Writing Cyprus: Homecoming and Cosmopolitanism in Colonial, Anti-Colonial, and Postcolonial Anglophone Literary Texts

Marios Vasiliou

Department of English Studies

May 2014

Abstract

The present thesis explores the divergent meanings of homecoming and cosmopolitanism for Anglophone literary narratives that write Cyprus in three distinct periods: the colonial, the anti-colonial and nationalist, and the postcolonial. While all three periods manifest a plurality of Anglophone narratives that write the island and inscribe it with an identity which reflects their ideological intentions, they also exemplify significant differences regarding the meanings invested on the above themes. In other words, reaching a 'homecoming' or finding a cultural arrival in the Anglophone narratives that write Cyprus often passes through the idiom of cosmopolitanism, but the latter manifests different meanings at different historical periods in the literary history of the island. While the first colonial narratives (which contribute to a literary colonial cosmopolitanism on the island) waver between domesticating and vilifying depictions of the island to the extent that only the first ones imbibe some form of 'homecoming' to the island, anti-colonial texts uniformly envisage 'home' along nationalist strictures and exude a sense of homecoming in their glorification of the nation and its nostalgia for ethnic homogeneity. In contrast to both, the Anglophone postcolonial texts that I deal with envisage 'home' across ethnic lines and imbibe an idiom of cosmopolitanism of the utopian and heterotopian kinds that is unlike any former cosmopolitan visions that have been observed before in the island's literary topographies. Cultural arrival, for these latter texts, is envisaged in rapprochement and cross-cultural friendship and is often deferred since the notions of home, homecoming, and community are often deemed to be implicated in, and traversed by, disruption and dislocation. The first part of the thesis (Chapters 1& 2) focuses on colonial narratives: while Chapter 1 explores the initial role of English on the island through archival material and its impact on literary modernity, chapter 2 looks at travel narratives by women, and argues that despite their domesticating aesthetic that promises a 'homecoming' to the island, they are actually not 'at home' in their own genre of the 'feminine picturesque' which affords them only aesthetic descriptions. Chapters 3 and 4 address the tense ambience of the 1950s and 1960s when Cyprus emerged as an independent nation-state: whereas Chapter 3 portrays how the literary friendship of Durrell and Seferis, and their alleged cosmopolitanism, collapsed under the weight of colonialist and nationalist alliances, chapter 4 looks at attempts to write back to the empire through the anti-colonial texts of Montis' *Closed*

Doors and Roufos' *The Age of Bronze,* which imbibe a nostalgia for a halcyon Hellenic past. In contrast to the nationalist nostalgia of these texts, the chapter examines the nostalgia for a cosmopolitan community that never came to fruition through the post-nationalist text of Baybars' *Plucked in a Far-Off Land*. The departure of the British colonial administration in the early 1960s signals also the silence of English in the literary sphere of the island. Yet, while English failed to make an impression on the island's cultural sphere during the early years of the new postcolonial state, recently, it re-emerged as a literary language and has grown to such an extent that it warrants attention in its own right. In the latter part of my thesis, I attempt to explore the literary identity of this recent Anglophone corpus of literature in the debates between nationalism, colonialism, and cosmopolitanism. My exploration will foreground the 'minor character' of these writers. Using a major language to express their affective relationship to the island, these Cypriot writers are caught between their desire to deterritorialize both the major language they use and the dominant local paradigms. Chapter 5 explores the ways that these writers revisit the past and invite effaced voices from the past into their narratives, and Chapter 6 examines the gender displacements brought about by deterritorializations that aim at re-envisioning community beyond the patriarchal nationalist paradigms that continue to dominate on the island. The writers I discuss are Alev Adil, Miranda Hoplaros, Andriana Ierodiaconou, Aydin Mehmet Ali, Nora Nadjarian, Lysandros Pitharas, and Stephanos Stephanides.

Περίληψη

Η παρούσα διατριβή εξερευνεί τους τρόπους με τους οποίους Αγγλόφωνα λογοτεχνικά κείμενα από τρεις διαφορετικές περιόδους, την Αποικιακή, την Αντιαποικιακή, και την πρόσφατη Μετααποικιακή, πραγματεύονται τις έννοιες του 'νόστου' και του 'κοσμοπολιτισμού'. Παρόλο που και οι τρεις περίοδοι περιέχουν μια πολυφωνία κειμένων που τοπογραφούν το νησί με ταυτότητες που αντικατοπτρίζουν τους διαφορετικούς ιδεολογικούς τους σκοπούς, οι περίοδοι αυτές παρουσιάζουν ταυτόχρονα σημαντικές διαφορές στην πραγμάτευση τους με τις έννοιες του 'νόστου' και του 'κοσμοπολιτισμού'. Επεξηγηματικά, στα Αγγλόφωνα αυτά κείμενα, η ιδέα του 'νόστου' ή της πολιτισμικής πραγμάτωσης συχνά συνδέεται με το θέμα του 'κοσμοπολιτισμού', το οποίο όμως παρουσιάζει διαφορετικές ερμηνείες στις διάφορες περιόδους της λογοτεχνικής ιστορίας του νησιού. Ενώ οι πρώτες αποικιακές αφηγήσεις (που έχουν τη δική τους συμβολή στη δημιουργία ενός λογοτεχνικού αποικιακού κοσμοπολιτισμού) αμφιταλαντεύονται μεταξύ απεικονίσεων που σκοπεύουν στην εξοικείωση ή στη δυσφήμηση του νησιού (στο βαθμό που μόνο οι πρώτες αναδύουν την αίσθηση του 'νόστου' στο νησί) τα αντιαποικιακά κείμενα ομοιόμορφα οραματίζονται τον πολιτισμικό νόστο μέσα από εθνικιστικές στενώσεις και αποπνέουν μια αίσθηση νοσταλγίας μέσα από την εξύμνηση του έθνους και την εξιδανίκευση της εθνικής ομοιογένειας. Σε αντίθεση με τα παραπάνω, τα πρόσφατα αγγλόφωνα μετααποικιακά κείμενα τα οποία συζητάω (εμφανίζονται περίπου κατά τη διάρκεια της τελευταίας εικοσαετίας) οραματίζονται την 'κοινότητα' και το 'οικείο' μέσα από την εθνική ετερογένεια και αποπνέουν ένα ιδίωμα του 'κοσμοπολιτισμού' που έχει ουτοπικό ή/και ετεροτοπικό χαρακτήρα και που δεν μοιάζει με κανένα προηγούμενο είδος κοσμοπολιτισμού που έχει παρατηρηθεί στο παρελθόν στις λογοτεχνικές τοπογραφίες του νησιού. Η πολιτισμική πραγμάτωση γι' αυτά τα κείμενα εστιάζεται στην επαναπροσέγγιση και στη διαπολιτισμική φιλία και συχνά παρουσιάζεται ως μία αναβαλλόμενη και ανεκπλήρωτη διαδικασία, δεδομένου ότι οι έννοιες του 'οικείου', του 'νόστου', και της 'κοινότητας' θεωρούνται συχνά ότι είναι αλληλένδετες με την εξορία, τον εκτοπισμό, και την καθημερινή δυσλειτουργία. Το πρώτο μέρος της διατριβής (Κεφάλαια 1ο&2ο) εστιάζεται σε αποικιακά κείμενα. Συγκεκριμένα, ενώ το 1ο κεφάλαιο εξερευνεί την αρχική δράση και επίδραση της αγγλικής λογοτεχνίας στο νησί και τη συνεισφορά της στη λογοτεχνική νεωτερικότητα μέσω μελέτης των

αρχείων του αγγλόφωνου Τύπου, το 2ο κεφάλαιο καταπιάνεται με τα ταξιδιωτικά αφηγήματα από γυναίκες και επιχειρεί να αποδείξει ότι παρόλο που το λογοτεχνικό είδος του Γραφικού (Picturesque) (και των μεθόδων εξημέρωσης και εξοικείωσης του διαφορετικού που δύνανται μέσω αυτού) δίνει την εντύπωση ότι οι γυναίκες συγγραφείς βρίσκουν την πολιτισμική πραγμάτωση, τα αφηγήματα τους αναδείχνουν επίσης και τον εγκλωβισμό αυτών των συγγραφέων μέσα στον αντρικό αποικιακό λόγο τον οποίο και προσπαθούν να αναπαράγουν. Το 3ο και 4ο κεφάλαιο καταπιάνονται με την τεταμένη ατμόσφαιρα της αντιαποικιακής περιόδου: ενώ το 3ο κεφάλαιο ερμηνεύει την κατάρρευση της λογοτεχνικής φιλίας των Σεφέρη και Durrell, όπως και του υποτιθέμενου κοσμοπολιτισμού τους, ως μετωνυμία της ασυμβατότητας των εθνικών τους επιδιώξεων, το 4ο κεφάλαιο εξερευνεί τα αντιαποικιακά κείμενα των Κώστα Μόντη «Κλειστές Πόρτες» και Ρόδη Ρούφου, «Η Εποχή του Χαλκού» που απαντούν στα «Πικρολέμονα» του Durrell, και που αποπνέουν μια νοσταλγία για ένα ένδοξο Ελληνικό παρελθόν. Σε αντίθεση με την εθνικιστική νοσταλγία των πιο πάνω αφηγημάτων, το κεφάλαιο επίσης εξετάζει το μετά-εθνικιστικό κείμενο του Taner Baybars *Plucked in a Far-Off Land* το οποίο αποπνέει μια νοσταλγία για μια κοσμοπολίτικη κοινότητα που δεν ευδοκίμησε ποτέ. Η αποχώρηση της Αγγλικής διακυβέρνησης στις αρχές του 1960 σήμανε επίσης και τη σιγή της Αγγλικής ως λογοτεχνική γλώσσα στο νησί. Ωστόσο, παρόλο που η Αγγλική ως λογοτεχνική γλώσσα απέτυχε να εδραιωθεί στο νησί κατά τα πρώτα χρόνια μετά την ανεξαρτησία, την τελευταία εικοσαετία υπάρχουν δείγματα μιας δυναμικής επανεμφάνισης της Αγγλικής στα λογοτεχνικά δρώμενα του νησιού. Το τελευταίο μέρος της διατριβής μου καταπιάνεται με τους κύριους εκπροσώπους αυτής της Αγγλόφωνης λογοτεχνίας και αναλύει τις ιδεολογικές, αισθητικές, και πολιτικές αναζητήσεις αυτής της λογοτεχνίας μέσα από το θεωρητικό πρίσμα της «Ελάσσονας Λογοτεχνίας» των Φελίξ Γκουατταρί και Ζιλ Ντελέζ. Οι Κύπριοι συγγραφείς που χρησιμοποιούν την Αγγλική ως λογοτεχνική τους γλώσσα εκφράζουν στα κείμενα τους την διάσπαση, τον τεμαχισμό, και την δυσλειτουργία που προκύπτουν από την επισφαλή και απροσάρμοστη θέση τους στα περιθώρια των εγκαθιδρυμένων λογοτεχνικών κατηγοριών, με τέτοιους τρόπους που μπορούν να ερμηνευθούν ως κείμενα «Ελάσσονης Λογοτεχνίας». Ενώ το 5ο κεφάλαιο εξερευνεί τους τρόπους που τα κείμενα αυτά «επαναπροσεγγίζουν» το παρελθόν μέσω μιας φιλοξενίας στις σβησμένες φωνές του παρελθόντος, το 6ο κεφάλαιο εστιάζεται σε ανατροπές φύλου

που αποσκοπούν στον οραματισμό μιας κοινότητας πέρα από πατριαρχικά εθνικιστικά πρότυπα. Το τελευταίο αυτό μέρος εστιάζεται στη λογοτεχνικά κείμενα των Alev Adil, Μιράντας Χόπλαρος, Αντριάνας Ιεροδιακόνου, Aydin Mehmet Ali, Nora Nadjarian, Λύσανδρου Πιθάρα, και Στέφανου Στεφανίδη.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the members of the Department of English Studies at the University of Cyprus for their support throughout the duration of this project. I am grateful for the scholarship that the Department granted me during the academic year of 2012-2013 as well as for the numerous stipends that were given to me by the Department during these last four years. Without this financial support, I would not have been able to complete the project. I would also like to thank my advisor, Stephanos Stephanides, not only for his support but also for his faith both in me and in this project. I also wish to express my appreciation to the other internal members of my examination committee, Dr. Antonis Balasopoulos, Dr. Zelia Gregoriou, Dr. Stella Achilleos, for their guidance and support. My appreciation also goes to the external member of my committee, Professor Robert J.C. Young, for his insightful comments and suggested revisions. Special acknowledgement is due to Dr. Stavros Karayanni, for his readiness to respond to any questions and read parts of the thesis, and Dr. Nicos Peristianis for always willing to help find solutions to issues of both practical as well as academic nature. Moreover, I thank the members of staff at the Department of English Studies, Thekla Constantinou and Andrie Kontozi, for their ongoing assistance with all sorts of administrative issues that were essential for the completion of this project. I have also been grateful to engage in dialogue with various people who have helped me in different ways in shaping the arguments of this thesis. These include: Lefteris Papaleontiou, Tziovanis Georgakis, Iacovos Hadjipieris, Andreas Sophocleous, Niyazi Kizilyürek**,** Effie Lambrou, Athena Constantinou, Ellie Hadjidemetriou, Maria Margaroni, Angelos Constantinou, Alexander McCowan, Aydin Mehmet Ali, Nora Nadjarian, Miranda Hoplaros, Alev Adil, Andriana Ierodiaconou, Frank Chouraqui, Andreas Athanasiades, Louiza Papaloizou, Thierry Petitpas, Thierry Tremblay, Alex Crighton, and Antonia Perikou.

Finally, but most importantly, I would like to thank my family for always reminding me where home is despite my desire to cast it in doubt: my parents for their unwavering financial and emotional support; my wife, Victoria, and two daughters, Calypso and Clementine, for enduring financial deprivation as well as scarcity of quality time as a family; my twin brother for always lending me an ear, and for being a living example of how life can be light and humorous. While I dedicate this thesis to all of them I do not expect them to want to read it.

