants (either Athenians or from the USA) who own a house are asked to sell one, they will usually consult their local relatives in such matters. A common tactic for discouraging a possible buyer is to ask for an extremely high price that you already know won't be accepted. People usually excuse themselves for not selling it because they did not achieve the (already known) high price. It is obvious that they already own another house where they live and this one has come to the family via inheritance. People do not perceive it as a means of earning money for investment. They don't really want or like to rent or give it away and they declare "let it be (i.e. the stone house); it does not call for bread". If they finally decide to sell or rent it, this will be usually via a network of relatives or close friends (e.g. the "Horseman" in Sparos, Karmiris' agreement about the coffee-house of Fotini). Nonetheless, yesterday's "ruins" turned to be lucrative investments, still the locals never really understand or appreciate the "traditional" as an important investment, because even now they prefer to invest their money in land around the area or in Karpenisi rather than inside the village.

After looking at the topographical map of the village where all the houses are shown, one can make a very interesting observation. There is a clear division between the houses which constitute the old village and those of the new suburb close to Ftelia, a natural extension which the village took towards the north-west due to the lack of space within the old village (Project 4).
The traditional stone houses are mainly occupied by migrants. All the local services are also situated in the old village. Nowadays they are whitewashed but they are originally stone houses: the church, the police station, the priest's house, the local infirmary and the doctor's house, the Folklore museum, as well as all the local shops. On the other hand, the new part of the village, with its new constructions of brick-houses, is mainly inhabited by locals. This way an oxymoron phenomenon takes place: the old traditional village is empty and unoccupied most of the time, while "outside" the village, children are playing and smoke is rising above the chimneys. The actual village is now being transformed into an historical and dead site, while the new extension around the village is lively and full of life (see APPENDIX II). One reason for this is the owners' rejection to sell in low prices the original stone houses, which today are recognized as "traditional". Only the incomers can afford the prices for them.

People's ideology follows this code: the migrants who live in the quiet centre hate fuss and want to rest during their stay. They come for Easter, Christmas or weekends and necessarily in August. They do not like the practicalities of the village life and they often complain: about the dogs that bark, about the goats that smell, because the wood is packed outside the houses of the locals who collect it to burn during the winter. On the other hand, the locals and their families inhabit the new extension which now forms a lively area, full with people all day long for all the seasons of the year. They expect the arrival of the migrants: "It's nice" they say "when the village is full of people". But at the same time they do not like outsiders "When they leave, we find our peace and quiet...". This contradiction connotes the need of the locals for socialising but also their feeling of having a different set of needs from the migrants (Photo 64).

Opportunities for buying land or an old stone house in the village are never widely advertised or published. In a property guide one cannot find advertisements for buying, selling or renting houses or land in the area of Evrytania. In the locality there exist only a few wooden signs with badly hand written information and telephone number (no name, no address) usually situated on a fence or a tree inside the property. A civil engineer who started to build luxury apartments in Karpenisi in 1994 had to stop when his money finished and two years later he has not yet found a customer to sell a flat in order to complete his construction.
People here buy and sell orally and usually via a family network. The richest person in the village is one of the local entrepreneurs: Loukas Karmiris. He bought this summer an excellent three floor stone house in the most preferred place of the village next to the central square without anyone knowing anything about it. Loukas who bought the house and its ex owner, Panayiotis (a distant relative of Loukas) kept their agreement with great secrecy. Panayiotis is a migrant who lived in the USA for many years and had recently moved to Athens. He used to rent for many years the front part of the first floor that is situated in the main road next to the central square, to a local man, who used it as a snack bar and a coffee-house. When the shopkeeper retired in the 1980s, Fotini (a widow at that time) rented it again and kept it open just selling coffee but no longer preparing snacks. The local customers kept going there for coffee and tsipouro but the shop did not work the way it used to anymore.

When tourism arrived in the village, Fotini started to make a kind of custard-filled pastry (yalaktoboureko). Her pastry, yalaktoboureko, became so popular that her photograph was publicised with an article dedicated to Evrytania in a magazine that promotes trips, excursions and vacation in Greece and abroad. Fotini runs her shop only during the weekends and vacation and that is the reason that the local customers do not go anymore to her place but they gather in the main hall of the hotel, in the central square, for playing cards, backgammon, drinking coffee and tsipouro. The locals differentiate themselves from the tourists for as they say "we live all year long here and we are not just visiting the village". Fotini's attitude, by not keeping this shop open daily, drove the locals away but attracted many tourists in their place. So, she is quite happy working with them. She also "helps" her daughter and her son in law, who run a hotel in Sparos. In fact, she is fully engaged in cooking daily for the customers of the hotel and tidying the rooms. Her shop in the village remains open during the weekends when she prepares her famous yalaktoboureko. Fotini had no notice from the owner of the house for his plans and agreement with Karmiris for selling the house to him.

One summer afternoon we were sitting outside the shop cleaning wild greens for a pie when two "foreign" civil engineers parked their car in front of the shop and started to measure the house. They completely ignored us and when they needed to go inside, they said hello to Fotini and asked her permission to go
in. Fotini let them and then she followed them in the shop asking them who they were and why they were doing that. They pretended to be busy and they paid no attention to her, just mumbling who they were and gave no reason what they were measuring around for. When they had finished, Fotini asked them to buy a drink or coffee but they refused, rushed to their car and rushed off. The selection of these two "foreign" civil engineers who happen to have their office in Karpenisi but their origin is from another village, instead of calling the local civil engineer is a clever manoeuvre often used when the villagers secretly want to make an agreement. There are three civil engineers from the village, two of them living in the village, so hiring one of the "foreigns" was an indication of something going on undercover as the owner did not want to give an explanation about his ongoing business with Karmiris. Two months later, Loukas Karmiris beaming with satisfaction, explained how he had bought the house without people beginning to get on to him.

While the majority of migrants restore or rebuild a traditional house, the majority of the locals appreciate the modern brick-made constructions for the advantages they hold and the economy they offer. They will use aluminium windows and doors for conserving heat within the house and not the traditional wooden-made windows and shutters. For example, in 1995, the school needed new windows and the civil council decided to buy new aluminium ones. All the migrants were shocked and angry about this decision because the school is a traditional stone-made building, fortunately not whitewashed like the church or the police station, and "it was impossible to destroy the character of this magnificent building". There is a kind of hidden superiority about their greater knowledge of architecture, tradition and styles.

On the other hand, the locals who live all year in the village know better the harsh conditions of the winter period and the necessities for heat and the need for conservation in the future for something they restore now. "We need money" they say "for fitting and maintaining wooden windows. Who is going to preserve them after 4-5 years and where are we supposed to find the money for it? It is better this way: you buy this aluminium stuff once for good". In fact, all the villagers do not share the same ideas about aluminium and wood. There are a few who still prefer wood instead of aluminium for public or private use; but for
them the choice between these two materials is simply a question of money. This is why, some of the locals live in new, modern brick constructions and some in old unrepaired stone-houses that sometimes do not have central heating or a proper roof. "When we find the money we will restore it", they said. Many times they just repair what is absolutely necessary and not what looks beautiful. For them the fireplace or the stove is a necessity and not a picturesque, traditional aspect of village life. It means that they have to cut down, carry and store huge quantities of wood for winter consumption: not an easy task at all. They will prefer the wood that burns slowly making a less impressive fire (oak tree) rather than the wood that burns quite fast but produces a more spectacular fire (fir tree). The locals will use the fireplace for having hot water, even cooking, while the migrants will just light the fire to entertain themselves. In some cases the migrants will call the local neighbour to start the fire because they are afraid to do it safely by themselves or they don't know how to do it at all.

In fact, there is a strong clash over the village's significance for each group. The staking of interests within the two groups is sharp. The conflict here is shaped because of the different interests the two groups have. For migrants the village is a place of recreation and do not like modernity in their "old homeland". Changes are for the cities and not for the ideal place they keep in their memories and hearts (to chorio mas dhen prepi na alaksi katholou, oles i alayes to katastrefoun). For the locals it is a place to live and use innovations in constructing their houses or changing the place for a comfortable and modern way of living. While the migrants have the luxury to come and go and to keep another house/interest elsewhere, the locals remain "glued" to its locality (imaste kolimeni edho). However, both groups demand the power in determining the way the locality will be as the locality becomes a critical feature for constructing their identities.

Another aspect of handling locality is the communal projects concerning the village. The migrants have strong opinions about them, a road coming across the village, for example. The differentiation from the locals started when the migrants insisted on making a cobbled road instead of an asphalt one. The locals supported their position saying that an asphalt road must be made because it is necessary for the cars to approach the most remote slopes of the village, but for the migrants a road is a question of spoiling - or in reality not creating - tradition.
There are cases where a cobbled path would be made, because of the icy steep slopes in the winter. There are not many roads in the village, except the one that proceeds from the main crossroad from Karpenisi to the village, cuts the village in two, and continues finally to meet Sparos. There is also a peripheral earth-road that climbs the ends of the villages and goes to Kaliakouda. The village has many paths, earth-made or cobbled that lead to the houses. So people who live permanently here try to bring the road to their doors, which is in most cases impossible because anyway the paths are too small to allow any extension from the neighbouring wall. But asphalt roads are considered as development for the village: "we live here all the year, we have to face ice, snow, rain and mud" they say "you arrive here some days for another reason" that is recreation (Emis zoume edho olo to chrono. Prepi na antimetopisoume ton payo, to chioni, ti vrochi ke tin laspi. Esis ercheste edho mono liyes meres to chrono yia ena mono loyo, yia na dhiaskedhasete). But the migrants insist "we will not leave you to destroy the traditional character of our village" (Dhen tha sas afisoume na chalasete to chovrioudhaki mas pou ine toso paradhosiako). Regarding the tourists, they come and go without much reflection. They only look at the surface of things in the village, they do not ask much and they never see inside the contradictions in terms of the locality. They are more absorb in their own experiences than the realities presented in the village: "I have been everywhere and I have never seen such a lovely place", etc. (Echo pai pantou kai pouthena dhen echo vri ena toso oreo meros).

Tuan (1974:63), in his book about Topophilia (which is a Greek word and means "love of place") says that "visitor and native focus on very different aspects of the environment". He contrasts the visitor or the tourist, who uses his eyes to compose pictures, with the native, whose environment's totality provides the native with a complex attitude (Photo 65). The point to be made here is that everybody is using the artificial landscape for their aims. Identity is strongly debated whether by a local, or a migrant or even a tourist but the means for its formation is the same: traditional or modern houses, cobbled paths or stone made fountains are all used for determining the connection of the built and "man made" landscape and people's identity.
The majority of the villagers produce their own wine and *tsipouro* from grapes. There is a silent competition among them for the "best wine of the year" in the village. There are also many migrants who arrive at the village in October. They save one week from their annual vacation just for the occasion: the season of making the *tsipouro* (*otan psinome ta tsipoura*) is "traditional" for both migrants and villagers. ABOVE - BELOW: Christoforos crushes the grapes. (Malenou 1996)
ABOVE: The priest of the village, Papa Kiriakos, presenting his private collection of antiques. He is also responsible for opening the local Folkloric Museum.

BELOW: Inside the Folkloric Museum, the young locals are posing in "the Shoemaker's corner"; they still remember Sotiris, the shoe-maker, who had a shop in the village and when retired, he donated his tools in the Museum. For these youngsters this is not "tradition" but it is past reality. (Malenou, 1996)
Many rivers flow in Evrytania's terrain. In the past, traditional water-mills were built and used due to the abundance of water. Today, they remain abandoned but they attract many visitors, both locals and tourists. Here, three local young men from the village are going fishing. On their way, next to the river, they "discovered" this old water mill, whose exact location was not known before. They spent quite some time exploring it. When they returned to the village they talked more about this than their fishing excursion. This contrasts with the migrants' views about "tradition": they are the ones who work to create it rather than taking it for granted as do the locals.

(Malencou, 1997)
Afroditi Voria and Antonis Flokas, the owners of the traditional tavern, "the Horseman". The restaurant is an old but renovated traditional stone house. The stones have not been whitewashed, and handmade curtains hang from the windows. The kitchen is separated from the rest of the shop by a false wall (at the right corner of the picture). An old wooden wardrobe (behind the couple) with its door removed has been transformed into a place where several bottles of spirit are kept and a lot of dried flowers and plants are stuffed in the empty spaces. They do not have plastic tablecloths on the tables (very chic for the villagers).

(Malenou, 1997)
In 1984 a backgammon competition took place between the migrants and the locals of Trano. The backgammon competition lasted one week. Groups of two were playing and the winner continued to play with other winners until four people reached the semi-finals and only two competed for the finals. The "backgammon festival" proved to be a great success, in terms of participation and interest. People were having a great time... Since then every summer other activities are also organised entitled entertainment for men, women and children. Here, in the main square of the village the Traniots compete with others at backgammon. Mr Pavlos (seated in front) records the result of each game.

(Malenou, August 1996)
From the late nineteenth century the economic mode of Evrytania was subsistence agriculture, in combination with stock breeding (sheep and goats). Some of the villagers of Trano still practise pastoralism. They drive their animals of sheep or goat up in the mountain Kaliakouda in summer. Nowadays, their interests conflict with those who want touristic development up in the mountains. The shepherds say: "It is our right to be here, for we are coming here since forever". But the managers of rapidly developing tourist enterprises claim: "We cannot drive people in the mountains and walk over the muck-heap! The flocks stink and should not be allowed here any more". The latter also introduce "tradition" in the wilderness of the area but the managers want it clean from every inconvenience. When the tourist groups pass a sheep-pen, they are happy to be treated with some freshly made cheese by the shepherds: "This is so traditional" they say.

(Malencou, 1996)
CHAPTER 9 Interpreting landscape

The Traniots live the differences in every day practice: in domestic space, in the way they eat, drink or spend their time, in the way they build their houses or interpret tradition. The most striking differences among the different groups of people living in the village are expressed particularly in the way they organise space around them. These differences in space also reflect changes in social and cultural priority. The nuances of cultural contrasts in the locals and migrants may seem the most trivial but they are in fact vital expressions of identity.

Space is used as another locus for the embodiment of identity. Both the interior space of the houses and the exterior space of the village are used by various groups of people in a decisive way. Through different uses, these different groups are often defined. Moreover, one meets with different values and interpretations. The village itself becomes an abstract notion, an almost political arena where different groups of people express themselves with their different interests and give multiple interpretations in space and many times in time, too. Hirsch (1995:1) writes

Landscape, has been used to refer to the meaning imputed by local people to their cultural and physical surroundings (i.e. how a particular landscape "looks" to the inhabitants).

The landscape of Trano is always at stake. First, because it is by no means a closed and isolated place and secondly, because it is a space where many people held various interpretations about it. For the local place is not just where one lives but also where one has one's own rights. For the tourist it is just a picturesque location and for the migrant it is eminently the ideal place to visit. For the local resident is a combination of all these: one's birth place is the most picturesque place in the world and provides the ideal framework from choice to live. The above categories are classified by this yardstick: their arrangement through place and their settlement in time (Photo 66, 67).

Built-up space is a living part of social organisation. The dialogue between space and society is continuous and renewed. This relationship is reciprocal, as each side reflects the other and is recognised through it. The building activity is
closely related to social organisation. Built-up space is a social product, is responsible for social facts, moreover, it is a symbolic reality and a vehicle for the ethics of the society that has created it. Built-up space is not just a reality whose function is to supply housing and safety for people. Furthermore, it is a symbolic reality, that bears the marks of history, culture and ethos of the society which generated it. It also bears the ethics of the society which created it. These ethics, as they have been expressed through reconstruction and spatial practices, are instrumental in the reproduction of the ingredients that have made the urban space (Photos 68, 69).

Social organisation is materialised within its limits and within definite spatial orders. This field can be limited and stable or wider and seasonal (e.g. nomads, Photos 70, 71). It is organised, named and bears the traits of the social organisation which has engendered it. As with social events, social organisation attains spatial dimension. Elements such as the hierarchies, classes, the social organisation, even the institutions are imprinted to the terrain. The transfer of property, for example, is decisive for the shaping of the country and the urban space. Place-names are also important evidence of what has happened and what is happening in the space referred.

Built-up space conveys news of the production and affinity. It is where can one see the developments and the transformations of the social structure. The built-up space bears evidence of the transitions and alterations/shifts and changes of the social organisation. This interaction is apparent in the reflection of social values in the shaping of space. That is because the space (as society) is shaped according to values and relationships. Therefore when one is moving into space towards a "described" place, a person's movement is also related to a social movement, which can be expressed in terms of space, like "upwards" or "downwards".

According to Zarkia (1993) built-up space is the vehicle of ideology, aesthetics and ethics of the society par excellence: It carries messages and reveals structures (Photo 72). The prominent location of a church in a village explains the relation of the social group to religiosity. The architecture of a society in a specific historic point is a priceless archive of information. The thoughts and knowledge of a social group are the materialisation of the "idea of space", i.e. architecture as a reflection of the culture.
I. Housing in the village: the locals' and the migrants' view

The organisation of rural and urban space or of the open-air and house space fit both the constraints of the natural environment and the socio-economic circumstances, moreover the historic necessities. Today, in the village, old - traditional and modern houses do not share the same facilities, because the stone houses were designed according to past needs and conveniences. First, the old houses were made by stones; their thick walls (sometimes 90 centimetres wide) kept (and still do) the cold out and the heat inside. Then, the old houses had not separate bedrooms, as the whole family slept in the same room. Also, they had not running water inside; thus, the oven and the bathroom had to be placed outside the house. Today in Trano, many traditional houses still do not have central heating; people still get warm by using the fireplace or a stove. Nevertheless, younger or elder, locals or migrants want to have the same facilities. This happens when an old "traditional" house is renovated or when a totally new house is designed to be built.

Many houses in the village where the locals live are slightly changed with a functional extension: the following scheme represents a ground plan of a traditional stone house that has been only partly altered. It serves a couple of locals, husband and wife. All the children have moved out, for they have married. An extension to the original building has been added; this serves as a bathroom, though without a tub. The ground floor of this house is divided into two parts: half of it, as one enters the house serves as a living and sleeping room while the other half serves as a storage room where the stock of food is kept: wine, olives, oil, potatoes, tools and working cloths fill up the space. The front of the house, which is no bigger than 20 sq. metres, is multi-functional. The bed is situated by the fireplace in one corner of the room. The bed is used not only for sleeping, but also as a sofa for seating or as a playground for the younger members of the family. When the whole family is gathered and space in the dining table is not sufficient, women will take their plates from the table and sit down there, leaving the table available for the men to sit. In some cases, while the children and the grandchildren eat or discuss by the fireplace, the grandfather sleeps on it; "do not pay attention to me" he says "do what you like. I am not disturbed". His wife will never be seen lying down. The only exception to that is in a case of illness.
The bed and the table are always made up by the wife. The man will sit down to eat, drink or chat, but he will never set it. The woman prepares or puts away everything: breakfast, lunch, snacks, dinner or treatments to visitors. She will be the first one to get up in the morning and the last one to go to sleep. It is clear that these two particular spaces, the bed and the table, while being used by both of them, it is the woman’s task to sort them out. She does not consider this as a burden "I am the housewife" she will say. "It is a joy for me to take care of you all" (all are the husband, children, grandchildren, siblings, friends and guests). "It is obvious that no man is capable of such task". However, some feminists would question this as a sign of power.

The rest of the furniture in this house is also used only by the housewife. The sink, the cooker and the fridge are the woman’s private locations. When a man is asking for a beer, from his wife, I was explained, he does not order her to obey. He is showing his ignorance in her private space and he recognises her ability to set things in order within the house in such a way that no man can. At the same time, a mother or a wife can refuse him the simple pleasure of offering a drink by simply stating "we don’t have any". By this way she controls her son’s or husband’s desires, for he would never go and check if there is a drink in the fridge or in the cupboard. Her word is taken for granted.

A very untidy house is described as a bachelor’s house. The absolute dominance of the woman is in the interior space of living, and furthermore this is apparent in the remaining spaces of the house where no man is ever allowed to mix. The man’s appearance within the house differs dramatically from that of the woman. He will be seated in a chair or a couch or perhaps he will lie down in a place that is usually considered "his own corner". If he starts to get up and go around, he would be soon rebutted: "Take your seat! Don’t get in my way" or "Don’t mess up with things". The woman will move actively all over the place. Her energy is expected and appreciated as well.

Many of the migrants may also live in stone houses but they use space in a different way. The Livas couple had bought a stone house in the 1980s. Their relation to the village comes through Elena whose grandmother was born in Sparos more than a hundred years ago. However, her grandmother moved to Lamia (some 80 kilometres from Karpenisi) after her marriage where the next three generations lived. They had no property in the village at all, but all these
years the family kept their bonds to this place by visiting and staying with their remaining relatives. After Elena's marriage with a successful lawyer in Lamia, they decided to buy a house in the village. They were mesmerised by the old traditional stone houses the village had, so with the first opportunity they bought one in the centre of the village. The price they paid was considered high by the local standards, as this house was in a very bad shape, almost demolished with no roof at all, abandoned and totally ruined. It was however a stone house and this was all that mattered for the Livas couple.

For the restoration of their house they did not consult or co-operate with any local. They used workers from Lamia and one of Elena's uncles, who still used to live in the village, supervised the whole project. They were asking for advice from professional people who the Livas believed had "class and style" but not the locals. They spent an enormous amount of money in restoring it, but the house is not necessarily what the local architecture calls a "traditional" house. They used materials from other parts of Greece, because the local available materials were not very fancy ones. For example, the stones which the locals use to tile the floor have different colours and are relatively small, but the Livas wanted the Pilioritikes stones (i.e. stones from Pelion) that are green and large. By mixing up styles and patterns (that the locals recognise as being from elsewhere and not typical for the region of Evrytania) they managed to build a beautiful house, which is now regarded (particularly by other migrants) as one of the best looking and "traditional" houses of Trano (Photo 73).