Table of Contents

Introduction

> The search for location in which the self is 'at home' is one of the primary projects of twentieth-century fiction in English…. It is in this context that I read all fiction in terms of homesickness. (George 3)

Literary critic Vangelis Calotychos rightly argues that "whenever Cyprus, or this region, is evoked, the space for discussion is always (pre)occupied and policed by those who claim no political or ideological agenda" ("(Pre)Occupied Space: Hyphens, Apostrophes and over-Sites in the Literary Imagining of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey" 49). The cultural sphere of the island, in the literary space, in particular, has been the battleground for contestations between various discourses that have endeavored to serve their own specific ideological and political agendas. While literature is still understood through the seemingly natural yet always forced alignment between language and national culture, such definitions of literary categories and their processes of construction "are always controversial and speculative, particularly in multilingual, multicultural countries which, according to the dictates of nationalism, are supposed to be homogeneous" (Yashin "Three Generations, Three Identities, Three 'Patriae' within Twentieth-Century Cypriot Poetry" 223). Cyprus is precisely such a multilingual and multicultural place, traversed by various languages and cultures that have left their particular imprint on the island and on its literary topographies. The island's literary topographies manifest differences during the various signposts of the island's history such as the colonial, the anti-colonial, and the postcolonial periods. Hence, my thesis aims to explore how colonial, anti-colonial, and postcolonial Anglophone literary texts write Cyprus with a specific focus on the themes of 'homecoming' and 'cosmopolitanism'. Evidently, both homecoming and cosmopolitanism are invested with different meanings during the different phases of the island's literary history. With regards to 'homecoming', for instance, the three periods reveal distinct tropes of writing the island as 'home' and of rendering it conducive to processes of 'homecoming'. Specifically, colonial texts manifest the conflicting discourses regarding the island's prospects for the British Empire and entail, on the one hand, both domesticating and exoticising tropes, and, on the other, a tendency to discard it as useless and unhomely. Thus, while some texts render the island conducive to processes of homecoming for the British subject during this period of early colonialism, others frustrate such processes. Conversely, for anti-colonial texts, the project of fighting colonialism

becomes synonymous with a desire to be 'at home' in the emerging independent state, and, thus, homecoming becomes subsumed within the nationalist agenda and resonates with a nostalgia for ethnic purity and homogeneity. However, in an ethnically heterogeneous island, which is composed of two major ethnic communities, the Greek-Cypriot and the Turkish-Cypriot, such nostalgia for ethnic homogeneity that provided the emotional impetus for the anti-colonial war meant that the emerging independent state could not have provided a homecoming for all. Indeed, the violent aftermath of the independence of the island testifies to the mutually hostile visions of 'home' that characterized the two incompatible nationalisms that were cultivated by the two major communities on the island. Finally, for recent Anglophone postcolonial texts the writing of Cyprus is associated with a re-imagining of community along ethnic lines and against sexual heteronormativity. Homecoming for these texts involves rapprochement and reconciliation and often becomes a deferred process that can be read metonymically as a suspicion towards homely structures.

Although my thesis covers all three of the above periods, my main focus is on the last one, the postcolonial, and more specifically, on the Anglophone literary texts by Cypriots that appeared in approximately the last twenty years. Thus, my usage of the 'postcolonial' in this thesis is one that is not synonymous to 'post-independence', since I am referring to a particular time of the post-independence, namely the last twenty years. Moreover, I am referring to a particular literary corpus that is written in English and is characterized by a preoccupation with issues of power, ethnicity, dislocation, and exile. This literary corpus comes into a cultural space that is mostly dominated by nationalist official discourses, which marginalize other discourses that question the nationalist nostalgia for ethnic purity and sexual heteronormativity. Indeed, most of the literature that is written by contemporary Cypriots in English comes into this heated cultural front as a discourse that endeavors to re-imagine community across ethnic lines and against heteronormal sexual boundaries, imbibing in the process a cosmopolitan orientation. The idiom of cosmopolitanism was also observed in relation to Anglophone literary practices during the colonial period, and was the alleged literary perspective of Lawrence Durrell during the nationalist era. Yet, this cosmopolitan legacy that English left on the island was swathed in a colonial rhetoric, and was, thus, too problematic for the postcolonial Cypriot to inherit as it was. Therefore, some of the recent postcolonial Cypriots who come to seek their home in English do so with a sense of unease, and have to rework the language to make it conducive to their projects of re-envisioning community beyond the local

paradigms, and against the tradition of English on the island since the latter is swathed in a colonial rhetoric. It is precisely in this straddling position of unease that Cypriots who write in English reach their highest proximity to Deleuze and Guattari's concept of 'minor' literature. Such literary practices entail the deterritorialization, on the one hand, of the local paradigms, and, on the other, the resistance to the "exoticist or domesticating impulses of a metropolitan audience" (Laouyene 3) through the estranging of the English language. Moreover, due to this straddling position between the resistance to the local dominant paradigms and the discomfiture with the English literary tradition, some of the contemporary Cypriot Anglophone literature seeks 'home' in an idiom of a cosmopolitanism that is different to other forms of cosmopolitanism that existed on the island. This renewed cosmopolitan idiom is either of the heterotopian or the utopian kind as I will be arguing in the last two chapters.

The Colonial Period

While the main focus of the thesis is the contemporary literary engagements of Cypriots in English, the thesis begins with British literary narratives from the beginning of colonialism on the island. The advent of British colonialism coincides with the arrival of the first printing press on the island and British colonialism becomes a catalyst for literary modernity on the island (Stephanides and Hadjiodysseos 1568). As such, the development of self-apprehension for the Greek-Cypriots, through Greek nationalism initially, and, for the Turkish-Cypriots, through Turkish nationalism later on and as a reaction to Greek nationalism (Kizilyurek 317), take place in a cultural sphere where English is also present and competes with these discourses for space. Chapter 1 argues that this initial stage of literary modernity saw the flourishing of a literary culture in Greek through numerous newspapers and literary magazines, something that was followed later on by the development of a literary culture in Turkish. English, in this initial phase of literary modernity, brought about a colonial cosmopolitan spirit through its role both as a colonial cosmopolitan language and as a language of translation. The literary space of Cyprus becomes from the outset of literary modernity a contesting space and is inscribed by a multiplicity of voices that promulgate nationalist, colonial cosmopolitan, as well as vernacular discourses. Chapter 1 explores the literary space at this initial phase of literary modernity with a focus on the colonial Anglophone literary narratives as they appear in the Anglophone press. While English becomes a catalyst for the advent of a literary activity

that is rich and multicultural, and brings into Greek, mainly, voices from all over the world through translation, the overwhelming majority of literary engagements of the Anglophone press reiterate a staunch colonial rhetoric. Alongside these voices, though, we also find examples of recalcitrant voices that are not 'at home' in the male colonial rhetoric and which contribute to a dislocation and disorientation of the concept of home in English.

Specifically, some of the first British depictions of the island are in favor of the new acquisition and exude a nostalgia for an arcadia that is not always fulfilled and leaves their authors with a disappointment. These depictions entail both domesticating and exoticizing tropes and enable their authors—as well as the British subject—to experience a 'homecoming' to the island. However, the decision to acquire Cyprus was not endorsed by everyone in Britain and a lot of the first depictions of the island set out to illustrate the unhomely aspects of the island for the British subject. The general feeling in these depictions is one where the British subject is made to feel 'not at home' on the island in such a way that Britain emerges as the unmistaken home in contradistinction to the island. I argue that throughout this period there is a pervasive anxiety caused by two conflicting desires: on the one hand, by the desire to maintain the distinction between Britain as 'home' and Cyprus as different from home, and, on the other, the desire to domesticate the new colony and render it conducive to processes of 'homecoming'. In this initial phase of literary activity in English on the island the latter becomes a contesting terrain between patriarchal colonialist discourses, nationalist visions, as well as cosmopolitan, and non-conformist voices. English, in other words, inscribes the island with a variety of voices, contributing to this patchwork of contesting and colluding discourses, while also, as a language of empire, is in itself dislocated by these contestations and collusions. Whether wishing to vilify the new colony and depict it as unhomely in contradistinction to Britain as home, or to praise it and domesticate it, these discourses imbibe an anxiety caused by the inevitability of cross-cultural contact. In other words, even for those texts where a feeling of 'homecoming' to the island is noticeable, there is also a lurking anxiety caused by the presence of the locals and the inevitability of cross-cultural contact. Indeed, the desire for domestication of the new colony is not devoid of another layer of anxiety caused by the fear of too much proximity, especially, when the voice of the female traveler (Chapter 2) enters the male homosocial world and wishes to portray herself as a free subject in contradistinction to the local women. As I argue in this chapter, these late 19th and early 20th century travel narratives by British women oscillate between a desire to inscribe the Cypriot 'topos' with a female presence through the contours prescribed by the

allotted genre of the "feminine picturesque" and a desire to break away from such delimiting contours. These oscillations, as I maintain, reveal that these women are not 'at home' in their own allotted discourse. However, their discomfiture with their allotted discourse is not concomitant to an outright and open challenge of the main tenets of the male colonial rhetoric. In other words, the cultural arrival envisioned by these women through their role as amateur ethnographers in the new colony is constantly contained by the delimiting contours of their genre, which forces them to remain within aesthetic descriptions and not to embark on socio-political commentaries. Such delimiting contours, though, are difficult to sustain, since their strict observance becomes a mode of self-imprisonment for the female travelers.

Rising Nationalism and Anti-Colonialism

The itinerary of the English language on the island continues until the 1950s, where the literary presence of Lawrence Durrell figures prominently. Durrell's friendship to another literary colossus, namely the Nobel laureate George Seferis, and the two writers' endeavors to appropriate the island as a literary homeland are the main themes of the 3rd chapter. Whereas Durrell flaunted his philhellenism while on the island, and endeavored to counter the rising nationalisms with a colonial cosmopolitanism through his role as a Director of Information Services, Seferis appropriated the island as his redeeming homeland, a space where he could discover an authentic center of Hellenism for his cosmopolitan aesthetic. The eventual cooling of their friendship is, as I argue, a meaningful metaphor for the failure of English to take root on the island as well as a window into a better understanding of the appropriation of the Seferian model by the Greek-Cypriots as the defining model of their cultural self-definition. The second part of the thesis (Chapters 3 and 4) explores the reconfigurations of 'home' in the era of rising nationalism which is marked by the anti-colonial war of 1955-1959. While colonialism started being attacked from colonized people, there were anti-colonial voices from within the metropolises also, who extended a cross-cultural friendship to the colonized people. The arrival of Lawrence Durrell to the island in the 1950s and his reputation of being a philhellene convinced him, as well as many metropolitan readers, that his book *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus* is such a gesture of friendship to the island and its people. While the book continues to be received as mandatory reading for the expatriate British or the interested tourist of the island because of its alleged objectivity and friendliness towards

the island and its people, my reading of his book uses the trope of friendship to cast doubt on Durrell's alleged love for the island and its people. Despite his desire to cast his narrative in a friendly spirit, away from the "smaller contempts" (Durrell ix) of politics, Durrell ends up writing a conspicuously 'political' book, which reveals also his anxiety and fear that when one befriends power, as he did by accepting a position in the colonial government, one risks his friendships. Durrell did indeed envision his home in Cyprus, and his book imbibes a sense of 'homecoming' to the island, but, alas, his envisioned 'home' was a colonial one—despite his supposed cosmopolitanism—and did not allow his alleged Cypriot friends to feel 'at home' in it. His hasty departure from the island is a testament to the fact that Cyprus became unhomely for him. Moreover, his departure may be read as a metonymy of the departure of English as a literary language from the island, and of the failure of the phony cosmopolitan idiom that Durrell's discourse propagated.

Nationalism and its discourses, in their repudiation of colonialism, emerge as the new promise of 'home' and for 'homecoming' for the colonized subject. Chapter 4 analyzes two anti-colonial narratives, *Closed Doors* and *Age of Bronze,* written by Costas Montis in Greek and by Rodis Roufos in English respectively, which converge in their common political objective to contest the essentialist formulations of colonial discourse on Cypriot identity, and specifically of Durrell's *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus*. These two texts express a nostalgia for a glorious Hellenic past that was obfuscated by colonialism, and, as such, constitute discursive attempts at re-inscribing Hellenism in Cyprus and at writing back to the empire. Home in these texts is delineated along the lines of a nationalist patriarchal vision. Subsequently, I draw on another narrative, *Plucked in a Far-off Land* that was written a decade later by the diaspora writer Taner Baybars. Baybars' narrative conveys another vision of home and community, one which brings the remembering of the past in crisis. In my discussion of these texts I employ the concept of nostalgia since all three narratives are nostalgic in remembering the past. However, whilst the first two are 'at home' in nationalist discourse and its nostalgia for a glorious past and remember the past in an unproblematic fashion, the third one employs a fallible memory to cast doubt on the process of remembering and homecoming and thus contests such unproblematic processes. Having a less overt political agenda, Baybars' narrative is not devoid of its own politics and expresses a nostalgia for a multi-cultural community that failed to take root on the island.