This house is a two floor stone house: on the top floor there are three bedrooms (one for them, one for their only daughter, Dafne, and another for the guests) and a big bathroom. On the ground floor is the kitchen, the dining room and the sitting room with two fireplaces, and a WC. They used very expensive wood to make their doors and windows and the front door alone had cost them a fortune (it is made out of pure wood). For many years now they did not have a door knob, for they cannot find something that "is really adequate and old for our door". So they just leave the key in the door all the time (a practice usually employed by the locals). Underground, in the basement, they created a play room and an alternative guest house. This basement has another entrance to the front but as the house is built on a downhill slope it looks like a basement. In the past people used this place for keeping their animals and firewood. The whole house has central heating apart from the fireplaces which are used mainly for decorative purposes.
Although, their house is more than 100 sq.m. (both floors) the Livas tend to think that their house has insufficient room. So after they finished their house, they also bought the next plot where a demolished stone house existed. They planned progressively to construct another wing for their house. In the new extension the kitchen will be transferred and after having visited Finland on a trip, they also plan to build a sauna. In the front they want to build a garage. The Livas are very proud of their house and they filled it with traditional antiques. The traditional furniture is in some cases bought from other places of Greece or it was given to them by other people who know them in the village. After they completed their house, they seized every opportunity for spending a couple of days there (weekends or holidays) and they usually invite friends who are offered hospitality. It is obvious that they could afford a lot of money to complete their house which cost them more than thirty million drachmas in 1990. Fotis is a successful and highly paid lawyer. Many people who know him from the village ask him to consider their cases.

The Livas are quite respected in the village but they do not mingle with the locals very often. Being upper class people they are not happy with the shops in the area, moaning for a long time about the lack of a "decent" restaurant in the area. Their estimation of "decency" is not addressed to the quality that the already existing taverns or coffee shops offer. It is concerned with the appearance of the place and especially its "originality". By helping Afroditi Vorla and Antonis Floka in opening another place for eating in Sparos, they definitely foresee the benefits they would themselves have if this place turned out to be as "traditional" as possible. The Livas insisted on consulting the owners about the way their tavern should be. They expressed a strong dissent about the decoration. For Antonis's idea of creating a unique environment was "many plants in the middle of the room and cages full of parrots or other exotic birds and maybe a monkey!". Having been the spiritual as well as the practical "godfathers" of the Horseman they are now in a position that allows them to choose the sort of music that Afroditi and Antonis play there (Photo 63 in Chapter 8). Therefore, it is not unusual that a tape of classical music or a Hatzidakis CD (choices that upper class people usually prefer) would replace the radio music or the laika that in some cases are played in the restaurant. Differentiation from the locals is becoming evident by simply choosing a different sort of music.
II. Land in the village: the locals' view

While the migrants worry about music in the local taverns or aesthetics in the village, the locals "struggle" with their everyday living. An example illustrating the use and value of land in the village is the opinion of Christofochos Stoumaras, a typical fifty-six years old local man. Today a grandfather of six grandchildren, he is also the father of four children and a faithful husband, as well as a brother of an extended local family. He and his wife, Kiriakoula got married because of love in the 1960s. Kiriakoula comments that they started their family out of the blue: "You see, my father, who was a shepherd (i.e. a poor man by the village standards of the 1960s), had six daughters to feed (her sisters). We lived a very hard life and we had to struggle with poverty and famine. Those were difficult times (to survive...). My father had to marry six daughters (i.e. give them a dowry) and there was no other man in the family. His first son in law, a shepherd as well, got hit by a motorcycle and died while he was coming back from the plains with his family and flock... He left behind four children, one yet to be born! So our father had to take the responsibility of the family of his oldest daughter all over again. It was as if he brought up ten children, in reality. He was a very tired man. When I got married I had to live together with my mother in law. Christofochos and I, we had nothing: no land, no house, no flock. I was given two saucepans and three blankets to start my new life. We worked very hard and during the next years we had to travel from village to village in order to keep working..."
tsoukalia ke tris flokates yia to ksekinima. Doulevame poli iklira ke ta epomena chronia elo metakomisame apo chorio se chorio eki poy itan dhoula. Dhen sterioname pouthena". Because the husband worked as a worker in building roads or houses his family, which was growing (that is the wife and their children), had to move from place to place following him (and his jobs) as they had nothing in the village to live on. "Nothing" here means land or a house or even a flock which would still provide them with a defined locality (the plains in the winter and the mountains in the summer).

Progressively, they saved up some money and they started building their own house in the village, where both were coming from. Christoforos started his own business: both husband and wife worked together in building stone houses. Kiriakoula helped actively her husband, as he could not afford hire another man to help him in his job. Her responsibility was to carry sand with a mule for the building of the house. She shovelled the sand taken from the river onto the mule's back and took it to the place of construction where Christoforos was building to shovel it down again for making mud. She was also "pressing" the iron rods when they had to do constructions out of cement. They worked "from dawn to night" and when Kiriakoula came back she had to do the housework and look after her children, who had grown up and went to school.

In the meantime, as years passed, they managed well. They built a house, they bought a plot of land in the village and a plot of land in Karpenisi. They also built a concrete building of two floors for their children in Karpenisi. "We managed very well. Not bad for someone who had nothing to start with..." (Ta kataferame mia chara. Ochi ki aschima yia kaplon pou dhen iche vraki na vall...). Their success is widely recognized in the village by the locals. It is estimated in terms of estate: land and houses. What they mean is that during the last twenty years they provided enough dowry for their three daughters and their only son. But Christoforos is not happy about everybody; he claims that "when I had to provide them with a dowry I had to give to each one of them what I had available at the time: one got only land, the other a house together with land, the other money and a house. However, we did not figure everything right..." (Otan irthe i ora na prikiso ta koritsia, edhosa stin kathemia oti ika ekinl thn epochi efkero: i mia pire yl, i alll pire mono chrima, i alll..."
What he means is that he and his wife did not share equally their property among their children. Of course, what they really misjudge is the fact that the estate which they obtained during the years was not available all and at the same time to distribute it equally. And as their daughters say, they were given what they (i.e. the daughters and the sons-in-law) asked for. One asked for money, another asked land or a house. Although the amount of money given to one of them was enough to buy a piece of land, she did not at that time. Her parents are disappointed because "money "flies" while land stays". At the present moment, she has neither land nor the money which she spent very quickly. So today, according to the parents' standards, some daughters have more estate than others.

The locals regard only the land primarily as real capital. There is only one reason and one excuse for providing them unequally shares of dowry, they explained. "As a building contractor, there was a period where you could find money all over the house. I had three parties who worked for me. You see all these people today in the village who make their living from the construction business they learned it from me. That was the time to save some money but who had wits then... You could open any drawer in the house and find thousands of drachmas inside! I am not kidding! Of course then we bought the piece of land in the village and two pieces of land in Karpenisi, but if I had any wits we would have bought some more. But, you know, we had also to give dowry for our three daughters, wedding expenses, you know money flew (i.e. money fled or left)" (Sti dhoulia mas ipirchan epoches pou Ichame lefta se ola ta sirtaria sto spitl. tote dhen kserame tis trapezes. Vlepis olous aftous pou dhoulievoun simera sto chorio stis ikodhomes; Oli emathan apo mena Tote eprepe na mazevoume to chrma alla pios iche miaio tote... Opio sirtari aniyes, mesa itan matso ta lefta. Dhen astievome. Tote ayorasame to chtima sto choro kal dhlo chorafia sto Karpenisi, alla eprepe na permame ki alla. Ichame omos ke kores na pantrepsoume, eksodha, jeris tora ta lefta favyoun).
To understand their notion about land we can follow the priorities they first gave: the first thing they bought was quite a large piece of land in the village where they built a hut for keeping chickens, rabbits, his dogs and some of his tools. When their first daughter, Martha, got married in 1980, he and his wife decided to give her this piece as a dowry without dividing it any further. "We thought that it would be a bad idea to share it with any of her other sisters, who would be married in the future... Too many people involved in one single spot is not a very good idea. Although that piece was very large. Who knew that one day houses there would have been built so close to each other. Every family has to have more or less clear property and take care of it as they want" (Skeftikame oti dhen itan kall idhea na to mirasti me tis alles. Ki ekines tha pantrevontousan aryotera, Dhen ine kalo na berdevonte poli se ena moiradhi, parolo pou to chorafi itan meyalo. Pou na kserame oti aryotera ua chtisontousan ekl tosa spita, toso konta to ena sto allo...Kathe ikoyenia prepi na echi ksekatharismena ta pragmata kal kathe pedhi na ta kani oti theil). Here, clear means unambiguous or square, without any argument in the use or exploitation. A sense of equality in division arises here. One child should not take more or all from the other. On this piece of land, Martha and her husband Simos, built a two floor house. They have two daughters, so in the future they will be given one floor each. Christoforos kept the right to have his hut and his animals in the hut attached to this plot as long as he lived (kraitse to dhikeoma tis epikarpias). In 1997 Simos died from a developing stomach cancer, leaving behind his wife with no job or other means to live and two young daughters to help to study. Martha’s father, Christoforos and her brother, Mitsos helped her until she found a job. The tragic story of widowhood within the family has been repeated.

Christoforos's and Kiriakoula's second daughter, Electra, got married six months after Martha, in 1981. She was given a considerable amount of money to start her life due to the fact that her parents had just provided their other daughter with the only piece of land they had at that time. As has already been mentioned, the land in the village was not divided, although they had the opportunity to split it. The parents decided to give all of it to one daughter. As land is usually considered the proper dowry, today, in retrospect, they comment that Electra was not equally treated.
"What could we have done? We gave whatever we had available at the time. One took land, the other took money. With a million drachmas one could buy two plots in those days. But Electra wanted cash. You know how it is... Land is usually left (to be later exploited or further transferred), while money is scattered to the winds..

Ti allo na kaname; Pantrepsame ti mia piso apo tin all. Dhosame stin kathe mia otl ichame: I mia pire yi, I alli pire lefta. Me ena ekatomirio epemes ikopedho tota. I llectra ithele chrimata, alla kseris pos ine ta lefta: I yi meni eno ta chrimata fevyoun). Nevertheless, they both believe today that this daughter was not equally treated. Money flew and she was later given a floor in the house they built for their third daughter and their son.

Their third daughter, Lina, married some years later. Meanwhile, they had "invested" some of the money they earned working in two plots in Karpenisi, one next to the other. So, Lina's dowry was money and one of the two plots next to each other in Karpenisi. They decided to build a house on the other plot for their son, Mitsos. At that time, Electra who had squandered the "dowry" was renting a house in Karpenisi. Her family had grown, she had two sons. But renting a house in Greece is considered a sign of poverty. No matter how expensive the rent is or how luxurious the house is, not having a house of your own is a matter of status. Even the poorest people in Greece manage to build an often non-legitimate house on a minimal plot of land, or next to their parents (see Hirschon: 1985), or together with their brothers. "One should have a roof over one's head" (Prepl na echis ena keramidhi pano apo to kefal! sou). The practice in Greece was for many years, uncontrolled building activity, no urban planning and houses that were not approved by the state (afterata spitia).

The problem of the illegal houses in Greece was so hot for many years that a few years ago, the Greek government decided to legitimate all the old constructions without any further prosecutions and inflict penalties on those who built new ones non-legitimate, of course. So either by building a house with a properly granted permit or not the Greek population obtained one house per family, at least. As the practice demands this house to be transferred via inheritance and only to be sold in an emergency, Greeks managed to differentiate themselves from other Western citizens. No loans or mortgages were asked and
In many cases, especially in the past, building a house meant a lot of personal labour.