Postcolonial Period

The third part of the thesis (Chapters 5 and 6) explores the ways in which the emerging corpus of literature in English by Cypriots engages with the concepts of homecoming and cosmopolitanism. My argument in these two chapters is that Cypriot literature written in English is not 'at home' in the established literary circuits locally and abroad as such circuits propagate the literary aesthetics of nationalism and patriarchy. I argue that the position of Cypriot Anglophone literature at the crossroads of national markers of literary circulation enabled it to engage in critiques of dominant discourses under less scrutiny from the dominant institutions. Having no option but to write in English, the writers I discuss in these chapters are not 'at home' in the legacy of English on the island and work towards its alteration so that they can use it and express their affective relationship to the island. While Chapter 5 engages with the repressed stories of the past that certain narratives try to resurrect by contesting literary tropes of historiography and canonized fiction, in an endeavor to revive and appropriate the tarnished and problematic legacy of cosmopolitanism of English, Chapter 6 addresses gender disruptions that are performed by narratives in English that do not feel 'at home' in the patriarchal dominant discourses of nationalism that still prevail on the island. Reinstating in the pages of history the marginalized people, be it colonized, poor, subaltern, women, has been one of the major projects of postcolonial discourse, Marxism, feminism, and other discourses that are committed against cultural hegemony. However, this project has led a lot of scholars to the realization that such reinstatement was simply not enough because it reproduced and reinforced certain biases that were deeply entrenched against such marginalized people (Scott 3). Postcolonial discourse and feminism are still implicated in this predicament. As Scott argues, it is only by questioning the primacy of what appears to be natural (i.e. man or woman) that we start perceiving how deeply entrenched some concepts are (3-4). The texts that I discuss in these two chapters engage in such a project of reinstating ignored or marginal voices in their narratives but not all go as far as to probe the primacy of the concepts they are dealing with. Be that as it may, they are all in a position of discomfiture with the established conventional discourses that dominate the cultural terrain in Cyprus, and engage in differently accentuated critiques of dominant norms and discourses. Furthermore, contemporary Cypriot literature is not 'at home' in the problematic legacy that English literature left on the island even when it was claiming the cosmopolitan idiom. In other words, the Cypriot Anglophone literature that I discuss in this thesis is in tension

both with the local paradigms and with the major language from which it springs. Therefore, in the case of some contemporary Cypriot Anglophone writers, the issue of language is associated with a sense of unease since these writers are not 'at home' in using the colonial language as it is impregnated with a colonial baggage, yet they need it, because it is either their inevitable or chosen medium for expressing their affective relationship to their place, and, thus, for "mediat[ing] their own cultures" (Young "World Literature and Postcolonialism" 220). It is precisely in this straddling position of unease that Cypriots who write in English reach their highest proximity to Deleuze and Guattari's concept of 'minor' literature. Indeed, an aspect of Deleuze and Guattari's concept of 'minor' literature is the latter's discomfiture with national categories of literary circulation. Such discomfiture with national categories is certainly evident in contemporary Cypriot Anglophone literature, which endeavors to imagine community in ways that contest national markers. Evidently, I am not arguing that there is no 'minor' literature in Greek or Turkish that is produced in Cyprus; rather, I am arguing that the overwhelming majority of literary production on the island is actually colluding with the established symbolic orders of literary circulation by aspiring to fit into the larger categories of metropolitan Greek and Turkish literatures. In contrast to this majority, though, there are some literary figures from all literary communities of the island, who are forming cross-linguistic literary friendships, and share a vision of community beyond nationalist strictures. Unlike the failure of the literary friendship between Durrell and Seferis due to the incompatibility of their literary and political projects, the re-emergence of English in the last twenty years is a harbinger of a different idiom, one that perforates borders and reaches out for relationships. But, how does a literature become 'minor', and how does Cypriot Anglophone literature come to proximity to these conditions of being 'minor'?

Deleuze and Guattari tell us that "a minor literature does not come from a minor language; it is rather that which a minority constructs within a major language" (16). Such a position has three main characteristics as Deleuze and Guattari argue: "the deterritorialization of language, the connection of the individual to a political immediacy, and the collective assemblage of enunciation" (18). Speaking specifically about Kafka, Deleuze and Guattari write: "To hate all languages of masters…. What interests him even more is the possibility of making of his own language—assuming that it is unique, that it is a major language or has been—a minor utilization. To be a sort of stranger *within* his own language" (26). The Cypriots who write in English and whose works are discussed in this paper are implicated in similar projects. On the one hand, they seek to establish their home

in English, while, on the other, they endeavor to emphasize their dislocated identity by estranging English through 'minor' utilizations. Moreover, through English, albeit of a 'minor' nature, these writers envisage 'homecoming' in the form of a place where community is formed beyond the strictures of nationalism and patriarchy that have become hegemonic on the island, and imbibe an alternative engagement with the 'political' in the process. Such envisioning of community implicates nostalgia, or the longing for 'homecoming' with the process of seeking home. It is in this direction that I would like to move on in an endeavor to elucidate some of the concepts that are integral to this thesis: home, homecoming, cosmopolitanism.

Home and Homecoming

Literatures, like people, also travel and seek to make themselves 'at home'. Nevertheless, colonialism and its processes have profoundly altered the concept of home, both for the colonizer and for the colonized. Moreover, due to the colonial encounter and the linguistic exchanges that it engendered, the concept of 'home,' has "been re-rooted and re-routed in fiction in English" (George 1). Similarly, the notions of home-country, homecoming, home-sickness have all been reconfigured in the terrain of fiction in English, and have in themselves brought about a reconfiguration of English and of its literary categories. The shift in literary theory from English to englishes or from 'English Literature' to 'literatures in English' is an example of such a reconfiguration (George 1). My thesis simulates this movement by opening its examination of the representation of home to include both colonial material as well as material written in the postcolonial era by subjects who come to inhabit English, and, thus, to alter it in trying to make their 'homes' in it. A thesis starting with material written by British authors and moving to literary works written in English by Cypriots, apart from aiming to foreground the various layers of dislocation that English engendered but to which has also been subjected in Cyprus, also intends to simulate the shift from English literature to literatures in English. Moreover, it aims not only to foreground the reconfiguration of our sense of home under 'literatures in English' but also to contribute to the ongoing dialogue of the discursive salience of 'home', and of the significance of writing as a form of 'homecoming'.

Writing Cyprus in English for the colonizer during the colonial period meant the domestication of the island in such a way that the latter became homely and familiar territory to the colonizing subject, and thus conducive to visitations from the metropolis.

However, as we will see, during this period there were conflicting discourses in English, since not everyone in the metropolis deemed the acquisition of the island as beneficial to the Empire. Moreover, the female authors who inscribed the island in English during this period were not 'at home' in the male colonialist discourse of Empire and tried to carve some space which would foreground their own particularities. During the anti-colonial period, writing in English, and specifically, Durrell's famous book *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus,* exemplifies a more complex character since it attempts to disguise its colonial rhetoric behind an alleged cross-cultural friendship. Durrell's attempt to domesticate the rising nationalism (especially the Greek nationalism) by employing the theme of eternal Anglo-Hellenic friendship, and, thus, render the island conducive to processes of 'homecoming' fails as we will see. Indeed, Durrell might have been 'at home' in his English writing of Cyprus and in his effort to graft an identity on the island, but his idiom was not homely for the Cypriots. Conversely, for the postcolonial subject, and for the Cypriots discussed in this thesis, in particular, writing in English is an ongoing process of unfulfilled homecoming, rather than a completed itinerary of cultural arrival, since the category of English literature is coterminous with a colonial rhetoric and, thus, in need of adaptation for the specific usages intended. Seeking home in English literature, in other words, is a process that is not devoid of a sense of unhomely unease for the postcolonial subject, and thus English is reworked and its ideological presuppositions are contested. Moreover, the concept of 'home' as a snug abode comes under scrutiny and demands problematization since it is implicated with politics of inclusion and exclusion.

Although home is an elusive concept that renders any attempt at definition synonymous to delimitation, I would like to establish that, in line with Rosemary Marangoly George, I treat the concept of 'home' as one that is based on the establishment of difference, and, one that, "along with gender/sexuality, race, and class, acts as an ideological determinant of the subject" (2). Homes, in most conventional representations, signify places of comfort, security, conviviality, and protection. If 'home' is a determinant of the self, the feeling of being 'at home', then, is identified with such cozy and snug feelings. In contrast, the feeling of being 'not at home' is one that denies the self such identification. The feeling of the self of being 'at home', or the 'homely', is a transient feeling that is always predicated on the exclusion or suppression of the 'other'. Rosemary Marangoly George maintains that, "Imagining a home is as political an act as imagining a nation. Establishing either is a display of hegemonic power" (6). In effect, imagining home is inextricably related to the processes of inclusion and exclusion, and the

establishment of such an imagining entails some form of violence against those others that are not included in it. It is the suppression of these forms of 'otherness' in the endeavor of the self to be 'at home' that Freud identifies with the uncanny. Speaking specifically about the relationship between the *unheimlich* (unfamiliar, foreign, strange) and *heimisch* (homely, familiar), he finds that the "uncanny is in reality nothing new or alien, but something which is familiar and old-established in the mind and which has become alienated from it through the process of repression" (Freud 241). In other words, the *unheimlich* is what was once *heimisch* or homelike and familiar, and has turned into something unhomely through repression. The unfamiliar, uncanny, or unhomely, is intimately related to some form of anxiety. As Dufourmantelle asserts in her dialogue with Derrida, "When we enter an unknown place, the emotion experienced is almost that of an indefinable anxiety" (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 26). The proximity between the homely and the unhomely, or rather, the latter's residence in the former, and its manifestation as a repressed site, is profoundly significant for discussions of 'otherness'. Indeed, if the unhomely is the repressed site which is inextricably related to the homely, then the self as it is identified with the homely is always present *with* its repressed other. The other's unexpected manifestation is what often causes this uncanny or unhomely feeling as Freud argues (Freud 245), and is the source of an unmistakable anxiety. The ghostly apparition of the repressed site, or the momentary anxiety caused by the unhomely feeling is one of tremendous freedom as Dufourmantelle avows since it is the fugacious moment before the unfamiliar or unhomely is mastered and turned into a homely site. She underlines that, "Thought is in essence a force of mastery. It is continually bringing the unknown back to the known, breaking up its mystery to possess it, shed light on it. Name it" (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 28). Some of the contemporary texts of Cypriot Anglophone Literature attempt to do precisely that, namely, to estrange the homely ambience of their narratives and instill an unhomely presence in it in order to question the homeliness of home and expose its exclusionary politics and processes.

Indeed, snug connotations of home as a site of comfort, familiarity, and safety render themselves easily appropriable to conservative discourses of patriarchal nationalism and colonialism. Thus, the resurrection of the suppressed or excluded part of the self or of various forms of otherness is impregnated with significance. In other words, the achievement of the ostensive coziness and conviviality is always predicated on the pernicious exclusion of an(other), which acts as a thorny reminder that when homecoming is fulfilled it is either an illusory or partial process. Therefore, various kinds of

envisioning of 'home' have been mobilized to foreground radical and revolutionary projects by exposing home's exclusionary processes, rendering the term much more ambiguous than its traditional connotations make it appear. By highlighting the exclusionary politics of home and its non-neutrality, discourses such as some of those aligned with feminism and postcolonial theory have unhinged the concept of home from its traditional moorings. It is in this vein that *all* fiction can be read as homesickness, as the epigraph of the introduction argues, including fiction where the desire of the self for homecoming revolves around issues of race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality etc. which are not explicitly part of nationalist agendas. While endorsing this view, that all fiction is homesickness, I would also like to add, that it is by treating writing (as well as reading) as a process of homecoming, and by examining the extent to which the latter is fulfilled, that we can differentiate between narratives that bring such processes in crisis and others that do not, those that keep the home open and porous and those that shut it firmly and endeavor to insulate it. For, let us not forget that "homes are not neutral places" and that the establishment of home is "a display of hegemonic power" (George 6).

Such processes of homecoming in fiction are certainly impregnated with political agendas, and, thus, necessitate acts of reading that are attendant to the multivalent meanings of such elusive, yet, deeply entrenched, concepts as home. Resisting, for example, the typical metaphor of homes as snug places, allows us to render them open to scrutiny and expose their exclusionary politics. Yet, at the same time, we are reminded that home, as a place of comfort and safety, has been of paramount importance to various persecuted groups, be it because of religion, class, ethnicity, etc. Thus, it is always important to keep in mind the location from where one negotiates home, and from where one reads critically the representation of home in fiction, lest, in our effort to speak on behalf of the marginalized, we end up ignoring and effacing their urgent need to be 'at home'.

The concept of seeking home is inevitably implicated with the concept of nostalgia. Indeed, homecoming (nostos), or, more precisely, in the case of the postcolonial subject writing in English, the impossibility of homecoming, is ineluctably associated with a pain or longing for return back home. Yet, if 'home' is as elusive as suggested above, where is the home that these postcolonial Cypriots who write in English seek to return? Is it in language or in place? This is precisely the locus of the tensions that are attendant to the process of writing for those Cypriots who write in English, namely, in their endeavor to find home in English, and, in their effort to bring another vision of community—one that

goes beyond national, racial, and sexual boundaries (cosmopolitan?)—home. As such, home is implicated with both language and place, or more precisely with displacement, since by bringing home another vision of community through writing, both language and place are altered, or displaced. But displacement, as already noted, is inextricably related with nostalgia. I deal with the concept of nostalgia in detail in Chapter 4, but the concept and its implications are integral to the whole thesis. Instead of treating nostalgia only as it is treated conventionally, that is as a debilitating trope of crippling attachment to the past or as an escapist trope of illusory return, I chose to treat it also as a trope impregnated with possibilities of alternative engagement with the past. Indeed, nostalgia is a negotiation of present and past continuities and discontinuities that rend asunder any notion of home as a fixed abode. As such, it can be seen as a critical trope of engagement with the past but also as a tool for envisioning community in the future. In other words, nostalgia is not only retrospective, but it can also be prospective, since it can revive and mobilize unrealized projects or visions of community. The postcolonial narratives by Cypriots in English that I include in this thesis engage in precisely such a process, namely the revival of an unrealized cosmopolitan community and its re-envisioning in writing.

English in Cyprus has been entangled from the beginning of literary modernity in a network of conflicting discourses such as those of colonialism, nationalism, and cosmopolitanism that reflect different visions of home. While colonial narratives tried to domesticate the unfamiliarity of the new colony and render the island homely for the British subject through a purported cosmopolitan spirit, their complicity with the overall colonial discourse meant that they also contributed to the imagining of a home that was particularly unhomely for the locals. Rejecting such colonial cosmopolitan visions of 'home', nationalist and anti-colonial discourses promised the relocation and restructuring of the local people's sense of 'home'. Nevertheless, not everyone was 'at home' in the patriarchal nationalist imagining of home and its attendant nostalgia for a glorious past. Indeed, the emergent nation-states simulated in many respects the hegemonic structures of colonialism and brought about new forms of exclusion and marginalization. Nationalism's critics tend to invest a great amount of hope in overcoming the hegemonic structures of nationalism in cosmopolitan projects that imagine home across ethnic lines and not along them. Yet, even cosmopolitanism, in most of its manifestations, seems to be implicated with imperialism. The next section discusses the imbrications of cosmopolitanism with imperialism and the implications of these imbrications for cosmopolitan visions of home.

Cosmopolitanism

The new world order (post-cold war) has been one of the most difficult to define in the history of humankind since despite the unprecedented ease of communication within the globe (internet, faster transport, globalized networks of instant communication) the global community so eagerly anticipated (and often celebrated) remains to be seen. In its place, we still witness atrocious violence due to an aggressive imperialism that is often disguised as a moral liberalism or as a response to revived ethno-nationalisms. Yet, the advocates of this new world order have been celebrating its globalizing presence as the advent of a new cosmopolitanism (Douzinas 151). It is thus necessary for this thesis, since it is claiming to read different kinds of cosmopolitanism in the Anglophone writing of Cyprus to make a detour into the fiercely contested terrain of cosmopolitanism so that we better understand the discursive and socio-political struggles over cosmopolitanism's meaning, including its current appropriation by dominant discourses of empire, as well as its classical history and its associations with projects of utopia and heterotopia.

Sam Knowles argues that cosmopolitanism "has become associated with such proliferation of meanings that it can be anything to anyone, a vehicle for articulating the individualities of the critics who profess to its espousal" (2). While implicitly referring to the work of Homi Bhabha and the latter's attempt to marry his elite postcolonial status with the subaltern experience on whose behalf his theory of vernacular cosmopolitanism claims to speak, Knowles does not altogether reject cosmopolitanism. In contrast to 'cosmopolitanism' that has lost any ideological currency because of its generality of meaning, he calls for the necessity to return to the figure of the cosmopolitan which still retains its ideological specificity as "an individual occupying the margins of society, embracing ideas of travel, of crossing borders: the modern day equivalent of Homer's Odysseus, of Swift's Gulliver, of Baudelaire's and Benjamin's *flâneur*" (Knowles 2). While significant in foregrounding the prolific meanings attached to cosmopolitanism to the point that the term has lost much of its specificity, Knowles' argument in favor of the figure of the cosmopolitan seems unconvincing in light of the fact that neither Odysseus, nor Gulliver, nor the *flâneur,* have much in common with today's deracinated, displaced, or forced migrants on whose behalf cosmopolitanism is supposed to work. Moreover, Homi Bhabha and his privileged status as a western academic—to which Knowles refers in

dismissing Bhabha's position to speak on behalf of the subaltern since "his social positioning renders him unable to present an adequate view of cosmopolitanism" (8)—is far more similar to the figures of Odysseys, Gulliver and the *flâneur*, and his marginality to their marginality than to the marginality of the subalterns of the world. In other words, in rejecting Bhabha's concept of vernacular cosmopolitanism on the ground that it does not differentiate between his own privileged academic status and the subaltern status of today's migrants, Knowles juxtaposes the equally privileged figures of Odysseus, Gulliver, and the *flâneur* as a sign of marginality from where visions of cosmopolitanism are to derive ideological sustenance. Be that as it may, I still believe that Knowles' diagnosis that the term has lost its specificity and is thus open to much abuse is important in understanding how the term has come to be part of the ideological agenda of empire.

In the discussion that follows I would like to discuss some of the intellectual endeavors to overcome this predicament and revive some of the critical import of the term. It is in light of this that I read Douzina's insistence that if cosmopolitanism is to retain a promise for radical politics it needs to be utopian since the term has already been made the agenda of the ruling order (148). In a different vein, scholars such as Breckenridge, Pollock, Bhabha, and Chakrabarty endeavor to expand the study of cosmopolitanism beyond western paradigms, and beyond the established practice of studying it in its development from the Stoics to Kant, in such a way that it aims to introduce "new genealogies from the non-Christian Sanskrit world" (Pollock et al. 6). Let us start with the former before moving into the latter so that a broad outline of the debates around cosmopolitanism is provided.

The high hopes and elevated spirits of the anti-colonial wars and their investment in the redemptive powers of the emergent nation-states quickly waned after, as Douzinas rightly argues, sovereignty started coming under attack when the new states assumed an alleged equality with the former colonial powers in international forums such as the United Nations (Douzinas 131). This is a salient point for any discussion on cosmopolitanism since triumphant endorsements of various (uncritical) cosmopolitan projects threaten to annul, to some extent, the crucial legacy of the battles of decolonization. As Mignolo argues with regards to the 'interdependence' theory—a revamped theory from the mandarins of TNCs which was "apparently a good ground for cosmopolitanism" (Mignolo 738) that came to replace dependency theory and its views of international relations as relations of dependency—in the context of Cold War, "Decolonized countries were striving for a nation-state, at the same time that the ideologues of the new world order no

longer believed in them" (738). It might seem paradoxical that it is on behalf of the areas that sought nation-statehood in the most resilient and inspiring manner that the most ardent calls for cosmopolitan projects derive. The paradox, of course, ceases to be a paradox as soon as we look closely at the ideological agenda of these calls for cosmopolitanism. As Timothy Brennan argues, cries for cosmopolitanism derive mostly from the imperial centre and as such they jeopardize anti-colonial struggles and their heritage. As he asserts, "Although the third-worldist sympathies of the 1960s did manage temporarily to tarnish cosmopolitanism's image, the term now arises with the legacies of decolonization as its targets" (4). It is this shiftiness of cosmopolitanism as a concept and as an ideological vision that demands vigilance, since as Douzinas argues, "cosmopolitanism in its different versions starts as a philosophical and moral universalism but it degenerates each time into imperial globalism" (174).

The ideological mission of postcolonial studies and of the area known as postcoloniality is to a large extent the elimination of power asymmetries between an imperial centre (which is becoming spatially elusive in capitalist modernity but which is still associated with geographical nation-states located in the West) and a periphery (whose nation-states continuously realize that their sovereignty is assured if they align themselves with the interests of the imperial centre(s)), and the dependence of the latter on the former. Nevertheless, the increasing conviction that we are moving more towards an imperial cosmopolitanism (where the West benevolently, or violently, exports not only products but also values such as freedom and human rights) rather than towards a critical cosmopolitanism (utopian? Impossible community?), has certainly affected the area known as postcolonial studies and in some cases brought about some vigilance regarding the elusiveness of cosmopolitanism and of the danger of an uncritical celebration of the latter. The eagerly awaited nation-state has not redeemed its emerging citizens, but, instead, it has often reproduced internally the asymmetries that were formerly imposed from without. It is precisely here that we find one of the thorniest difficulties of cosmopolitanism; for, how can cosmopolitanism avoid jeopardizing the legacy of the struggles for decolonization and liberation while engaging in processes or visions of undermining the nation-state? In the midst of atrocious intra-national and international political and economic asymmetries any celebration of cosmopolitanism seems immature, if not naively apolitical.

How can one speak of cosmopolitanism of any kind, in the face of so much violence against the exiled, the immigrants, or the non-citizen? Moreover, how can new visions of cosmopolitanism remain critical and avoid being co-opted by the discourse of

globalization? Also, when one diagnoses a certain cosmopolitan aesthetic in a particular corpus of literature, is this vision that is shared by a number of authors sufficient to actually bring about a change in the social milieu? Critical as these visions might be, in other words, can they actually bring about what their vision literally aims, that is, another politics of the cosmos? Let us clarify here that literature does not provide solutions to social and political problems. Instead, it becomes political through its engagement with social issues and socio-political contradictions, agendas, and debates. The question is whether in its engagement with such issues, it retains the criticality that such socio-political issues warrant and demand, and, furthermore, whether it does so in ways that are of literary and artistic merit. In other words, the prognosis or diagnosis of a certain political vision or agenda in a given corpus of literature is significant since literature becomes political through the 'tropes' it employs in questioning the boundaries of the polis. As such, not only can it undermine the state and its laws, but also can contribute to the re-envisioning of 'politics' in ways that transgress conventional conceptualizations of politics. In other words, while cosmopolitan visions could strive for an unconditional, and, thus, impossible cosmopolitanism, their 'politics' are judged by how close to this unconditional cosmopolis, they come through their praxis. As Derrida reminds us, "the theoretical task [is] indissociable from its political implementation" (*On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness* 9).

Utopian Cosmopolitanism

The historical record of cosmopolitanism is not particularly promising for a way out of the predicament that we have outlined, namely, the "continuous slide of cosmopolitan ideas into empire" (Douzinas 159). Yet, cosmopolitanism in ancient times and specifically in Stoic thought was antinomian and critical of power. For the Stoics, the cosmos in their vision of cosmopolis was the metaphysical horizon and the polis was the actual ground where human relations unfolded and were judged according to the metaphysical cosmos. As such, the Stoics "imagined the cosmopolis as an ontological and ethical correction of the polis" (Douzinas 156), and, thus, their laws and institutions were seen as necessarily fallible and constantly subject to critique since they were by nature inferior to the metaphysical ideals of justice and morality. While the Stoic imaginary cosmopolis was utopian, its concurrent antinomian critique of its institutions meant that the Stoics were also politically active and involved. In other words, Stoic utopian thinking

was not one that amounted to political paralysis but rather one that became a catalyst for political action. Nevertheless, what distinguished the Stoic version of cosmopolitanism from later versions of cosmopolitanism was the Stoics' awareness of the inseparability of the utopianism of their thought (the cosmos as the impossible and unconditional ideal) from the fallibility of their institutions, which prevented the latter from claiming identification with the former. As Douzinas puts it, for the Stoics

> The alternative to the polis is the cosmos, not as a better arrangement of institutions but as the place where gods and men gather together and laws express the natural integrity of the relationship between human and divine….Logos and eros are its foundation against the artifice of customs, corrupt laws and institutions. Its citizens are errant, nomadic, today they would be refugees, outsiders, migrants. (155-6)

Cosmopolitanism as antinomian, distrustful of power, suspicious of institutions but still politically engaged through its awareness that praxis means not the implementation of a universal model of cosmopolitanism (which to Douzinas means an inevitable lapse into imperialism) but the constant and infinite unworking and correction of the polis through the metaphysical laws of justice and equality of the ahorizontal horizon of the cosmos. Simply put, the metaphysical principles of justice and dignity of the cosmos are tools to resist and undo the unjust workings of the laws of the polis.

I would like to think that it is through the disaffiliating moments, where we extend a hand of hospitality to the 'other', to the immigrant, the non-citizen, the oppressed, or even to the 'other(s)' of ourselves, that we revive something of the old tradition of cosmopolitanism, by our unworking of the state laws and regulations. This, importantly, does not mean the eradication of the state in the name of a stateless cosmopolitanism, a vision that is not utopian but politically naive in view of the lack of another alternative. Fortunately or unfortunately (it is both), it is still the state that bestows rights on people and any celebration of stateless cosmopolitanism would need to fill that gap somehow. And so far it has not. The texts that I read in my analysis of contemporary Cypriot Anglophone literature at times engage in such acts, namely the reworking of their own communal bonds in such ways that the familiarity of 'home' becomes unfamiliar. It is thus that hospitality, or philoxenia, lives up to its name: when the other, the non-citizen makes a foreigner out of us, and we assume her/his position against our state. It is in this light that I read the estrangement of narratives and the authors' choice to render their narratives

unhomely—by allowing the repressed forms of otherness to haunt their text—as a distinct form of cosmopolitanism in contemporary Cypriot Anglophone literature when compared to other forms of cosmopolitanism observed during the colonial and nationalist periods, which were clothed in a colonial rhetoric. Indeed, as chapter 1 argues, the advent of English on the island becomes a catalyst for literary modernity and contributes to the creation of a literary cosmopolitanism. Yet, such cosmopolitanism is hegemonic and imperial. Moreover, Durrell's alleged cosmopolitanism is phony since it is used to undermine the island's rising nationalisms and, by extension, to promote colonial interests. The cosmopolitan vision whose subtle signs I read in some of the narratives of contemporary Cypriot literature written in English is different and at times resonates with the aforementioned utopian cosmopolitanism which does not aspire to a managerial project of uniting the cosmos, but simply aspires to that "nocturnal side of speech" (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 2) that haunts the narrative and makes it unhomely, exposing thus the exclusionary politics of any home-construction project. However, these narratives also resonate of another form of cosmopolitanism, one that does not strive for an impossible cosmopolitanism but tries to find, instead, pockets of resistance within the existing political order.