The building of the Stoumaras family house in Karpenisi, started in 1989. In order to finish it, the whole family worked: the father, his wife, their son (who was working in the family business of construction from the age of thirteen), sons in law and cousins were engaged in the very demanding and exhausting business of building. Any extra pair of hands (skilled or unskilled) would help, so even friends worked there for helping the family and saving the money for the workers. They built the house piecemeal, literally using their hands and only when needed they hired another worker. First they laid the foundations, then the floors and finally the reinforced concrete. The walls were constructed a year later and for a decade the house did not have a roof covered with tiles. Reinforced concrete worked as a roof. It took three more years before becoming habitable. As Electra was living in rented accommodation, they decided to give her the ground floor for her family. Mitsos, the son, was planning to build the first floor of the house for his own benefit, in the distant future, so half of the construction was a skeleton building.

Lina, her husband and their first daughter, lived in the village on the top floor of the family house and made plans for building their own house on their own piece of land in Karpenisi next to Mitsos and Electra's house, in a few years time. But the law for the building construction in Karpenisi was to be changed in 1981. According to the prior law, the existing one floor construction was allowed to be raised up to two more floors. The proposed bill would not allow all the constructions in the area of Karpenisi to rise higher than one floor. Because of this unexpected change in the built-up areas, the family of Stoumaras decided to permit Lina to build another floor in this construction, before the strict enforcement of the new law. This meant that she was now going to have a plot, money, and a floor in the family house. "She got the best of the "dowry" agreement" (Vyike i pio kerdhismeni), Kiriakoula said, although it was not initially planned for her to benefit from this family arrangements. Together with her husband she had started to make plans for a house in the plot she was already given. But the change of governmental policy allowed a flexibility in the family plans for making the best of it in general terms of family provision. The benefit of having another floor now that it was still allowed, and for the sake of saving money by avoiding laying foundations in the next plot Lina owned, she and
her husband made an agreement with the rest of the members of the family and they finally built a second floor in the house. "And that happened after I had already given them the plot. So she had more than everybody else", Christoforos commented but not with bitterness, "this was not fair for her sisters, who were given just land or a house and money. Yiannis took everything: money, the plot and finally a house". Still, Lina is not entirely happy. She often says: "I would like this house to have some wings! Fly and land in the village, where I really feel at home" (Photos 74, 75). As far as Martha is concerned, although the value of the piece of land in the village where she lives (that is more than a stremma, i.e. 1000 sq.metres) with the two floor house, the hut and the garden may be worth much more that he thinks or he thought at that time, he still insists that the other sisters were hard done by taking less dowry.

Today, land in the village is highly valued but the locals don't necessarily agree with this high evaluation. A small piece of land (less than 200 sq. metres) on a very steep slope is for sale for four million drachmas - an amount of money overrated according to the local standards. For this reason, this particular piece of land is not sold: nobody shows interest in buying it. "It must be a sucker whoever is going to buy it" they say, because it is situated very high in the village, no road approaches there, no house exists on the plot. The price, however, remains comparatively high by the local standards; this price is obviously addressed to the "foreigners". "One can ask the price he wants or the money he is short of..." (o kathenas zital oti tou lipi) the villagers add in a low voice, and they are only interested in buying what is considered as a bargain price. Trespassing in Evrytanla happened with fast development. The locals, ex-shepherds, ex-workers knew who had migrated for good to the USA or Australia, who were struck with personal disasters, such as illness or death, living in another city far away from the county, or who had simply no relative left behind to look after his land and seized every opportunity to fence the abandoned fields with barbed wire. Many times these fields were even communal land. The land was not considered as one of great value so peoples' attitudes towards it were "who cares for old fields in the mountains?" (pios niazete yia ta paliochorafa). At the same time people from villages far away from Karpenisi had just started trespassing on communal land.
Stories from the villagers of Prosilio are told explaining the way they did it. Some of the villagers just helped each other but they did not bother to fence any fields for their own good. "Old land" they explain to me "who could imagine that Karpenisi would ever grow that much and today this land is worth much".

Many families in the village started from nothing but achieved a lot. Today they own land, even if in some cases they were not originally from Trano. They have created their identity via the "roots" they planned inside the village. In a few years time, when all the older people, who remember what the boundaries between the local fields were, die, many families who trespassed land will only enjoy the prestige that thousands of stremmata in a locality gives. During my research I found out that identity runs through the past by the means of various different ways: names, histories, tradition but mainly of houses and land. The village layout is a paradox worth to be explored.

The old stone houses in the original village centre are bought up or rented by migrants who live only part of the year and enjoy its peace and quiet. The locals live in more recently built houses in an extension to the village. Strategies and secrecy in real estate transactions, different attitudes to building, renovation and restoration of "traditional" buildings, preservation of old cobbled paths, widening of the asphalt roads, even land encroachment are only just a few illustrations of the ways people interpret landscape and they who have a stake in the locality make their claims to a local identity or even challenging those claims.
The summer.

While the migrants enjoy their vacation in the mountains (i.e. the village), the Traniots prefer the seaside.

(Malenou, 1996)
ABOVE: The family of Fotinos lives permanently in the village. Their establishment for the flock is permanent: cement pens and a very well organised household. BELOW: For the family of Vlahos, nature is their household: children play with the animals who come outside their hut for a snack. Their "fridge" (in the background of the photo) is some plastic covering the vegetables that they cultivate every summer and collect when ready to eat. (Malenou, 1996)
Semi-nomadic livestock breeding is difficult for the shepherds who have young children. The conditions of living are hard, the children live in a pen with no electricity, no running water, no proper housing conditions. But the morale is high: "We are used to it. We live as our parents did before... The tradition must go on". ABOVE: Liakos Vlahos' hut from outside. BELOW: His daughters inside their hut. (Malenou, 1996)
ABOVE: In the northern slope of Kaliakouda Mountain (snow-covered) in a luxuriant vegetation lies Trano. BELOW: Renovated traditional stone houses in the old village covered in snow (the Livas's house is in front). (Malenou, 1996)
ABOVE: Lina prepares the dining table; her children, Marina and Konstantina, are helping her. BELOW: Her husband, Yiannis, prepares the meat on the barbecue. This is an everyday scene from a local household. (Malenou, 1996)
CHAPTER 10 Gender as an aspect of identity

From my research in the village became clear that the role of both genders is to create a family, but a strict dichotomy between man and woman exists. Their roles are connected to the public/private sphere of spatial organisation. The role of women in Greek society particularly has been demonstrated as passive and subordinate. Okely (1991) in her article argues that women may be subordinate but not submissive. Subordination does not imply women do not have agency. Hirschon (1985:15) argues that "a male bias" approach has dominated all the ethnographic writing where "males are treated as the primary if not sole actors and women are barely visible". However, many of Hirschon's previous papers (1981, 1983a, 1983b) have shown that women are active agents who define space through their activities. It is important to stress here that the so-called subordinate, powerless and unprestigious role of woman limited in her domestic world, is a view taken from modern industrial society, which separates the public (in the early days exclusively male but nowadays still debated) arena from the domestic realm, i.e. home. As the latter, is not highly valued nor prestigious by westerners, domesticity becomes insignificant and it is consequently overlooked.

Many researchers have approached Mediterranean culture as one where the man/woman dichotomy is closely related to the public/domestic activities where each gender is engaged. Nonetheless, Hirschon's research in Greece demonstrates how the domestic sphere, still a female domain, does not necessarily connote seclusion, isolation, deprivation or inefficacy for the women. "Marriage and the creation of a family, the integrity of the family home - all these constituted the major goals and concerns for Greek women and men alike" (Campbell:1964; Du Boulay:1974 cited in Hirschon:1985:16). These concepts should be not be treated as parts of Greek culture within which women's role is fitted, but as the quintessence of Greek culture where both men and women historically, religiously and even politically have a complementary role in social organisation. Also, Hirschon's material from a very different context (i.e. refugees from Minor Asia living in an urban area) provides insight for some of the issues I looked at during my research in the mountainous village: women are the active agents in maintaining their built environment in the best possible condition and they continuously make efforts in the process of environmental care, for both private and public space.
I. The woman's and man's activities and responsibilities

Women's activities and duties in the village stress the public dimension of the female role in Greece. While men are engaged in political or economic activities, women are responsible for the spiritual and religious concerns of their families apart from the practical, everyday needs of their household. We have already seen how these domestic tasks bring them to the outside world; their religious tasks are also not just limited to the domestic sphere but are also extended to the public setting, in pilgrimage or in practices surrounding death. It is their task to act as mediators between the living and the dead's world. With their visits to shrines or monasteries situated in the countryside all over Greece, they achieve a high degree of geographical mobility, often not exercised by men. Women's pilgrimages permit them to make contact with other people beyond their families or localities. Social communication with other people (who are not related to them in terms of family, neighbourhood or place of origin) occurs as they mix with strangers, or other pilgrims. As I have stated earlier, women appear to be much more selective than men for their entertainment, time management and companionships. All these factors also define their mobility, in contrast to men who do not travel much. Perhaps the reason for this is that men are not selective. Men always repeat their well known attitudes to social life: they are not open to new friends, unknown events or any inconvenience in their everyday habits. Men tend to say "leave me in peace" (asa me stin isichia mou) when their lifestyle is threatened.

Like other aspects of social life in Greek society, religious activity should not be seen as a distinct part of culture, but interwoven with the wider social and historical context (Hirschon:1983a:115). For many centuries Greek identity was related to that of the Christian Orthodox Church (ibid.:116). Four hundred years under the Ottoman Occupation reinforced this notion of identity. Nowadays, the state is trying to separate some formal aspects of social life, which for many centuries were closely connected to the church: civil marriage and divorce have occurred only in the last decade and still, people in the village do not approve or practice them. All the aspects of modern social life in Greece are still connected to the church: names (through baptisms), marriages (in church), even deaths (funerals and services in the religious context). Even the majority of holidays in Greece are closely interconnected to religious occasions: Christmas and Now
Year, Carnival, the Virgin's Mary Annunciation (25th of March), Easter, the Day of the Holy Spirit, the Day of the Dormition (15th of August) are official Bank holidays. In the village, it is always the woman's responsibility to organise the "festive table" for the family. Women are also far more active than men even in occasions like baptisms, weddings, funerals. While men stay out of the women's ways, women organise everything and communicate with a variety of people, family members, visitors or strangers. In Greece generally the home is the centre of their life: "(t)he word "home" carries a breadth of meaning in Greek as it does in English, at once having physical, social, emotional and explicit symbolic qualities" (Hirschon:1982:66). Territoriality may serve symbolic purposes, as it is able to endow space with symbolic meaning.

In Greece women play an important role in the family structure as they give birth to new members of their family and their main responsibility is the bearing up of their children and keeping their family together. The kitchen becomes one of the most important of spaces in Greek culture: it is the ultimate feminine domain. The kitchen is closely related to both nourishment and hospitality, two main responsibilities of women's roles. None of these issues should be overlooked or relegated. "Since antiquity, strangers have received special treatment among the Greeks" (Hocart:1969:18 cited in Hirschon:1982:68). On the other hand, hospitality may reflect the Greek fear of strangers or their reverence towards them but still it implies that "strangers (will) be invited into the strictly private territory of the home, an area normally closed to outsiders" (Ibid.). In this way it is the women who act as mediators between the outside world and the inside world of their family.