Postcolonial Cosmopolitanism and Heterotopias

The antinomy between the local and the global, the national and the international, the cosmopolitan and the vernacular, or the particular and the universal, has been of utmost relevance to postcolonial theory. But the latter tried to approach this antinomy by foregrounding the in-between spaces that have always been present in such seemingly antithetical concepts. Instead of transcendental models of cosmopolitanism, some postcolonial theorists propose translational modes of being. Pollock et al summarize this project: "transdisciplinary knowledge, in the cosmopolitan cause, is more readily a translational process of culture's in-betweenness than a transcendent knowledge of what lies beyond difference, in some common pursuit of the universality of the human experience" (6-7). It is in this vein that we are to understand Pollock's study of the cosmopolitan and the vernacular in history, which aims to rethink both concepts in terms of practices and not only in terms of ideas. By foregrounding the plurality of cosmopolitanism he argues for a move beyond the singular choice between the cosmopolitan and vernacular, or the global and the local, since quite often the two reside in

each other, as he claims. Lest that his argument is interpreted as one in favor of a certain uncritical hybridity, he warns that what he has in mind

> is a tactical reversal of domination—a resistance – through – appropriation, as it has been described—which, in fact, approximates what I take to be the process of vernacularization before modernity. This practice derives from a realization born of accumulated historical experience of both pre- and postcoloniality that the future must somehow become one of *and* rather than *either/or.* (Pollock 47)

The suggestion for a move towards *and* instead of the *either/or* divide is one that he understands to be precisely a cosmopolitan practice, namely the "awareness of the varied cosmopolitan and vernacular possibilities that have been available in history" (Pollock 48). As such, it aims to move the study of cosmopolitanism beyond the delimiting strictures of universalism and revive some promise from its relationship to vernacularism. Such an approach of *and*, he claims, is profoundly promising. In his words,

> To know that some people in the past have been able to be universal and particular, without making either their particularity ineluctable or their universalism compulsory, is to know that better cosmopolitan and vernacular practices are at least conceivable—and perhaps even, in a way those people themselves never fully achieved eventually reconcilable. (48)

A similar theoretical impetus drives Bhabha's "vernacular cosmopolitanism" (Bhabha "Unsatisfied: Notes on Vernacular Cosmopolitanism"), Appiah's "rooted cosmopolitanism", or Pollock et al.'s "cosmopolitanisms". The latter, by coining a plural form of cosmopolitanism aim to foreground precisely the multiplicity of practices that can come under the name of cosmopolitanism and also to keep it open for the future. Their project, in other words, is committed to an openness of meaning attributed to the term since their intention is not to find one universal patent of resistance through the import of the term but instead to find pockets of resistance afforded by the heterogeneity of practices and by the contingency of the situations that demand such practices. In contrast to Knowles' call for specificity, Pollock et al. insist on keeping the term open:

> We are not exactly certain what it [cosmopolitanism] is, and figuring out why this is so and what cosmopolitanism may be raises difficult conceptual issues. As a practice, too, cosmopolitanism is yet to come, something awaiting realization. Again, this is not because we already understand and can practice it but have not—a mode of action whose rules we are familiar

> with and need merely to apply. Cosmopolitanism may instead be a project whose conceptual content and pragmatic character are not only as yet unspecified but also must always escape positive and definite specification, precisely because specifying cosmopolitanism positively and definitely is an uncosmopolitan thing to do. (1)

The writers' insistence on the openness of the term should not be misconstrued for a lack of direction or methodological rigor; rather, it is an ideological commitment to eschew the danger of monophonizing cosmopolitanism.

The multiplicity of practices associated with their conceptual openness attributed to the term brings them to proximity to Foucault's ideas on heterotopias: places that "are something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted" (Michel Foucault "Des Espaces Autres" 3). In other words, the openness of the term and the multiplicity of practices associated with the term as espoused by Pollock et al., instead of participating in the envisioning of a complete reversal of the political order, that most visions of cosmopolitanism entail, articulate a search for pouches within the margins from where the established order might be contested. Foucault's heterotopia is not antithetical to utopia, but simply more identifiable and realizable. Moreover, it shares some of the fictional attributes associated with utopia but entails at the same time some 'real' qualities (Michel Foucault "Des Espaces Autres" 4). Foucault employs the figure of the mirror to exemplify this in-betweenness of heterotopias, being both mythic and real, existing and non-existing, topic and atopic. He says that, "The mirror functions as a heterotopia in this respect: it makes this place that I occupy at the moment when I look at myself in the glass at once absolutely real, connected with all the space that surrounds it, and absolutely unreal, since in order to be perceived it has to pass through this virtual point which is over there" ("Des Espaces Autres" 3). With regards to cosmopolitanism, utopias and heterotopias, as discussed here, are not different in their approach to praxis, since they both entail an antinomian critique of the law of the polis and aim at its correction. Where they differ, in my opinion, is in their horizon of vision. Utopian cosmopolitanism, while aware of the impossibility of its completion, does not at the same time cease to envision the complete, yet ongoing reversal of the system. Conversely, heterotopias, through their 'real' attributes, entail some form of completion of vision, or a realizable horizon for cosmopolitanism. The call for a cosmopolitanism that

"is yet to come" (Pollock et al. 1), and the avoidance to specify it are not necessarily synonymous to an impossibility of enacting or of fulfillment. Rather, what the authors above argue for, in reclaiming cosmopolitanism for postcolonial studies, is the amplification of cosmopolitanism beyond its western genealogy. As such, they point to various types of cosmopolitanism that already occurred and emphasize the heterogeneity of situations that point to cosmopolitan practices. To put it simply, while sharing a commitment to keep the future open and engage in a critique of the current political order, utopian cosmopolitanism differs from heterotopias of cosmopolitanism to the extent that the former sees itself as an impossibility that provides an ever-expanding horizon of ethics for providing direction to the polis, whereas the latter keeps itself open by foregrounding its multiplicity and heterogeneity.

Heterotopias are of profound import to postcolonial appropriations of cosmopolitanism, as Pollock et al. envision it in its openness and heterogeneity, since they involve not only a multiplicity of space but also a rupture with the traditional notion of time: "Heterotopias are most often linked to slices in time—which is to say that they open onto what might be termed, for the sake of symmetry, heterochronies. The heterotopia begins to function at full capacity when men arrive at a sort of absolute break with their traditional time" (Michel Foucault "Des Espaces Autres" 6). More importantly, though,

> heterotopias have a function in relation to all the space that remains. This function unfolds between two extreme poles. Either their role is to create a space of illusion that exposes every real space, all the sites inside of which human life is partitioned, as still more illusory…. Or else, on the contrary, their role is to create a space that is other, another real space, as perfect, as meticulous, as well arranged as ours is messy, ill constructed, and jumbled. (Michel Foucault "Des Espaces Autres" 8)

It is the former function of heterotopias that I see as apposite to the postcolonial appropriation of cosmopolitanism as part of its critique of the current political order. The recent postcolonial Cypriot narratives written in English that I theorize and discuss with regards to their cosmopolitan aesthetics exemplify both of these theoretical approaches to cosmopolitanism, the utopian and the heterotopian. While most of the works engage with issues of power and hegemony from a perspective of marginality and seek pockets of resistance to the established order and the dominant discourses around them, there are times when their aesthetics resonate of the utopian cosmopolitanism as we referred to in

the previous section. Writing in English from a position of difference, or of marginality, they often intend to engage in a critique of the hegemony of English, by inscribing their difference without necessarily wishing to lose their affective relationship to English as their literary language**.** Nevertheless, as we will see in the last two chapters, some works resonate with that utopian cosmopolitanism that engages in a critique of the political order by creating sites that function as the complete reversal of the 'real' established order of society.

In sum, the thesis explores the divergent meanings of homecoming and cosmopolitanism for Anglophone literary narratives that write Cyprus in three distinct periods: the colonial, the anti-colonial and nationalist, and the postcolonial. While all three periods manifest a plurality of Anglophone narratives that write the island and inscribe it with an identity which reflects their ideological intentions, they also exemplify significant differences regarding the meanings invested on the above themes. In other words, reaching a 'homecoming' or finding a cultural arrival in the Anglophone narratives that write Cyprus often passes through the idiom of cosmopolitanism, but manifests different meanings at different historical periods in the literary history of the island. While the first colonial narratives waver between domesticating and vilifying depictions of the island to the extent that only the first ones imbibe some form of 'homecoming' to the island, anti-colonial texts uniformly envisage 'home' along nationalist strictures and exude a sense of homecoming in their glorification of the nation and its nostalgia for ethnic homogeneity. In contrast to both, the Anglophone postcolonial texts that I deal with envisage 'home' across ethnic lines and imbibe an idiom of cosmopolitanism of the utopian and heterotopian kinds that is unlike any former cosmopolitan visions that have been observed before in the island's literary topographies. Cultural arrival, for these latter texts, is envisaged in rapprochement and cross-cultural friendship and is often deferred since the notions of home, homecoming, and community are often deemed to be implicated in, and traversed by, disruption and dislocation.

Part I: British Rule

Chapter 1: Mapping English on the Cypriot Topography

Where is the home for me?
O Cyprus, set in the sea,
Aphrodite's home In the soft sea-foam,
Would I could wend to thee;
Where the wings of the Loves are furled
And faint the heart of the World.

Aye, unto Paphos' Isle
Where the rainless meadows smile
With riches rolled From the hundred-fold
Mouths of the far-off Nile,
Streaming beneath the waves
To the roots of the seaward caves.

But a better land is there
Where Olympus cleaves the air,
The high still dell Where the Muses dwell,
Fairest of all things fair!
O there is Grace, and there is the Heart's Desire
And peace to adore thee, thou Spirit of Guiding
Fire! (Euripides 25)

Literary Modernity and Topographies of the Island

When the British came to Cyprus in 1878, the praising songs and positive accounts regarding the island had already ceased for quite some time. Indeed, the former glory of the island as it was represented both in mythical and historical accounts was overshadowed by its more contemporary history of Ottoman occupation (1571-1878) to the extent that it

remained outside the seventeenth and eighteenth century European voyage to the Orient (Mitsi 118-19). As Mitsi attests, in the scarce travel accounts of British and French travelers who came to the island between 1800 and 1878, the island seems to be floating between Greece and the Orient. Notwithstanding the fluidity and ambivalence of Greece's own geopolitical location between the West and the Orient, or between Western Hellenism and Hellenism, as well as the Orient's own convoluted semiotic location in the European imagination, this ambivalent location was never to abandon the island in the representations it elicited in the years to follow. The advent of British colonialism in 1878, which contributed to the birth of literary modernity to the island, might have opened the route to Cyprus for European (mostly British) travelers, but it did little to clear out the mist and befuddlement that enveloped the island with regards to its identity in these pre-colonial European travel accounts. Despite the increasing literary representations of the island in the form of travel documents, poems, and journalistic articles, by both foreign travelers and locals, Cyprus has continued to float between the familiar West—often via the gaze of western Hellenism—and the exotic Orient until today in such a way that it challenges the borderlines of both of these constructs. The island's identity has been the battleground between colonial literary representations as well as literary representations by Cypriots both during colonialism and after the island's independence in 1960, and it can serve as a focal point from where literary investments that engendered tensions, collusions, and complicities between and within the languages used on the island can be examined. Such topographies invest in various ideologies of 'home', in gestures that range from containing 'home' within its conventional connotations of comfort and safety, to endeavoring to liberate it from its conventional connotations. While the latter topographies are primarily—but not exclusively—associated with the post-colonial era and constitute self-reflexive attempts to question the exclusionary politics of both colonial and nationalistic imaginings of 'home' and of their patriarchal underpinnings, the former topographies are found throughout the history of the island and constitute typical visions of 'home', that "connote the private sphere of patriarchal hierarchy, gendered self-identity, shelter, comfort, nurture and protection" (George 1).

In this chapter, I intend to focus on the beginning of literary modernity on the island, and on the dislocations that English has engendered in its entry to Cypriot topography. Topography, or the writing of a place, attains particular urgency for emerging nations, and, while being profoundly shaped by political, cultural, and social imperatives, its end products, in the form of political, cultural, or artistic artifacts, shape the reading of

place as well. In colonial "contact zones" (Pratt 8), this process is heightened, and it becomes a battleground between contesting ideologies that, through their common and shared endeavor to open up spaces for themselves or create habitable 'homes', collapse the conventional binaries of colonizer/colonized, public/private, west/orient, masculine/feminine. Post-colonial studies stipulate that colonialism has altered irrevocably the notion of 'home' for the colonized, rendering it unhomely. Such theoretical approaches, although significant, rely too heavily on the conventional binary of colonizer and colonized as well as on typical connotations of 'home' as a safe and protected place. Without disregarding the asymmetry of power that the advent of colonization begot, I propose to explore the Cypriot topography in this initial phase of literary modernity on the island through an examination of the tensions, collusions, and complicities between English and the local languages of Greek and Turkish, but also within the languages themselves. Although attention will be given to all three languages involved, my focus will be on English and specifically on how the translocation of English on the Cypriot topography is accompanied by a sense of disorientation with regards to the concept of 'home'. My examination will focus on the literary topographies that map Cyprus in this initial stage of colonization of the island.

Literary modernity in Cyprus coincided with the advent of colonialism and was largely its result. The beginning of literary modernity on the island reveals a certain kind of cultural cosmopolitanism, whose impetus can be found both in the new literary ambience that colonialism brought to the island but also in the influence of the Cypriot diaspora in Egypt and other parts of the Middle East. Although the first printing press of the island was a gift by the Alexandrian Cypriot Brotherhood (Bryant *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus* 33), the timing of its arrival roughly coincided with the time that the island passed onto British administration, and, as a result, the latter demanded that the first newspaper (named appropriately "Κύπρος/Cyprus") be bilingual, Greek and English. The early demise of the paper—it only lasted for a short while in its initial bilingual form—was not a harbinger of what was to follow. Indeed, the arrival of the printing press was instrumental in the birth of literary modernity in Cyprus and brought about an impressive literary activity, if we consider the extent of illiteracy that pervaded the island, since even as late as 1921 64% of the people were reported to be illiterate (Παπαλεοντίου *Κυπριακά Λογοτεχνικά Περιοδικά Στα Χρόνια Της Αγγλοκρατίας* 10). The fervent literary activity that followed the advent of colonialism was mostly in Greek, and, in terms of literature, it is exemplified in literary works published

predominantly in newspapers and in magazines, and less so in books which are few and scattered at the beginning. Literary activity in Turkish blossomed somewhat later, in the 1890s, and was facilitated by the descent from Turkey of the exiles of the 'Young Turk' movement who came to the island and campaigned against the Sultan's rule from the safer space afforded by the British administration (Bryant *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus* 33). Indeed, the birth of the Turkish Press in Cyprus is accompanied by acute tension between the followers of the Young Turk movement and the proponents of the Sultan, and the first newspapers become the battlefront for this ideological contest (Τενέδιος 79). The role of English in this initial phase of the literary activity on the island was important in two major ways: firstly, through the substantial number of travel documents, treatises, and poems that aimed to represent the new colony to the British public; and secondly, through its role as an intermediary language of translation which brought a considerable array of literary works from various languages of the world—including Eastern languages—into Greek for local readers, contributing to the creation of a certain kind of cultural cosmopolitanism.

The translocation of English to the Cypriot context is marked by dislocation, since from the outset it is employed to serve opposing discourses reflecting contesting imperial politics in its representations of the island. Moreover, through its role as an intermediary language of translation, not only does it collude with the local languages in bringing home to them works of a variety of 'Other' languages, but it is also employed in a gesture that brings to English the invisible cross-cultural ghosts of an(other) past of the island, as it is exemplified in Cobham's *Excerpt Cypria* (1908): a cross-cultural past which the discourses of nationalism that developed later on turned a deaf ear to. Indeed, in this work by Cobham, the British Commissioner of Larnaca, we find a vast collection of literary works from various languages, translated into English, traversing the centuries and mapping the Cypriot 'topos' with a plurality of languages and cultures. Nevertheless, travel literature by British travelers and explorers will be discussed separately in the next chapter, and will be approached from the perspective of the feminine picturesque, a literary genre that was particularly prevalent amongst female writers and which reveals new layers of tensions, collusions, and complicities within English.

Topography, as Leontis argues, affixes "culture to place" (2), and in so doing becomes "both a process and a product" (3); it entails, in other words, both the orchestration of the unearthing of a past through the activation of the historical and archaeological processes, and the process of becoming the living manifestation of the

specific cultural heritage through the archive, the literary and historical record, museum, or other forms of tradition. This is particularly salient in emerging nations that are engaged in the process of creating a national culture. Yet, what about such places that have experienced literary modernity through colonialism, or concurrently with colonialism? How do the local attempts at mapping their homeland collide, collude, or comply with the colonial attempts at topography? How does the colonial language partake in this process? The advent of English in Cyprus as it is exemplified in travel literature and treatises on the island by travelers and journalists as well as in literary works in the press archives brings about to the British subject the establishment of Britain as 'home' in contradistinction to Cyprus. In other words, the displacement of English to the colony reinforces the sense of Britain as 'home' and the voyage back to Britain as 'homecoming'. Whether the island is represented in such terms as to be rendered unhomely and uninviting, or whether the literary work simply accentuates the feeling of alienation from Britain that the journey to the empire entails, Britain emerges as the place activating a desire in the British subject for nostos (homecoming), which in some poignant instances turns into a nostalgia. The excerpt from a poem that follows and which was written by Mr. Frederic Bowyer, "a propos of the departure of the Guards to Bermuda" (The Owl 20 September 1890) is paradigmatic of such feelings of nostalgia that the business of empire entails. The poem was first published in the *Sunday Times*, but was reprinted in the Anglophone press of Cyprus: "But loving hearts still think of us at home,/ and send kind messages across the foam;/the homely phrases with new meaning shine/and Love's sweet rapture lights up every line" (The Owl 20 September 1890). The exilic sense of the voyage across the foam is heightened to such a degree that it leaves little doubt about where 'home' is and what it symbolizes. Moreover, such writings—as well as readings—of 'home' reinforce the conventional fixing of 'home' as a place of comfort, familiarity, and safety.

Yet, at the same time, there is a tendency to bring the new colony home, to make Cyprus appear either as a place where the British subject feels 'at home' in the journey to the empire, or to make the journey to the empire part of 'homecoming' by domesticating the new colony. While the right balance between oriental flavor and antiquarian value rendered the island appealing to the British public and encouraged investment and domestication, plunging the island deeply in the Orient threatened to efface its ancient Greek past—and thus the moral prerogative of British rule to re-familiarize the locals with their grand past—as well as to jeopardize British mercantilism. Whether a literary work of this early stage of colonization extends the notion of 'home' to the colony or discards it as

a useless acquisition, depends very much on the imperial politics of the writers and their cultural predispositions regarding the island. The first, being proponents of British prime-minister Benjamin Disraeli's policy, see the process of colonization of the island as acculturation, or rather as a re-acculturation of the locals—whose depiction in these representations Orientalizes them to different degrees based on whether they are Christian or Muslim—to their island's former ancient Greek glory. This re-acculturation occurs under the guidance of the British nation, which perceives itself as the lawful guardian of this process, and through the lens of Western Hellenism sees its advent to the island as a 'homecoming' or as a return to its cultural roots, the Hellenic topos. The Orientalisation of the local people in this process of 'homecoming' of the British subject is an integral step in the justification of colonialism, or more euphemistically, the re-familiarization of the locals with their past. Thus, we have a curious convergence of western Hellenism and Orientalism in these first literary topographies.

On the other hand, the adversaries of Disraeli's politics, who generally lack sufficient 'Oriental flavor' for appreciating the island, depict it as a dreary, degrading, and unhomely landscape. The underlying belief in these bleak representations of the island is that its Ottoman past has effaced its former glory to the extent that is not worthy of domestication. This is indeed a very dominant discourse in European narratives about places that have been part of the Ottoman Empire since the Ottoman Empire in European discourses of civilization has been traditionally treated as the paradigmatic decadent 'Other' of the civilized European. As Bryant argues, "the 'decline of the Ottomans' as a supposed result of the corruption of their race has remained—in one form or another—an accepted, indubitable part of the European narrative of the rise of 'civilization'" (*Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus* 18).

Nevertheless, these two main tendencies share more than it appears at first since, despite their differences regarding the identity of the island, the former values its antiquarian value while the latter dismisses it altogether because the empire has more important outposts to serve. Both share a colonial ideological conviction about the racial impurity of the people of the island. Indeed, Dixon's often-quoted question "What are the Cypriots?", and its immediate answer in terms of the Cypriots' racial impurity (Dixon 19-20) was prevalent in British representations of the island. As Gregoriou maintains, the colonial claims about the racial impurity of the locals have been instrumental in the development of Cypriot self-representations—predominantly Greek-Cypriot ones—which were intended to refute the racial impurity attributed to them by investing in orthodox

national identities that precluded the local others as well as other approaches to memory (Gregoriou 260). It is of interest that the ideological backbone to allegations of racial impurity of responses that Greek-Cypriots constructed is essentially the same as that of the allegation since they deploy the same essentialist model to refute the allegation. The development of folkloric literary studies in the Greek-Cypriot community in this early stage of colonization aimed at proving the Greekness of the island and of its people and is indeed derivative of the pervasiveness of the discourse of racial impurity in colonial narratives (Παπαλεοντίου *Τα Πρώτα Βήματα Της Κυπριακής Λογοτεχνικής Κριτικής* 26-27). From the outset of colonialism, these initial investments in folkloric studies by the Greek Cypriot community represent attempts to appropriate 'home' for Cypriots in exclusively Greek terms and thus they involve their own exclusionary processes and politics.

The Sociopolitical Context of the Times

At this stage, a brief look at the socio-political context of the times can help us better understand and appreciate the role of the English language at the beginning of literary modernity on the island. The transfer of power from the Ottoman Porte to the British Empire has to be seen as part of the larger context of imperial politics, since the main reason why the British Conservative prime-minister Benjamin Disraeli wanted the island was "to defend the empire against what he believed were Russian designs on India" (Morgan 3). After the degrading defeat of the Ottoman Empire by Russia in 1877 and the dismembering of the Ottoman Empire, Russia was forced to renegotiate the terms of the treaty with the Porte at the Berlin Congress, where Britain's prime-minister conducted a political maneuver—that later came to be described as dexterous or disastrous by political allies and adversaries correspondingly—and acquired the island through a secret agreement with the Porte, called the Cyprus Convention (Morgan 3). The agreement stipulated that the island would remain under Ottoman sovereignty but would be administered by Britain so that it could rapidly respond to further Russian encroachments on the feeble Ottoman Empire by providing military support to its defense. Moreover, Britain was to pay an annual tribute of around £92,800 in exchange for being allowed to occupy and administer the island. The tribute was calculated based on the average of the last five years' excess of revenue over expenditure in the island. Since the Ottoman Empire barely spent anything as investment on the island, the tribute proved to be far more financially burdensome than it was initially thought to be by the British. Moreover, it was the Cypriot people who had to

pay for it through taxation, and this meant that there was very little money left for any projects to develop the island during the first years of British occupation of the island. Indeed, the tribute became a bone of contention between the British colonizers and the Cypriot people, but also between the British government officials themselves. They saw the tribute either as a necessary burden that came as part of the package of administering the island or as an unwanted obstacle that needed to be removed so that the island could start enjoying some colonial development and enterprise. The lack of funds for British enterprise created not only a sense of embarrassment but also an anxiety that British rule would appear inadequate in the eyes of the world, and particularly in those of its colonial adversaries. Lastly, the convention stipulated that the island was to be returned to the Ottoman Empire if ever Russia was to return the lost Ottoman areas that came under her Empire during the victorious war of 1877 against the Ottoman Porte (Panteli 46). Although the possibility of ever relinquishing the island to the Porte was a remote one, as we can see from some comments from British officials (Panteli 46), the uncertainty regarding the future of the island as well as the economically overwhelming annual tribute were both important issues that were foregrounded in treatises on the island.

The Beginnings of the Press in Cyprus

In 1878, when the British took over, the island was in a dreary financial position, and most of the people lived in dire and dreadful conditions, facing huge taxation, ongoing epidemics, as well as repeated droughts and locust attacks (Σοφοκλέους *Συμβολή Στην Ιστορία Του Κυπριακού Τύπου* 22). Moreover, the vast majority of the people were illiterate, and there were very few schools, let alone an efficiently organized educational system. Since there was no printing press during the Ottoman times, the official documents that were published for the administration of the island were printed using the process of lithography (Σοφοκλέους *Συμβολή Στην Ιστορία Του Κυπριακού Τύπου* 13). In other words, when the British took over the administration of the island, there was essentially no modern literary culture. As it has been mentioned in the introduction of this chapter, the arrival of the first printing machine coincided with the arrival of British colonial rule. The printing press was a gift by the Cypriot and Greek diaspora of Egypt, and, as Sophocleous argues, it was the outcome of the desire of the diasporic Greeks and Cypriots to cultivate a national consciousness in the Christian Cypriot people that would lead them to national redemption, which meant union with Greece (Σοφοκλέους *Συμβολή*

Στην Ιστορία Του Κυπριακού Τύπου 27). Be that as it may, the first printing machine arrived on the island in the summer of 1878, and, before being put into operation, the island changed hands and passed from the Ottoman Porte to the British Empire. The journalist and editor who was entrusted the role of bringing the printing press and starting the first island newspaper was Theodoulos Constantinides, who taught for years in the Greek schools of Egypt (Σοφοκλέους *Συμβολή Στην Ιστορία Του Κυπριακού Τύπου* 28). When he requested permission to start a newspaper in the printing press that he set up in Larnaca, the newly arrived British High Commissioner Sir Garnet Wolseley granted his permission on the condition that the paper be printed both in Greek and English.

The birth of the Cypriot press in its portentous twin form is not only symbolic of the simultaneity of colonialism and literary modernity but also of the tensions and collusions between languages that the advent of English brought about to the Cypriot literary topography. Indeed, as we will see in detail further down in this chapter, the form of the first Cypriot paper was not one of harmonious symbiosis but rather one of two fraternal siblings that at times colluded with each other in upholding colonial structures and ideas, and at others, undermined each other. Unfortunately, we do not know exactly how many editions the paper went through in this form, but we know that soon after its beginning, the main editor Constantinides could not afford to pay the salary of £4 per month for the British journalist, Palmer, and ended up switching roles with him, before losing the printing press completely to the British company Henry S. King & Co that continued to publish the paper only in English until 1882 (Σοφοκλέους *Συμβολή Στην Ιστορία Του Κυπριακού Τύπου* 56). During the first years after the arrival of the first printing press, there was a flurry of print culture, exemplified in weekly newspapers and literary magazines. Print presses started appearing in most big cities, and each one of these cities had its own newspaper by the end of the century (Σοφοκλέους *Συμβολή Στην Ιστορία Του Κυπριακού Τύπου* 14-15). Indeed, the arrival of British colonial rule and of the first printing press became catalysts for print activity, especially in the Greek community where, by 1890, there were five Greek newspapers with a total circulation of almost 3000 (*Cyprus Blue Book Reports for the Year 1889-1890*) and various magazines of a predominantly satirical nature (Σοφοκλέους *Συμβολή Στην Ιστορία Του Κυπριακού Τύπου* 14-15). The Greek-Cypriot press from its onset clamored for *Enosis* (Union) with Greece, and, although it was generally content with the transfer from the Porte to the British Empire, it saw the status-quo as temporary, and incessantly endeavored to bring up the issue of Enosis and, thus, became instrumental in the overall cultivation of a national

sentiment in the Greek-Cypriot community. Also, around the same time there appeared a "Journal of Cyprian Studies" and an impressive total of 450 books were published (Bryant *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus* 33). Moreover, there were three English speaking newspapers at the time with a total circulation of around 850 copies (*Cyprus Blue Book Reports for the Year 1889-1890*). This fervent print activity would exhibit itself somewhat later in the Turkish-speaking community (Bryant *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus* 33) since in 1889-1890, there were only 64 subscribers in the first Turkish-language newspaper owned by a Turkish-Cypriot on the island, called *Saded* (*Cyprus Blue Book Reports for the Year 1889-1890*), that was founded in July 1889 (Τενέδιος 78). There were two earlier newspapers, Umit (1880) and Dik-El-Shark (1889), that were owned by an Armenian but lasted in circulation for only a short time (Σοφοκλέους "Εισαγωγή Στην Ιστορία Του Κυπριακού Τύπου" 23). In these first years of literary activity in Turkish, there are two trends that become particularly conspicuous: on the one hand, a reaction against the Greek-Cypriot calls for Enosis with Greece; on the other, the influence of modern ideas that was facilitated by the movement of the Young Turks and continued with Kemalism (Kizilyurek 317-18).