The housewives' care of their domain, their maintenance of their home, moreover the area surrounding it, reflect women's need to personalise and control space, but also provide women with an ultimate mechanism of expressing and identifying their womanhood within the Greek social organisation and culture. The autonomy of each individual woman in each independent household is fulfilling the ultimate goal of her identity. Getting married means having children and taking care of her family; through these roles she gains control of her own realm and becomes aware of her status. The offering of hospitality is only one aspect where the woman mediates between her family and the outside world.
My argument is that women act in a variety of contexts, and communicate using different ways, while men are often neglected or even overlooked by women. Their sphere of activity stops right outside their house: it is solely related to their jobs and maybe to their peer group of friends, in the context of sports or politics. This is evident within their own house: men do not own a special space, or corner where they can sit or do something. In the domestic realm there is not such a thing as a "man's room". The woman runs her own kitchen where other women are also secluded but not the children; it is only relatively recent that modern architecture provides their own room for children. The sitting or living room and maybe the dining room, which also composes the living environment of the house, are not used by the men. Many ethnographers have discussed another seclusion of women from the public space, in terms of villageness, as children are sent to fetch their father from the coffee-shop. My objective is to analyse how this attitude shows the woman's power and control not only in the terms of her private sphere, but also in the public sphere. I shall be drawing from observations from my field work area, and these may be relevant to this rather than to the whole of Greece.

In the latter case, woman's empowerment supersedes her seclusion from the public, as she is the one who decides when and who is going to be sent out to call the husband who is sitting in the coffee-shop (which is surely a collective men's space). An adequate analogy would be that of the queen bee: the woman located in her kitchen (her own kingdom), sends the workers (male or female relatives such as children, youths, unmarried sisters) to call the drone (her husband) whose conjugal and providing role limits him from her own realm, the family's house. Without her own appearance in public she is capable of directing his movements. "It is time for him to come home" (keros na mazaf\i sto spiti tou), orders while she prepares the table for dining and soon a relative to whom she is superior in terms of age or gender, will be off to carry on the "message"; the man had better obey, if not immediately (lest he lose his prestige among his peer group) still in time for not causing any problems.

The man has to come in and go out, for there is nothing for him to do inside the house. His role is limited in the bedroom where he is expected to exercise his conjugal tasks. He is also expected to work outside the house and earn money in order to provide his family with the necessary provisions. He is
often not allowed to assist with female tasks even if he wants to do so. I was
told this revealing anecdote about a newly married woman in the village of my
field area: her husband wanted to help her with her everyday chores but he was
aware that this should passed unnoticed. If the villagers discover that he
performed female tasks he would have lost his male identity within the village.
One afternoon his wife was cleaning the house. Very heavy handmade rugs
should have been removed and beaten but the woman was incapable of doing so
without any help. He arrived just on time to see her trying. "Give me a hand
here", she asked him. "Yes, yes" he answered willingly, "but wait until
it gets dark!". His identity had to be protected from the outsiders' gossip; if
he was to be seen beating the rugs together with his wife he would be mocked by
the others. But the point to be made here is that men help their wives many
times in domestic chores, although carefully and secretly for fear of losing their
masculine prestige. If a man cooks or washes the dishes, this should remain
covered within the very closed precinct of his family. If the man wants to set the
table, or to serve a titbit to a visitor the woman (wife, sister, or mother) will
usually interfere: "let ME do it right.. You don't know where
everything is..." (Ase emena na to kano... Esi dhen kseris pou ine ta
pramata).

Men are usually sent out to sit in the coffee shop or visit a friend or simply
to work. Again here one should pay attention to the distribution and control of
the earned money. In most of the cases, it is the women who are in control of
the household's economic affairs. Men will never express this in public, but the
decisions are made by women, who are also careful not to boast about their
management. Women decide about holidays, expenses related to clothing or
furnishing; they also make decisions about dowries or inheritance distribution, and
possible investments, apart from cleaning, tiding, shopping, cooking or reading
with the children. Nowadays they may also working full or part time. Thus they
do have in addition some independent money.

This is clearly shown in the following cases of both the local and the
incomer woman who run their business in the village: here gender is an aspect of
identity which cuts across the local/migrant divide and which offers new and
shifting patterns of identification. Their example address the complexity through
which processes of identification take place and the "egg-timer" model of identity
dynamically appears.
II. Two women: the shifting pattern of identity

A few years ago in my area of fieldwork, advantageous subsidies and low interest loans were offered to the locals by EEC in order to develop ecological tourism. Kostas used his inherited plot of land to build a three floor building with six rooms to let. He and his wife Nana named it after his family name as "Tsamoura's Mansion". On the ground floor where the outbuildings (laundrette and the heating system) were supposed to be situated, he built a small apartment. There all the family, Kostas, Nana and their two kids, lives now. Nana is the one who runs the rooms. She very proudly declares that "I have complete control of the rooms. Kostas has nothing to do with them. He does not know anything about the job and he is not involved in matters concerning the hotel". In the publicity leaflets she promotes herself as the owner-manager of the enterprise. In this manner, she distinguished her position from the rest of the women who let rooms in the village and they are usually "helping" their husbands to run their rooms. In reality women make all the necessary arrangements and do the work for the rooms, but they do not speak as if they were the decision makers for their enterprises.

When the locals referred to the rooms to be let, they mentioned the name of the man of the family who runs the rooms, although in reality their wives run them. So, for the family of Yarifalos, who owns some rooms, people will say "Go to Laki's rooms"; for the family of Fotinos they say "Mihalis's rooms", for the rooms belonging to the family of Sfinas "Akis's rooms", the same for the Vorlas family which has "Dimitris's rooms", or Alexiou family which has "Epaminondas's rooms". By using the husband's name, they declare who is the head of the family, which among other activities also lets rooms. The only exceptions to this rule are the cases of Nana Tsamoura and Katerina Farmaki. The locals use the women's names to refer to their rooms instead of their husbands: for the Tsamoura family, Kostas's name is not used to stand for that of his wife, Nana, who is not a village woman, as already explained, but a migrant from Athens whose attitudes in many cases do not fit the social rules related to women. As far as Katerina Farmaki is concerned, she is a divorced woman who does not have a husband at all, apart from being an Athenian "migrant" (she does not live permanently in the village).
Nana has introduced a new model of woman into the village. "I am a modern woman... You know I was the first (local) woman ever seen to drive a car in the village...", she says. She is a woman in her mid twenties, who was brought up and studied in Athens, where she met her husband, Kostas who also studied there; they fell in love and eventually they got married. They have been married for eight years now and they have two children, a boy of six years old and a girl who is just four. From the first time we met she was very interested in my work and willing to help me. She introduced me to some older women (e.g. her mother in law) who were "traditional women" (as she nicely put it) and also to the school teacher who taught her son. She always offered me instant or "American" coffee, instead of the traditional Turkish coffee and small croissants bought from the supermarket, instead of the hand made dessert sweet women make in the village. In the picnic held on the first day of May in Kaliakouda (near to St. Ilias there is a flat field, an excellent place for the village's gatherings outdoors), she had prepared chicken and meatballs and "modern" salad, for she excused herself as she did not know how to make a pie.

To make a pie - as well as bread - is an expected skill of a housewife but to make a pie with 14 pastries is the ultimate challenge for her, for only the very skillful ones can achieve it. So, Nana does not pretend that she is a "modern" housewife according to the local standards. Sometimes, however, people talking in low voices have excused her for doing something "because she is not from here". Nana is also the only female I have ever seen going out and paying for herself and her companions in the village when they drink coffee or eat snacks. The villagers expect women to go out accompanied by their fathers, brothers or husbands. They also think the act of a woman buying someone else's drink or paying her share or the bill in a restaurant as inappropriate. "Women are accompanied" (I yinekes sinodhevede) they say and what they mean by that is that they are not allowed to pay their expenses for themselves. Nana has broken another rule: she is also the only one who invites her friend Lina without their husbands and some times without her children. During the summer they sit in the main square and they order a pizza, or even have ouzo kal mezedes. When she does that she insists on paying the bill, for "some clients left today so I have some money to spend". She acts (as does her husband) very generously even if sometimes she cannot afford it. They are both considered as having a high sense of honour (philotimo).
Katerina Farmaki was adopted by a Traniot, Simeon Farmaki, because he and his wife could not have any children. They lived in Athens where he worked as a teacher, but they visited the village every summer. After he retired, he returned to live in Trano and at that time he passed on all his property in the village to his daughter. Katerina became the owner of a stone house and a plot in the village as well as a house in Athens. She decided to make the best of it and run a business related to tourism in the rapidly developing area of Trano. The sad story to be told here is that her father died the day she was having the inauguration of her enterprise in the village, in Easter 1994. He, as a writer, was devoted to the recording of the local traditions. In his memory, Katerina donated the furnishing for the new library situated in the local Folklore Museum.

Katerina is a divorced woman with a young daughter and a well-paid job in Athens. However, she also took advantage of the governmental subsidies and decided to build some rooms in the village, in a plot she inherited from her father. There was a small problem at that time. The allowances were given exclusively to local people and not to the outsider investors. The reason for this was that the government wanted to create some incentives for the locals to stay in underdeveloped areas. Katerina lived (and still does) in Athens but she found a way to become a "local". On the elections of 1990 she became a "local" by resigning from voting as an heterodimotis. This was made possible by falsely declaring that she had been living in the village for two years. This confirmation was given by the local president, Nikos Selliotis. In return for this favour, she supported the candidate Nikos Selliotis, who was running as a president for the village on the New Democracy party slate at the forthcoming elections. This way the president acquired a "client" and Katerina Farmaki became a "permanent" inhabitant of the village.

Thanks to Selliotis' election, and this certificate of locality, Katerina managed to build her rooms to let in the village and called them "the Forest Inn". As the name itself proclaims, the settlement looks very much like a traditional English Inn. There is a communal room on the ground floor decorated with a mixture of English and traditional Greek style. Her rooms are the most expensive in the village (about 25,000 drachmas per night, the equivalent of 60 pounds, when the other rooms in the village cost about 5,000 - 10 pounds per night). She is always full. The reason for her success is that the rooms are equipped with a fireplace and the decoration is in Laura Ashley style, which are very popular among the "new rich" (neoploutous) Athenians lately.
During the 1990s, a particular group of people have become attracted towards "traditional" places all over Greece: e.g. renovated castles in Mani, windmills in Mykonos or stone houses in the mountains. The emerging class of new rich people who have recently stopped travelling abroad now spend a considerable amount of money on their long weekends - Thursday evening to Monday night - discovering "untouched" corners of Greece. The second reason for Katerina's success is that her first job helped her encounter a lot of wealthy people who were just buying or building new houses, who owned a second car - usually a jeep (this lately in Greece has became a favoured item for newly rich people) and who could spend a lot for a weekend. She had an already existing clientele who consequently sent other friends to her place thus always increasing her guests. The point to be made here is that Katerina's rooms are not traditional at all in terms of Greekness. But the majority of people visiting them - not just the locals, but also guests, visitors etc. - do not recognise the style. All of them admire it as they come walking along the road: "Oh, look at these nice traditional rooms" they say, convinced that nice (although in international standards) and traditional goes together. Some of the visitors think that it is a sort of cafe so they stop to have a look. They are usually intrigued also to have a look in the rooms, something that Katerina never refuses; she is very proud of her rooms. People, then come out commenting "I was rendered breathless at the beauty" (Photos 75,76).