In the midst of this initial literary activity, it is also interesting to note the role of translation and its symbolic significance as a gesture of bringing 'home' the 'other'. The plurality of literatures that comprise the translation choices, including European classical and Eastern literatures, show a cultural cosmopolitanism that challenges the binary of 'West' and 'Orient' that seemed to become dominant in the literary representations of the island both by the British and by Cypriots. Indeed, in these first years of literary modernity on the island (1880-1930), translation plays a significant role and shows a different trend than the one that developed after independence on the island. Specifically, during this first phase, there is a substantial number of literary works that are translated into Greek by Cypriot literati, whereas after 1974, when the two communities were more rigidly separated, and when the new nation-state of Cyprus (which was represented only by Greek-Cypriots) wanted to create its own literary genealogy, there is the opposite gesture, of translating works of Cypriot (or more accurately Greek-Cypriot) literature into other languages. Nevertheless, during these first years there are over 150 literary scholars and writers who translate over 900 literary works from 400 different authors, representing an incredibly wide range of world literature (Παπαλεοντίου *Τα Πρώτα Βήματα Της Κυπριακής Λογοτεχνικής Κριτικής* 274). Although the vast majority of these translations are from English, French, and Russian literature, there are also translations of works of Japanese,

Chinese, Indian, Persian and Arabic literatures through English and French (Παπαλεοντίου *Τα Πρώτα Βήματα Της Κυπριακής Λογοτεχνικής Κριτικής* 277-78). It is important to note here that quite often Greek-Cypriot scholars criticize the accuracy and quality of translations of literary works by Greek scholars, especially translations of works of English literature (Παπαλεοντίου *Τα Πρώτα Βήματα Της Κυπριακής Λογοτεχνικής Κριτικής* 275). The access to English education and culture that came as part of colonialism, as well as the Cypriot and Greek diasporas in the Middle East, were instrumental in these first steps of literary activity and in the literary inclinations of the first Cypriot scholars. Indeed, a number of Cypriots studied at British universities and the American University of Beirut and became familiar not only with English literature but also with Eastern literatures through British Orientalism. As Stephanides argues, "this complicity did not result in its [British Orientalism] emulation, but brought about its own kind of cross-fertilization and intervention in the home culture" (Stephanides and Hadjiodysseos 1568).

This cross-cultural gaze of initial literary activity in Cyprus is also reflected in the first steps of critical literary commentary by Cypriots. While classical European literatures seem to be the focus of the first literary commentaries on the island, there is considerable attraction and attention to Eastern literatures. Despite their scarcity, the literary choices of these first Cypriot scholars, illustrated in the lectures and literary commentaries that were produced, portray a literary cosmopolitan spirit. For example, in 1881, O. Iasonides is reported to give a series of lectures in Limassol on the work of Milton and, in 1892, on Shakespeare (Παπαλεοντίου *Τα Πρώτα Βήματα Της Κυπριακής Λογοτεχνικής Κριτικής* 413). In 1909, C. Lovarides writes critical commentaries on Arabic and Indian literature. In 1917, P. Fasouliotis gives a lecture on Persian medieval poet Nizami. Finally, in 1883, a Greek scholar from Asia Minor who lives in Famagusta presents his critical commentaries on unknown old Arabic literature, including poems of pro-Islamic and early Islamic literature as well as unedited samples of the work of women poets, one of whom he identifies with Sappho (Παπαλεοντίου *Τα Πρώτα Βήματα Της Κυπριακής Λογοτεχνικής Κριτικής* 278-79). Scant as it might be, this initial literary activity as it is outlined in the translation records as well as the first literary commentaries shows a literary cosmopolitanism of linguistic exchanges that disappeared shortly after. The exchanges of Greek with English and other European languages brought about an interesting literary cross-cultural terrain that is absent both from the mainly homogeneously Greek literary scene as well as from the representations of the island in English (treatises, travel narratives, journalistic articles) which imbue a predominantly colonial rhetoric. This

cross-cultural ambience is also evident in Cobham's *Excerpta Cypria* (1908). Cobham's work is a compilation of works "that give in a single language and in one volume what eighty different writers have left in twelve tongues" (Cobham 'Preface'), and cover more than eighteen centuries of literary history of the island. Indeed, Cobham's translations weave a literary tapestry of the island that brings to English voices from a polyglot and cosmopolitan past. Thus, through the laborious efforts of a colonial administrator, English inscribes on the Cypriot 'topos' a literary cosmopolitanism, but at the same time, is in itself enriched by its cosmopolitan ghosts.

The Dialectic between English and the Local Languages

Let us now turn out attention to the newly-emerging Cypriot press to see other aspects of the dialectic between English and the local languages. The first paper, as it was mentioned, was the four-page *Κύπρος/Cyprus* paper whose initial bilingual form was split equally into two pages in Greek and two in English, yet the two parts bore little relevance to one another. The first edition of the paper is very interesting indeed since it reflects the profound tensions as well as collusions that came to characterize the relationship between the local languages with English until today. The two sections are quite different, apart from one article that was written in English by Palmer and was translated into Greek. What is of great interest is that the translated article (one that has a colonial attitude about the prospects of the island as a British dominion) is printed on the same page as another article, written in Greek by Constantinides, that reads like a eulogy of journalism and free spirit, the latter being tendentiously linked to ancient Greek ideals (see Σοφοκλέους *Συμβολή Στην Ιστορία Του Κυπριακού Τύπου* 40-41, for entire passages from this newspaper). In this latter article, while Constantinides outlines the outlook and goals of the newspaper, he does not fail to underline that his pen would be inspired by the Greek ideals of a cosmopolitan confraternity of nations. It is interesting that 'cosmopolitanism' is used positively here, whereas later on in Greek narratives by Cypriots, it is seen as a concept that could endanger the Hellenic identity of the island (Gregoriou 255-56). Cosmopolitanism is welcome when it is mediated through Hellenism, the article by Constantinides seems to be suggesting. The tension created by the two opposing articles is somewhat alleviated by Constantinides' praise both of the colonial rulers as brilliant examples of culture and progress and of his English-speaking editor, whom he introduces as an experienced and politically astute journalist. Despite the inability of the two editors

to communicate with each other since they did not speak each other's language, Constantinides highlights their ability to communicate through their high ideals of cosmopolitanism. Whether he is paying lip-service to his colonial masters and his colleague or whether he truly believes that Britain is a cultural paragon is difficult to ascertain, yet, what is interesting is that Constantinides' initial collusion with the colonial rhetoric of 'civilization' disappears once he starts his own newspaper in Greek, called *Neon Kition*, where, as Sophocleous observes, his attitude toward the colonial rulers is radically different (Σοφοκλέους *Συμβολή Στην Ιστορία Του Κυπριακού Τύπου* 43). Indeed, not only Constantinides, but also the Greek press of Cyprus in general in its incipient years, were of a quite vociferous character in their claims, and quite often read motives of de-hellenization on the part of the colonial government when the latter attempted to introduce new legislature, especially in the sensitive and politically crucial sector of education. While not disregarding the colonial imperatives that aimed at fortifying their dominance, as will be discussed later, this has been a formidable discourse in Greek-Cypriot colonial and postcolonial attempts at self-identification since, by making itself synonymous to the anti-colonial movement, both before and after independence, it hindered the possibility of a broader and more heterogeneous movement against British rule, or of a broader and less exclusive envisioning of 'home' in the postcolonial state. Thus, from the colonial times until even today, the discourse of de-hellenization has been mobilized to hinder any messing with issues that pertained to the official appropriation of the identity of the island in exclusively Greek parameters, instigated either from without or from within.

The tensions and collusions reflected in the first edition of the first-ever paper to be published on the island are paradigmatic of the general relationship between English and the local languages on the island. Apart from the political imperatives that impinged on the literary activity of the island, there are also cultural issues that had their own effect on the island's literary topographies but which also ended up being reflected in them. Some of these cultural presuppositions about the island were reflected in the views about the local languages that the colonial officials who were affecting language policies in Cyprus had. Cypriots responded to these attitudes and policies in various ways, and our examination needs to explore these reactions too. In this initial phase of the Anglo-Cypriot encounter, the colonialists knew very little about both the new colony as well as about their new subjects; yet, in general terms, in the British imagination, the island vacillated between the exotic and/or decadent Orient and the familiar image of Hellenism. It is of

profound interest that, contrary to the usual colonial practice of imposing English as the language of education in Cyprus, colonial policy was different and allowed education to be carried in the local languages. This policy certainly had a significant influence on the overall impact of English on the island as well as on the kind of nationalisms that were young at this early stage and which reached full development later on. Studies of the history of education and of language policies in the Cypriot context tend to base their analyses in debates either between the Anglicists and the Philhellenes, or between those advocating the imposition of English and those acknowledging the value of the Greek language as one of those languages that could impart the benefits of civilization. Be that as it may, we need to also consider whether indeed these discourses were as conflicting as they appear since, as Viswanathan's research shows in the context of India, seemingly opposing colonial educational discourses shared a deep ideological objective (168). We also need to question whether they are as transparent as they appear, since they are both intersected by some form of Orientalism and were at different historical periods affected by utilitarian imperatives too. Finally, we need to consider the response of the Cypriots to these debates and to attempts at legislation in education, since, for the Greek-speaking Cypriots, English constituted a threat, whereas Turkish-speaking Cypriots, saw the Greek language as the main threat to their cultural and linguistic survival (Karoulla-Vrikki 349-52).

Historian Tabitha Morgan's explanation of the decision not to impose English as the language of education follows this above approach to her analysis of the educational sphere of the island. She argues that the reason for this peculiarity of Cyprus in the colonial context was the classical education and the high regard for Greek that prominent British colonial officials had, which made them confident that the rich ancient literature and history of Greece could provide "ample means, not only for ordinary education, but for the attainment of a high degree of mental culture", as Lord Kimberley, secretary of state for the colonies, was to declare (qtd. in Morgan 38). This view, she continues, was not endorsed by everyone at the time, since there were many Anglicist British officials, including Sir Robert Biddulph, the high Commissioner of the island from 1879 to 1886, who believed that only education in English would allow the Cypriots to feel a sense of loyalty towards the British empire (Morgan 38). Nevertheless, as Morgan claims, the British appropriation of classical Greece, bolstered by the emphasis Oxbridge put on it as part of the curriculum, was such a dominant part of the identity of Victorian imperialism that it affected colonial policy and made Cyprus a special case (Morgan 38). Since British

officials saw ancient Greek culture as the origins of their own glorious empire and themselves as the successors of this glorious past, the Greek character of the island presented a peculiarity to the colonial ambitions of the empire. Morgan also observes that this conundrum that the Greek character and inhabitants of the island presented to the British rulers and their western Hellenism was to elicit various reactions, one of them being the educational policy of not imposing English as the language of instruction; it proved also, though, she claims, to be a continuous source of disillusion with their Greek subjects, since they consistently failed to live up to the British colonial expectations of classical Greece. Moreover, unlike the Turkish subjects of Cyprus, they were not alluringly Oriental enough for their failure to live up to the British expectations of classical Greece. Thus, they ended up being either denied their Greekness or being represented as something in between (Morgan 42). But, was Orientalism indeed reserved only for the Muslims of the island? Such approaches and explanations of British colonial rule and of its policies, useful as they might be, fail to explicitly acknowledge the hybrid nature of colonial discourse, which extolled the antiquarian value of the island because of its ancient Greek relics, but also persistently exposed the inhabitants of the island not only various degrees of Orientalization but also a more general discourse of racial impurity, which created in itself colonial fears and anxiety about cross-cultural contact. The Cypriots still remain hostages to this discourse since, instead of investing in critical approaches that reclaim hybridity from its biological connotations, they have legitimized the exclusionary politics of biological hybridity by investing in apologetic self-representations (Gregoriou 243-48). Further, such explanations of educational and linguistic policies fail to bring out the ambiguity of such discourses as philhellenism, especially in its imbrications with colonialism, as in the case of Cyprus. Moreover, in disregarding the reactions and responses of the Cypriots to colonial policies, such approaches bestow a greater power to colonial rule and its processes than they deserve. Indeed, the theorization of the colonial encounter in Cyprus and the form that it ended up assuming needs to take into consideration the reactions and responses of the Cypriots to that rule.

Cypriot Self-Perceptions and Local Responses to Colonial Policies

But let us take a quick look at the British colonial educational policy in Cyprus so that we can better understand the interplay between the various factors that influenced it. Persianis argues that the British colonial educational policy in Cyprus was to a great extent

similar to educational policies in other colonies in being an 'adapted education' policy. At the same time, however, it differed from them in being more elusive as well as more influenced by the political situation than education policies in other colonies (45). The advent of British colonial rule in 1878 found an existing educational system in place on the island. The Greek-speaking schools, in particular, had a clear ideological and political orientation that was deeply entrenched in their structure. Modeled on the Greek mainland schools, their purpose was to disseminate the Enlightenment ideas and to bring about the moral and national redemption of the people (Persianis 51). The complete alignment of the Greek-Cypriot schools with those of mainland Greece meant that the former were the recipients of various benefits, such as free admission to the universities of Greece without examination, school textbooks from Athens, as well as a status of equivalence to Greek diplomas (Persianis 51). These benefits were too precious for these schools and proved to be decisive at moments when the colonial government tried to offer alternatives to them.

It is against this background that we need to understand British colonial policy in Cyprus. The latter was not uniform and underwent considerable change in the 82 years of colonial rule on the island. Persianis argues that British colonial education policy is roughly separated between two periods: a) 1878-1931, where an explicit 'adapted education' policy is evident with little direct involvement by the government, and b) 1931-1960, where we find "an implicit 'adapted education' policy or a planned policy of cultural and educational lending" (56). Various considerations and factors such as the uncertain political status of the island during the first part of British rule (up until 1925, when Cyprus becomes a Crown colony): financial constraints of both the Colonial government and of the Orthodox Church at different times; the racism of the colonial officers and governors; the rising social demands for education and the concomitant rising local investment in education as a vehicle for the conveyance of national ideology in the two communities were at play in influencing the variable educational policy. Moreover, the interplay between these factors at different historical times was decisive in the introduction of new colonial policies.