Katerina is an interesting case of a migrant who does not fit into any of the categories of migrants outlined by Poerregaard (1997). She runs her business from Thursday to Monday every week with some intervals in January and September when she goes on vacation, like a returned migrant. But the rest of the week she stays in Athens where she continues to work in her other job as a kitchen designer in her partner's business and she looks after her only daughter who goes to school in Athens. Katerina lives with Antonis, who is also her partner, in Athens and her daughter, but usually Antonis and her daughter do not follow Katerina to the village because they will miss Monday's works and lessons. Ilianna, her daughter, comes regularly during holidays and vacations but she does not associate a lot with the children of her age. Her only friend is the one year older daughter of a married couple living permanently in Lamia, who also seize every opportunity to come to the village: they are the Livas couple. The Livas couple as already stated, agree with Katerina about the refined tastes and
manners of the people who are used to mixing. This pattern is passed on to their daughters: so usually where Dafne is, Ilianna is also to be found.

Katerina, like Nana, lived in Athens and their bonds are via their new family and not by "roots". They are both seen as "not exactly locals but not entirely outsiders" by the villagers. Although they share many similarities in manners, they mutually dislike each other. Being both "owners & managers" of the same type of local enterprise often encourages an open competition. If Katerina gets a wooden summer umbrella for the garden, Nana will also buy exactly the same type, even if she is short of money or if she is not going to use it at all. When Katerina bought a dog; a pure blood cocker spaniel, Nana started to look for a pure blood husky. In 1996 Katerina Farmaki sponsored the Cultural Week of Trano (Photo 49) and the next year Nana Tsamoura asked for the sponsorship. This great rivalry between the two landladies has been turned Into a joke by the locals: "Wait and see what Katerina does next", they say "for Nana will copy it, as well".

But often antagonism is not harmless or to be laughed at. Other owners of rooms in the village have suffered from it. The Yarifalos family also has rooms to let high on the top of the village with, in fact, the best view of the village. They suffered a lot of unfair and fraudulent competition. The reason I was given was that "this happened simply because we were the first who completed the letting rooms and they wanted to steal our clients". As everybody started to build them at the same time (after the subsidies and loans of the EEC developing program), they wanted to harm Lakis's success and clientele, although at that time everybody else had started to let rooms. I was told the following story: while they were waiting for clients to arrive from Athens, more than once, their clients had been misled by other rooms owners. Lakis had pitched a wooden sign in the main road but somebody removed the sign so the clients lost the road for Lakis's rooms and they drove to the village. There they were asking for information about Lakis's rooms but they were "kidnapped" from another owner to be offered rooms in their pension; rooms which where practically unfinished. After a long search Lakis found out what happened the same day, so he went to his clients and he dragged them out of their new settlement (which was cheaper because unfinished) to his own rooms. They did not tell me the name of the saboteur, but after a while they referred to something irrelevant, trying to give me a hint about his identity.
The case of Lakis differs a little from the rest of the owners for he has also a full licence to serve drinks in his place. As I have already mentioned, the view is breathtaking but the decoration wipes out the first impressions one has. Sometime during the winter, the men, who are usually sitting in central square at the hotel that also serves as a coffee shop, decide to go for a drink in Lakis's rooms. Lakis who is a building constructor does not work all day long during the winter period. These nights end up quite late and with an extreme amount of alcohol consumed. There is also a barbecue in the fireplace with sausages, steaks and lamb chops. A lot of stories are to be told on an occasion like this. That's an exception to the rule of sitting in the coffee-house of the hotel.

The locals are in many ways different from the migrants. Their interests are different; so therefore, are their views and behaviour patterns. Many migrants, who already own a house in the city, come to the village for vacation. This way they differentiate themselves not just from the other citizens who do not have a traditional house (i.e. the Livas couple) but also from the villagers who also do not have another house. The only case for the locals to have a second house is when they come from another village. Finally, place and identity are related to each other. The paradox of the Athenian half-migrant, Katerina Farmaki, implies that tradition is often invented in order to satisfy the visitors. When Katerina returns to Athens, she claims another identity.
Inside the "Forest Inn". ABOVE: The sitting room, virtually decorated in Laura Ashley style, that nowadays is a multi-national creation. The guests enjoy their coffee. BELOW: The suite is called the purple room. Each room has its own colour. Ilianna, the daughter of Katerina, is posing for me. (Malenou, 1997)
I. Public appearances: generosity and masculinity

All the ethnographers who did research in Greece recognise the man's status in the public sphere. In line with the dominant ideology Greek men appear very active outside his house, while inside the house the woman is in command. Many men in Trano used to joke about their wives "I will ask the supervisor" (tha rot iso ton proistameno) they would say for cases demanding serious decision making. However, outside the house, it is their responsibility to care for the appearances and maintain the family's social status. One form of this attitude is a Greek sense of generosity, the well known philotimo (i.e. sense of honour). The following case of the Tsamouras family in my field area proves it.

Complaints are heard often about the distribution of money the migrants' Association collects every year from the Summer Cultural Festival and spends for the locals' sake. In 1995 during the last evening of the fiesta in the main square of the village, the president of the local football team "Potamia" asked the Migrants' Committee publicly to donate an amount for supporting the local football team. It was already known by word of mouth that they had raised more than 800,000 drachmas thanks to the festival and it was also known that their expenses should not be more than 150,000 - 200,000 drachmas, considering the sponsorship. The Migrant's Association decided to donate only the sum of 50,000 drachmas to the local football team, despite the profits they had. People murmured that with this amount they "became socially ridiculous" (edhosan to mitho=yelioplithikan). One ex football player and member of the football Committee, Kostas Tsamouras took the offensive, so, he proposed that he alone would donate another 60,000 drachmas to the local team, personally and not as a member of the football committee. Everybody thought of this as a very generous offer, but especially the locals who beamed with pride on behalf of Kostas: "One can understand...", people explained, "with his generous gesture, he embarrassed the stingy migrants" (Boris na katalavis... Me tin aplocherl chironomia tou, edhose na katalavoun l tsgounlhes metanastes).
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One should consider that the family of Tsamouras is not a rich family: their long term payable loan for "Tsamouras's Mansion" is something that everyone in the village silently disapproves of. The case of Tsamoura's family is different from everybody else because they did not just borrow for building the letting rooms - as the rest room-owners did in the village - but they also built their own house with it. So they are still practically indebted for both their house and the rooms. The poorest person in Greece is still the owner of his house, even if this means only a hovel of one room with the kitchen and the bathroom outside. When Kostas goes out to have a drink (to the local disco for example) he will necessarily buy every co-villager present a drink. Sometimes this means buying more than twenty drinks! Every time people tease him about his well-known generosity: "Well... Tsamouras is here - prepare yourselves for the free drinks!...". When I asked him about it he said: "When I go to the local disco I want to leave some money to the owner of the club. I just drink one or two and Nana who cannot stand drinking; she has an orange juice... But I feel constrained to buy all the people I know a drink so I will have to pay 20,000 drachmas or more. I cannot stop doing it. These people are giving me jobs. This way I thank them". I wanted to tell me about those people who have just received his treat. He told me: "It's all right. Another time they will buy me a drink...". Apparently, he enjoys his reputation very much and he always tries to affirm it. He has a particular way of treating people, without showing off: he will never shout to the waiter; "Give those people over there whatever they want". Instead, he will be out of sight for a couple of minutes, giving his order secretly and directly to the bar-keeper. When one's free drink arrives at the table, people usually raise their glasses to the person who is treating and they drink: "to your health" they salute him. When they are sitting far away, they even stand up and shout wishes loudly: Cheers. "Stin iyela sou". On these occasions Kostas looks a little embarrassed and keeps nodding back to them without too much exaggeration. When a person thanks him personally, Kostas usually says "It's nothing... Enjoy yourself" (Dhen ine tipota... Na isel kale). By the local standards, Kostas's gesture was very generous indeed. By becoming wealthy, he did not become "stingy" as those who were born rich are.
Generosity is one of the many features ascribed to masculine identity. Another can be the refusal of the man to do any chore in the house as stated elsewhere, or if he really wants to help to be careful not to expose himself to the public view. I have recorded many cases in the village where young men shift their identity either temporarily or permanently. An example is the birth of a baby by a local couple of the village. In the past, it would have been inconceivable for a man to be seen taking care his baby. Changing the napkins, feeding with a baby bottle or pushing the push chair in the central square of the village. Today, men are open to this change. They believe that it is their duty, too. Perhaps behind this attitude still lies a hidden motive: the confirmation of their masculine identity. This is because many couples in the village they do not give birth as once people used to do. So by showing off their offsprings they reassure themselves and society that some are more men than other. No matter what the men' motive is, one can notice a shift in their roles and attitudes. This is also observable in their local custom of Kalimera.
II. Customs and change

In Trano, there is a special occasion where all the men of the village use their gender identity to promote a local custom: on January the 5th in the evening, all the masculine population of the village gathers in the central square as soon as it gets dark. Children, youngsters, adults and older men repeat year after year the custom of singing the Epiphany Carols while visiting all the houses of the village. This group of people is named after the custom of singing the Carols of the Epiphany: Kalimera (APPENDIX III). They are called "the men of the Carols of the Epiphany" (i Kalimeradhes). Some carry a few traditional Greek musical instruments, a tabor - drum (dauli) and a clarinet (klarino). They move from door to door singing the special carols. Wherever they go they would be treated with meat, pies and tsipouro or wine. They also collect money as a donation from those they have visited and sung to: literally every house in the village. With the money they collect, the next day a festival for the people of the village will be organised. The locals, the migrants, friends from elsewhere who are given hospitality and even visitors are welcomed to sit, eat, drink and dance traditional folk music for free. A proper glentl (i.e. the occasion where people eat, drink, dance and/or sing and enjoy themselves) is set up where everybody - young, old, woman, man, married, single, children or dignitaries - participates (Photos from 78 to 92).

Many migrants travel from far away to be in Trano especially for this occasion. Considering that this is happening just after Christmas and New Year's Eve the effort people who don't live permanently at the village, make in order to come just for the performance of the custom, means quite a lot. Cohen (1985:96) explains how the Scottish custom of spree (which resembles the Evrytanian Kalimera) "takes people back to their kinship-neighbourhood group of origin" and "provides them with an occasion to reassert one's primordial loyalties under the licence of the exceptional event".

Yet, the reason why migrants return to participate in the custom may be not that simple: perhaps Turner's notion of "communitas" emerges here. Instead of a social structure, the "society is pictured as a communitas of free and equal comrades" (Turner:1974:238). As a rule, conflicts among the locals and / or the migrants and their manipulation about the exercise of power are evident in every single activity. Kalimera is one of the very few - maybe the only occasion where
people’s attitude towards authority was set apart and it worked as a very special ritual of unique solidarity. Turner (ibid.) wrote

rituals may be performed in which egalitarian and cooperative behavior are characteristic, and in which secular distinctions of rank, office, and status are temporarily in abeyance or regarded as irrelevant. On these ritual occasions persons deeply divided from one another in the secular or nonreligious world nevertheless in certain ritual situations cooperate closely to ensure what is believed to be the maintenance of a cosmic order which transcends the contradictions and conflicts inherent in the mundane social system. Here we have an unstated model of communitas, an operational model.

While men in every household of the village sing the Carols, ta Kalimeres, women also participate in their own complementary way: every housewife is prepared to welcome the Kalimerades, by serving them a variety of titbits and of course, tsiouro (a distillation of the pomaces from the wine-press, that is much stronger than wine) or wine. The housewives use their best recipes for homemade bread or filo for the pies; they also insist that the Kalimerades taste a little of everything. The snacks vary in type and taste: cheese or green pies, sausages, baboules (a kind of local kokoretsi), bits of roast lamb or chicken, meatballs, kokoretsi, (i.e. bits of liver and other meat roasted on the spit) different kinds of cheese and maybe oranges are served one way or another. A silent competition occurs among the households: the men will stay long in the house where they will be treated best, in terms of food quality and taste. They will comment to a new-comer: "Don't eat much here, we will stop in Aristidis' house where Mary makes the best pies in the village", or "Don't drink much tsiouro, we will taste Dimitris' wine which is very good this year" (usually wine is home-made in the village), or even more often "Don't stuff yourself with pies... In Sakis's place there is a very good home made sausage".

It is to be expected that men usually get drunk long before they finish their circle in the village. Even children are allowed to drink in moderation this night (Photo 82). As the night passes, people start to abandon the gathering: while in the beginning it may be some sixty or even more people later, those who are tired of walking leave and their number decreases. There are a few houses where the
Kalimerades do not stop to sing: those are either the closed ones or the houses in which some member of the family has been recently deceased and they are mourning (iparchi penthos). After they finish their obligation to the households of the village, they telephone other members of the community who live abroad or in Athens and they sing a couple of verses to them, too.

The verses of the Carols are changed according to the composition of a particular household but not its rhythm. There are different verses for each member of the family: first, they wish that the man of the household will prosper and that his wife have beauty (Kalimera afenti mou, napoume stin kira mas). Then they wish that the unmarried daughter (thiyatera) may marry the son of a king (here she smartly "replies" that she has already chosen the groom who is a shepherd) and or that the unmarried son (yio) may marry a beautiful bride of high rank. If the family has a member in foreign lands (ksenitemeno) they wish that he may return wealthy and they even sing a different verse for the priest of the village: they wish that his church bells may be heard far away. All these verses are revealing of the values of Greek culture, moreover, they reveal what are the matters of paramount importance for a mountain community in Evrytania, as this custom only occurs in Evrytania (nowadays in just two villages, one of them being Trano and the other one Prasino, only 5 km away).

The core of Greek society is the family. This is evident in every aspect of life and widely recognized by other anthropologists who did research in Greece. Campbell (1968:334) stated:

We have emphasized the historical importance of the family institution in the social structure of Greek communities. In the uncertainty and changes of contemporary country life this remains true. A man's categorical obligations are still, in most situations, to his family. ... The family has a multiform character. It is not only a domestic group concerned with the care and upbringing of children. It is also an economic enterprise and a religious community. This quality underlies the exclusive solidarity of the family and its isolation.

Friedl (1986:42,51) has also stressed that the family is the most significant unit in the social structure of a Greek village community. Kenna (1976b:348) agrees that "(t)he pattern of household organization on Nisos is based on the nuclear family ... (which) ... regards itself as a unit with its own specific interests". This is primarily established in the verses of Kalimera, of which the wishes for the
household are related to the prosperity of the master of the household (*nikokiris-afentis*) and to the beauty of the mistress of the house (*nikokira-kira*). It must be stressed that prosperity and wealth mean self-sufficiency in economic terms, which is the aim of every Greek household (Kenna:1976b:349). Beauty is often related to health and well-being. The wishes for the migrant are also related to health and success. They illuminate the long tradition of migration from Trano to Constantinople and the U.S.A. later, whose aim was that one should return safe and with many mules loaded with goods. It is worth adding here that the men who usually left the village in those first waves of migration could in some cases have been married; their wives who remained back home living alone had to support themselves and maybe an unborn child or an infant. Because their husbands delayed their returns it was not unusual for a husband to return and find another child in the family whose birth did not coincide with his departure. In Trano there are some very old people today whose are believed to have been the adulterous children of "long-distance marriages". These marriages never broke down and the wives revelled in their freedom as their husbands did far away.

Finally, the verses about the unmarried son ask for him a beautiful bride who comes from a good family. The most striking thing about the Carols is the verses concerning the unmarried girl: here is the only case where the character replies in the pre-organized attempt to arrange her future. And she does not just answer back but she answers negatively, having already made her decision about her future. This maybe not the case for Greece in general; as Kenna (1976b:33) stresses "cultural homogeneity cannot be taken for granted". But it is the case for the barren land of Evrytania, where women were more than often left alone to cope with the hardships of life, therefore they became active, their voices were publicly heard and their opinions were openly stated.

In January 1996 I learned about this custom I had asked people I knew well if they believed it would be appropriate for me to attend it: a male activity *par excellence*. They suggested that I should. As I was too embarrassed to arrive with all the men at the central square where they gathered, I waited in a house I knew they would pass to sing first. When they arrived and saw me waiting they dragged me into their group. In spite of my fears of attending an originally masculine activity, I was made very welcome by everybody. Recording the village's rituals, as I explained, made them swell with pride. For 11 hours I followed the group of men whose number would increase and decrease (as some people would drop by to sing just for some houses). At every house they visited I
was pushed in front of the procession; everybody could see that I was going with
them and then they shouted excitedly, but not in an angry or annoyed way:
"Look! There is Yioulie with them!". Both the participants and the
villagers who waited in their houses for the Kalimerades to arrive would treat me
first of all with the best titbits and tsipouro as if I were a very special honoured
guest.

I was told stories related to Kalimera which had happened years ago and
patiently explained whatever I asked. The fact of my femaleness did not disturb
anybody. I can only think of a couple of reasons for this. Many people,
particularly the elderly who knew me, believed that being there was my sort of
right and duty as I represented my grandfather's lost line: I was somebody's
granddaughter, therefore I was a member of a family whose participation in
the ritual was its own right (echis ipochreosi na vriskese edho). Those people who
did not know who I was were complimented by my attention to their ritual. They
were flattered by my curiosity and attention: we talked a lot during that long
evening. After the Kalimera I was famous: I had literally visited every single
house of the village, I was introduced to every one living in the village, I had
talked with almost everybody. This was finally my gala performance in the
villagers' life. The problem was now that everybody got to know me but I only
remembered just a few people.

Although many people at that time already knew that I was a professional
photographer, that first time of attending the Kalimera, I did not carry any visual
media to record the night the men sang. The next evening during the eating and
drinking I took many photographs. My unconscious decision of not taking the
camera also affected people's views about my presence during the custom;
questions, conversations and comments were easily followed as I mingled with
people whom I did not know. As the years passed, the Kalimerades cannot think
of Kalimera without my presence: every year they call me at home to confirm my
attendance there. From the second time when I participated in Kalimera and
onwards I used my camera and a video-recorder, as naturally as if I had always
been there. From the photographs below the reader will see that no one is posing
for me. Over the past four years I have not taken a photograph of any of them in
a "still" pose. Perhaps I don't want to: that is, record a stillness that does not
really exist, destroy the spontaneity and free but patterned expression of it.
Cohen (1985:96) has explained how the Scottish custom of spree, which simulates the Kalimera, takes people back to their kinship-neighborhood group of origin and provides them with an occasion to reassert one's primordial loyalties under the licence of the exceptional event. This symbolic behaviour exhibits continuity of form and substantial change of content refracting changed circumstances as Whalsay people assert the reality of its cultural boundary and commit themselves to it.

Therefore, rituals heighten consciousness and symbolically affirm and reinforce the community boundary and reconstitute the community for both members of settled and dispersed communities (Cohen:1985:42). Epstein (1978:110-111) also attests to "the importance of the role of custom or symbol in the transmission of identity when practices discarded in one generation can be revived in the next".

Rituals and customs in Trano are also open to a shifting interpretation. While in the past, it was said that only men participated in the Kalimera, today women are also invited to follow the parade. Change comes together with people's shifting identity.
All the men gather to sing the Kalimera in every place where people live in the village: in the houses but also in the shops, in the coffee shops, in the hotels or guest rooms of the village. Here they sing in a village coffee shop.

(Malenou, 1997)
The gathering of men walking for hours along the cobble paths of the village in order to visit all houses and sing to them. As the time passes, those who cannot stand anymore leave, this way decreasing the number of the singers. I had also to carry a heavy bunch of equipment (camera, different lenses, flash, batteries, films and video recorder) for more than 9 hours! (Malenou, 1997)
ABOVE: Musical instruments are brought in the Kalimera: Tabors and pipes even if those who carry them do not know how to play them.

BELOW: Children and youngsters are allowed to drink tsipouro or wine on this special occasion, as long as they are not getting drunk. (Malenou 1997)
ABOVE: Young and old participate in the Kalimera. For many this will be the only occasion for visiting many of the migrants' houses that are closed all year long.

BELOW: Next to the tabor is the donation box, which is brought outside the church next morning, so after the Epiphany service more money will be collected for the Kalimera feast (glenti).

(Malenou 1997)
Wherever the *Kalimerades* go, the housewives will be ready to treat them with snacks, meat, pies, cheese, desserts and of course, tsipouro and wine. Among them there is a silent but real competition: who is going to treat them best.

(Malenou 1997)
On Epiphany night a *glenti* is organised and all the villagers attend it. People eat, drink, chat, and dance traditional folk dances for the whole evening. Each family will arrive together: despite the ritual's solidarity, people still underline their primary social commitment, family. Many stay seated all night long, while a few go around. (Photographs above and below from the fiesta in the local tavern, Malenou, 1996)
ABOVE: Women are expressing their *kefi* by drinking with their arms bent. In many cases it was the older women who felt relaxed presenting a "masculine" attitude, rather than the younger who stayed seated and watched. BELOW: Martha and Electra are sisters; Levteris and Simos are their husbands. Simos died from stomach cancer in less than a year. Both couples have two children each of a similar age, as the sisters were married the same year.
With the donation of the villagers for the Epiphany day a big fiesta (*glienti*) will be organised for the whole village. The *Kalimera* attracts all the population of the village (from the age of 8 until that of 80). After eating, they will start dancing traditional folk dances; a live band with traditional Greek musical organs plays all night long.

(Malenou, 1996)
CONCLUSION

In order to understand, describe and interpret, the anthropologist has to mix in with local society and become the life and soul of the party. For me this was easy to do for I was a native anthropologist of the locality having unique access in the Tranions by speaking the Greek language and by staying in the field for long term participation. The anthropologist seeks to seize the essence of life around her or him and to incarnate its animating spirit. Through my past and observations I shared with the Traniots, I moved from being "the stranger" to someone who was accepted because of my link to the place through family and land. Carrying all these factors in my anthropological suitcase, I was studying "otherness" but with a passport in a mountainous Greek village.

This has a double meaning: one interpretation is that as someone with local connections the researcher had a way into the community. In many cases, the author's origin was "a passport" in the community under study. However, another interpretation is that as a Greek studying abroad and carrying out research for a UK doctorate, the author obviously had a passport in order to travel outside Greece. So here, the significance is dual having a metaphorical passport "in" and a real passport out, which links the author to an outside world of academic work and makes her an "Other" to the people she is studying.

By not using some of the conventional social science research methods, such as tape recorder, interviews, questionnaires, spatial maps etc. I managed to overcome many of the problems initially presented in my research. My preference for other means of research, like the use of photography and video, together with my skill in them, proved very useful for "opening doors" in many different contexts in village life. I hope that the photographs submitted here are not viewed just as illustrations of the text. My aim follows Danforth's comment about the photographs made by Tslaras, that she used in her book "The death rituals of rural Greece". Danforth (1982:viii) wrote that they "constitute an

* I would like to thank Professor Margaret Kenna for her comment on the dual meaning of "passport".
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independently conceived visual commentary — one which complements,..., the anthropological analysis it accompanies".

The anthropologist records all aspects of the local scene, trivial as well as tragic. Recording everyday scenes of how people work, eat, drink or travel or entertain themselves to more occasional events such as baptisms, weddings, migrants' meetings, local councils, funerals, fiestas or rituals, I discovered that people live the differences even in every day practice, in domestic space, in the way they eat, sit, in what they look at and in the way space is organised around them. Autobiography, reflexivity and long term participation helped me to highlight many aspects of biases in both the migrants' views about the locals and the other way round. By identifying strongly with the people I studied, I may perhaps have not appreciated the extent to which I has been brain-washed. I was the embodiment of someone with different place identities. Thus, I became aware that I enacted through personal experience something of the return migrants. Subjectivity and personal involvement are a part of the anthropologist's task; I became a "private eye" with a moral commitment to my hosts. This is made apparent from the following example.

From the beginning of my fieldwork, people's attitudes toward the Cultural Festival were ambivalent: it was something special, but also it was something not worthwhile. While younger or older men and women living permanently in the village, used to refer to some of the past summer's events they were quite reluctant to talk at great length about the festival itself. This particular attraction of many of the migrants from the village could be the reason for the locals' rejection of this event. As the village is full of migrants, the locals feel threatened by their large numbers and their ostentatious activities. Therefore, they keep repeating that they don't need that "stuff" and do not speak enthusiastically about it: "Hmmm... The Cultural Week.. This takes place every summer. Many people arrive for it: the village is full by then. What exactly happens? Don't ask ME! They organise it, they know all about it (to tell you)... That's just what we needed!". At the same time, the locals use the village as a location, a reference that they identify themselves in contrast to the rest. They insist: "We are the ONES who live here ALL year round" and by saying this, they demand the larger piece from the cake of local identity.
During the winter, when the village was empty and quiet, I spent many hours in the coffee shop talking about everything together with those who stayed permanently in the village all year round. It was the beginning of my encounter with the locals' trust, and at that time I desperately tried to find out what was the meaning of the Summer's Cultural Festival for the villagers. The stereotypical answer I was always given was: "Be patient... Wait until the summer and you will find out by yourself what's going on...". As everybody was making this identical comment rather unconsciously, the hint worked to encourage the wildest interpretations. A couple of months had passed before I could have some direct answers. This happened chiefly because of my own identity. Being an incomer, a migrant, an "Athenian" (like myself), Ylannis, a man of my age, had roots in the village and shared many of my views about the locals. While he had just migrated from Athens to live permanently in the village, when he was just visiting the village he had been seen as an incomer, as an Athenian by the locals for many years. He could more easily understand my position, that of an outsider: "You see... I know how you feel... Like me when I first arrived here. Nobody talked to me (about the local issues) as they do now. Now I became one of them: by living permanently here I became one of them. Now they say I can understand. Before that they said I did not understand anything. They sometimes pointed out to me: 'Watch out! You are not from here...' You don't really know what's going on.' But some times, even now that I live permanently here, I know that still I am not one of them: no matter if I feel like them or how much I try to behave like them, I will never be seen as an equal...". While worrying about his "confession" to me betraying them by not following the line of silence "wait and see by yourself" they had committed themselves to, he made me aware of the importance of the migrants as well as of the stigma they carried for the locals.

Obviously, being stigmatised initially as a migrant, he had to behave carefully to confirm his other identity, the "trying-to-become-local" one. This secrecy covering the festival was finally related to the local politics and their manipulation from the Migrant's committee for personal showing off during the later years.
The summer arrived and with it, at last, the migrants arrived. They were always involved in conversations and activities related to the Summer Cultural Week and were never concerned with their lives in their permanent residence in the cities. Their talk about the Festival was extended and repeated while staying at the village. "Oh... Yes! The Cultural Week is something. It is getting better and better every year. Many events occur and all the people have fun. It is something that is really worth attending it. Why don't you participate in something? Cooking or volleyball? Everyone is welcome here!"

Here it is very important to stress the dual notion of space: the meaning of "here" is not only the village but also the event. The cultural week of the migrants, who are always seen as incomers or outsiders by the locals, enables the migrants to challenge the notion of belonging. They use the cultural week, its performances, appearances and activities according to their needs; the migrants' primary aim is to feel "at home". The important issue is that both migrants and locals use space and time for their own purposes. They share a common perspective: by negotiating ideas of locality and temporality or permanence, they negotiate different aspects they ascribed to identity.

"Being from here" for the locals means that one cannot understand their ways by simply arriving for a short term or just occasionally visiting the village. That one can actually be from the village but by not living there testifies his or her ignorance about the locality. Still the notion of identity is related to place: who you are is where you live and not simply where you come from for the locals. The latter (where you come from) is what the migrants debate with their appearances, houses and even their coming and going. Here I would like to introduce the model of the egg-timer for identity. This model may be applied elsewhere, but I related it to the study of place and identity in the Greek mountain village of central Greece where I conducted my research. I would like to argue that identity develops through the combination of several levels of social experience, which are contained within one another, rather that aspects of social life overlapping one another. This combination of several Identities is seen as enclosed into one part of an egg-timer. When a shift in space and time occurs, then the egg-timer containing "identities" at one end overturns, Inverting inside out

---
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the sequence of its components. This turning of different social and cultural levels articulates another, different moreover, contested identity.

Unlike some earlier village studies as isolated communities, I problematised migration, movement and flexibility of identity in place. I found out that the notion of belonging has multiple meanings and is perhaps acted out in "jest", "game" or serious struggle. Also a "game" is in many cases used to set out rivalries, uncertain ties, conflict and loyalties, as in football: the local and the various migrants' teams carry many and different implications. Volleyball, basketball or football are not just games for the people of Trano. Either migrant or local, people play a game in order to set out their uncertainties, rivalries or other conflicts. In many cases the amateur and not especially trained locals win through being highly motivated; also their well exercised bodies contrast with the obese Athenian or American non manual workers. The occupation can be seen as another "class" contrast. It is also very interesting to see how "them" in that case would have include also people labelled as "us". The migrants and their team were perceived as being different from the locals who had played with and for them. The inversion of migrant identity by the locals is something that although rare it happens within the context of the locality. But when the village has to encounter an absolute outsider, such as another village or another city, then the egg-timer of identity turns over and all the conflicts and rivalries are forgotten, for the sake of the village. The subversion will unite everybody against outsiders, reinforcing but also shifting the Internal boundaries. In night entertainment, in games, in various social contexts, the Traniots will appear and will also be and feel united, as everybody in the county knows.

I have also challenged the idea that migrants bring change to "passive traditional villages"; instead the migrants' views change according to location. They may revert to or invent tradition in the "original" place. Meanwhile, the villagers may "modernise" in ways which are contrary to the return migrants. Locality is interpreted as an exploration of identity. Local people have shifting and changing relationships with a range of types of migrant: the returned migrants, the occasionally returning migrants, the weekenders, and the summer visitors. All of them are defined on some occasions as "insiders" and "outsiders" depending on the particular context.
The environment provides a limiting context for human productive activity. People acquire particular characteristics through associating with each other in a particular landscape, which has particular history and is exploited in a particular way. The people of the village and the area have unique vocabulary and pronunciation which help identify locals to each other and to outsiders. They are Orthodox Christians and they state their direct link between them and the Ancient Greeks. This latter, however, is more a "myth-history" rather than a fact of historical background. Still, oral history plays important role for the claims they make.

The seeming classical mountain shelter / enclave has actually been a place for political activists (on the left) during the Civil War from Crete to Thessaloniki and for bandits at certain points in history. Collard (1987,1989,1993) seems to represent wars as momentary interruptions in tradition instead of integrated into the peace time lives and identity. As time passes and creates distance from these turbulent days, people seem to accept the implications of the Civil War into their everyday practices in this mountain area of Central Greece. They still express, however, their untamed spirit and wild inner self by performing individual resistance to power and control.

The village plan reveals the physical segregation of migrants and locals in different localities. Symbolic space is created with the "traditional" setting both groups use: houses decoration or renovation, use of land, different tastes and food, hand-made and local products. Greek culture seems to be overwhelmingly male-centred to an outsider and male activities appear more prestigious. But by exploring the importance of the public and private sector within the Greek community, it becomes clear that the highly valued position of the family in the social structure provides the women with real power. The use of the binary opposition between public and private spheres for understanding the male and female roles, shows differences in appearance and reality. Men appear to have more power in the spatial organisation of public spaces, such as the kafenio, the ayora or other official or political space. But this rule is broken on special occasions like holidays, festivals, Kalimera, etc.
As it seems I have found out that memories and family, past and locality, migration and origin, politics, control, power and tradition are all mixed in an egg-timer that turns over and again in space and time formulating people's identity. So, "the story" as they say or my research should finish the way I intended to start: Once in the small big village of Trano...
TOPOGRAPHICAL SKETCH MAP
OF THE VILLAGE

KEY

- Newly built house
- Traditional stone house
- Hut / barn
- Permanent residents / locals / insiders
- * In the houses that are not marked (i.e. [ ] )
  live the migrants / outsiders

APPENDIX II

86 Houses of locals
198 Houses of incomers
284 Total number

270
APPENDIX III
THE EPIPHANY CAROLS (in Greek): TA ΚΑΛΗΜΕΡΑ

Kalhmera Kalhmera afentit mu' kai kata smera
Afrenti mu' sta sarangia su kantilia krermasmeva
Dixwos alisia kremontai dixwos aeria swntai
An baliei ladi kai keri feggoun sti gerontia sou
An baliei ladi monaxa feggoun tin afrenti sou
Polla eiptame t'afentit mac na poyme stin kura mac

Kurma mu' otan stoiligei kai pas sthen ekklhsi st baziess ton hlio prostopo kai to feggari asthbi kai ton kathario auqernin baziess kaggeleofroidi.
Kurma mu' ti thugatera sou kurma mu' tin akribi sou

Tin elouzices, th qtenisses sta sunnefa stin kribeis kai stparaxe to sunnefo kai faheki h korri mesa tin eide o giou tou basili ton eide o giou tou Rnga de thei w egw to basili, de thei w egw to Rnga mon' thei w toospandopulo na paiizei ti(ς) phlogerees.

Edw exoume ena gi kaloi polla paiidia kai axia palikaria guresan gia na pantreutoyn, na broyn v' arabaonias(t)oun na paroyn apo psilh meria kai apo Pwrgadeis mna na 'nai psilees, na 'nai lignes, na 'nai kaggeleofroides.

Ew otopo eiasi sthen xeniti, pou 'sai makrua sta xena kalai na pas, kalai na 'rheis me moules fortwmenees.

Sik w apaoi deespota kai mhin bariat koiamae ola ta sthmantra xtipoun, ki olles oi ekklhsiess ma to diko sou sthmantro, den krenei, de xtipai.

Kerasta afentit mu', kerasta ta laspokopiasmena na pane sto krasopoulid, na fanei kai na poyni kai na poluxronisoune na poyni KAI TOY XRONOY!

FOR THE MAN
FOR THE WOMAN
FOR THE UNMARRIED DAUGHTER
FOR THE UNMARRIED SON
FOR MIGRANTS
FOR THE PRIEST
FOR DONATION
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