For instance, while the first years of British rule on the island saw the enthusiastic desire of the director of education to introduce English as a language of instruction in schools, the plan was withdrawn shortly after because of fierce Church protestations (Persianis 55). Moreover, financial constraints due to the uncertain status of the island led to the maintenance of the existing system with only a role of indirect control left to the colonial government through the appointment of a Director for Education and through

financial subsidies (Persianis 52). During these first years of colonial rule the emphasis of the colonial government was on primary education and on the promotion of literacy among the population, against the Greek-Cypriot demands for the promotion of secondary education. The 1931 uprising and the burning of the colonial Government House wounded the colonial government and its prestige and marked a new line of policy with regards to education. As Persianis argues, "The British felt that the kind of 'adapted' education policy they had applied up to then had failed to help them either to maintain their political control over the Cypriots or to make their 'civilising' role in Cyprus better understood and appreciated by the colonized" (56). It is at this historical juncture that the British colonial policy on education changes and becomes one of cultural lending and of cultural integration. This new line of policy also entailed a "Cypriotisation of Services" (qtd. in Persianis 56), which meant the inclusion of Cypriots in the administration of the colony. The new role of English on the island and the increasing dissemination of the language amongst Cypriots after 1931 are related to this new policy since one of the criteria for a position in the public administration was the knowledge of the English language. Political expediency was certainly paramount in this policy, since the latter aimed precisely at promoting the British ethos and culture and at diverting the Cypriots' alliances from their motherlands to the British metropolis.

The new education policy entailed the introduction of English in 1935 in primary education, the opening of multiracial schools with English as the language of instruction, and a new curriculum in primary schools with regards to the teaching of History and Geography with an emphasis on the Cypriot context instead of the Greek and Turkish contexts that dominated up until then in the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot schools respectively. With regards to secondary schools which were deemed as the incubators for the fostering of nationalist sentiments, the colonial government decided for only indirect control through the registration of teachers and schools and against their complete closure. Concurrently, though, it assumed control of the English school, which was to serve as a model of secondary education and of a multiracial school. The establishment of the Teachers Training College which used English as its language of instruction and which replaced the segregated Teachers Training Schools gave further impetus to the dissemination of English on the island. Therefore, we can see that while at the beginning of colonial rule an adapted education policy predominated on the island, the socio-political and financial realities of the 1930s changed the direction of educational policy and brought

about a more direct involvement of the colonial government in the sector of education. Gregoriou summarizes this change of direction of education:

> The colonial inscription of elementary education evolved from a decentralized scheme of control (control through the recognition, authorization, re-compartmentalization and re-distribution of pre-existing elites, bio-power and communal sentiments) into a centralized scheme of organic control: control through modernization, regulation and reform. The latter included the regulation of teacher accreditation, teachers' salaries and the appointment or dismissal of teachers; the incorporation of educational expenses in the general budget; the legalization (though not the enforcement) of obligatory primary education; the control of teacher education, the curriculum, and the textbooks. (252)

The impact of these educational policies on the spread of English on the island has been significant. Moreover, the educational institutions that emerged to cater for the needs of the new realities including the necessity of English for entrance to the public administration paved a new direction for education in Cyprus which is still manifest today through the numerous Anglophone private schools and institutes for the teaching of English.

The particularity of the Cypriot colonial paradigm, where English was never imposed as the first language in schools, and the extent to which British colonial rule succeeded or failed to impose its control in Cypriot education, need to be understood not only through colonial policies but also through an examination of what Cypriots thought of themselves and how this affected their responses to such policies. If the British at the onset of colonialism thought that the Orthodox Cypriots were the hapless descendants of the glorious ancient Greeks, then the Greek Orthodox Cypriots themselves were made to feel certain of this ancestral link and to think of themselves as the "real ancestors of Europe" (Bryant "On the Condition of Postcoloniality in Cyprus" 48). The institutions that ensured such self-identification were the Church and the educational curriculum. The Orthodox Greeks of Cyprus were so heavily dependent on an ancient Greek heritage in their self-definition, that to "deny …[them] a Greek education was not just to deprive them of their rights but to deny them full humanity, since humanity directly correspond[ed] to Hellenism" (Bryant "On the Condition of Postcoloniality in Cyprus" 54). The specter of de-hellenisation that the quote alludes to has since the beginning of colonial times been of huge currency in stirring up nationalist sentiments in the Greek-Cypriot community and

has been a dominant weapon in the hands of those who control educational and language policies until today. However, as Bryant argues, the Muslim minority had their own civilizational claim in "Ottoman imperial rule and later claimed to have participated in a project of national modernization that explicitly aimed at bridging East and West" ("On the Condition of Postcoloniality in Cyprus" 49). The Cypriot self-perception as one of the "civilized" ones, although not incontestable either from without or from within, had a profound influence on the responses of the two communities to British colonial policies in fields like education, but also to the overall impact of English itself on the island. As Bryant observes, it was of paramount significance to the "equation of nationalism with civilization…[since] it appeared to Cypriots that nationalisms were not just ideologies of liberation, but were ideologically liberating, extracting them from the realm of primitive 'Asiatics or Africans'" (Bryant "On the Condition of Postcoloniality in Cyprus" 49). As a result, during these first years of British rule on the island, the Cypriot press in Greek and its more slowly emerging counterpart in Turkish both have their own moments of protest to British colonialist attitudes or policies. In two distinct examples that Bryant outlines, the former appeal to their Greek heritage to highlight their refusal to be treated like 'Asiatics or Africans', and the latter refer to their Moslem civilization to underline their refusal to accept the government plan of bringing an English schoolmistress to the Muslim Girls' school (Bryant "On the Condition of Postcoloniality in Cyprus" 49). Evidently, the two major communities could not be expected to, and indeed did not, have the same response to colonialism and its policies. While the Greek-Cypriot community became increasingly more vociferous against colonial policies and perceived English as an adversarial tool of distancing the Cypriots from their vision of Enosis with Greece, the Turkish-Cypriot community became increasingly more fearful of the danger of Greek and its integral role in the Greek-Cypriot imaginary for Enosis. Thus, while the Greek-Cypriots focused their protests against English, the Turkish-Cypriots tried to undermine the role of Greek on the island. The Turkish-British cooperation in the legislative council derives from this fear of the Turkish-Cypriot community of the Greek-Cypriot increasing demands for Enosis (Kizilyurek 317). As Kizilyurek notes, the first ever modern theatre play in the Turkish community, called 'Vatan ve Silistre', "was put to the stage in a protest action against the insult the Muslims of the island felt, after Katalianos, the famous Greek nationalist, entered the Lala Mustafa mosque in Famagusta in 1908" (317).

Cypriot Dislocations of English

In these first years of literary activity, we also have the first endeavors by Cypriots to use the colonial language and promote their own political agendas. George Ciakalli's treatise *Cyprus Under British Rule* (1902) aims to do precisely that. In the pages of this short treatise, Ciakalli carefully navigates through dangerous waters. While not failing to pay lip-service to the British rulers and their civilizational conceit, he subtly also anticipates the Greek-Cypriot desire for Enosis with Greece. Moreover, he registers Greek-Cypriot dissatisfaction with the inadequacy of development projects on the island, which he attributes to the onerous tribute. Lastly, he underlines the urgency of removing any form of taxation of the Cypriots for the Tribute since, as he argues, it is Britain that should pay for it, since it is Britain's military interests that are served by the occupation of the island (Ciakalli 42-43). In view of the scarcity of literary works written in English by Cypriots in these first years of British rule on the island, works like Ciakallis' are important testaments of the Cypriots' engagement with the language, as well as of the uses that they subjected it to.

It is in view of this background that we need to consider issues pertaining to the dialectic between the languages on the island, education policy, as well as the overall character that colonization of Cyprus came to assume. Such a multi-perspectival and multi-disciplinary approach illustrates that English in the Cypriot literary topography was put to various uses and was deployed to serve contesting politics. It was thus coated with profound ambivalence, but was dislocated further through such uses. Indeed, in the first years of colonial rule on the island, the Anglophone press of the island teems with reports, treatises, touristic articles, and literary works that purport to represent the new colony to the British public. Apart from the tension between the two generally opposing representations of the island—one of praise for the island's value and potential and another of its repudiation as worthless— an interesting dialectic between the newspapers was also developing, not only between the Greek-speaking press and its Anglophone counterpart but also within the Anglophone press. Since some Greek-Cypriots started early on their own newspapers in English, there were at times contesting views between the different Anglophone newspapers that existed contemporaneously. The dialogue that we observe between the newspapers as early as 1880 (only two years after the beginning of the Press on the island) is profoundly illuminating regarding both the general significance of the press and the contestations that were unfolding over questions of language, education, and

truth.

For example, the pages of *The Cyprus Times*, which was British owned and served the imperial perspective, are fraught with satirizing comments about the quality and content of the other Anglophone newspaper, *Cyprus*, that was owned by Mr. Rossos, a Cypriot. In the same issue, 21 August 1880, there are various sardonic references to the newspaper as well as to its owner. Even when it refers to an article on education and the teaching of English in particular, that was printed in *Cyprus* 17 August 1880, the author in *The Cyprus Times*, says that although "the remarks upon the latter interesting subject are most edifying, … many will regret that they do not come from a purer source" (21 August 1880, 2). The article continues by observing that,

> it is quite a relief to turn from the maudlin nonsense to which we have so long been accustomed in the columns of the *Cyprus* newspaper, to a subject of this kind; and judging from the good grammar, and the scarcity of gallicisms in the article to which we allude, we are inclined to think that the composition of the leading column of the paper, must have been confided to a new and more experienced pen. (21 August 1880, 2)

Writing about a serious subject and using the imperial language correctly was a prerogative of the British, and, thus, the authorship of such an article in a newspaper owned by a Cypriot needed to be disputed. While not stating it clearly, the article insinuates that the author of this article must be British, for being both, "a new and more experienced pen" is unlikely to be expected of Cypriots at this time in 1880, who were just starting to become familiar with English through higher education in Britain and in the American University of Beirut. The colonized should learn the colonial language but s/he can never learn it as well as the colonialist. This reminds us of Bhabha's famous motto, "almost the same, but not quite" (Bhabha "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse" 132). Apart from showing the significant role of English at the beginning of colonial rule, the quote also shows the battle over truth that was developing between the two Anglophone papers. This is also evident on the next page of *The Cyprus Times*, where the plan of Mr. Rossos, owner of *Cyprus*, to start a newspaper in Greek, by the name of *Alethia* (Truth), is satirized by providing a quote from Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*, "as most appropriate for a motto; 'An evil soul producing holy witness/is like a villain with a smiling cheek—/A goodly apple rotton at the heart:/O, what a goodly outside falsehood hath'" (The Cyprus Times 21 August 1880, 3). The cultural authority of a quintessential

example of English literature provides ample ammunition for the British editor of *The Cyprus Times* paper for claiming monopoly on truth, by undermining the claim to truth of a prospective paper in another language apart from English, as well as of a paper in English, whose owner's cultural roots cannot boast of a link to such a literary authority. These examples reveal the significance of English at the beginning of literary modernity on the island, and the tensions over its usage that its translocation to the Cypriot topography engendered.

Literary Representations of the Island in the Anglophone Press

I would like now to turn my attention to some literary works that were published in the Anglophone press, and, through close readings, I would like to develop some of the arguments that I have been pursuing in this chapter, namely the argument regarding the dislocation of English in the Cypriot context through the various perspectives that it has been made to convey and the tensions within it. It should be emphasized here that, in general, the Anglophone press does not contain an enormous amount of literary works, and that what was published did not follow a systematic plan of addressing a specific literary audience. Rather, the literary works (poems, short stories) that were published are in the main sporadic and quite random both in terms of frequency as well as content. Nevertheless, while generally exhibiting two main opposing tendencies of favorable and unfavorable perspectives on the island, these works share also a colonial perspective that is unequivocal. Let us have a look at two poems that reflect these two main tendencies of representation of the island and explore how their depictions engage with the theme of 'home'. In the *Cyprus Herald*, 12 July 1884, there is an interesting poem written by P.P.H who used to live on the island and who dedicates his poem to the people of Cyprus. The poem praises Cyprus for its beauty and its potential which can be fulfilled under British guidance and enterprise, as it suggests. It starts by attacking those who slandered the island as a dangerous place for fever and says that, in actuality, it is a place for recovery and relaxation. Then, it completes the island's praise by attributing its progress and future potential to British excellence and benevolence. The poem, although long, is worth quoting in its entirety since it exemplifies both the appropriation of Cyprus as part of the 'homecoming' experience in a gesture where the British subject is made to feel 'at home' while also depicting the island in such terms that it oscillates between the familiar West and the exotic Orient. The island might not have a stable geographical location, since it

floats between the West and the Orient, but it is ensured to enjoy stability in the hands of its industrious and civilized new owners, the poem suggests. I quote:

Cyprus

Oh Cyprus lovely Island standing in the distant East
Thats persecution suffered and condemned by those who
[know you least
Described by some newspaper as a fever stricken den
Rundown, despised, ignored, by some correspondents pen
Who chanced to be upon your soil, one unprecedented
[year
When sickness all throughout, the Mediterranean did
[appear
Who wrote attacks against you, and wrapped you up
[in gloom
Causing intending visitors to change their notions very
[soon
Years have since past over, and you have a better name
As a health resort for Invalids, you are growing into fame
Many of whom on Troodos heights, the Summer would
[like to stay
But for want of accommodation there, they have to keep
[away

I have lived five years upon your soil, and best of health
[enjoyed
Although at nights in Summer time, by Mosquitoes
[annoyed
I've travelled your hills by night and day, the Stars
[and Moon my guide
Until I reached some village, where welcome I found
[inside
You've taken my pony from me and placed him in the
[Khan
And brought me to your dwellings, and refreshed the

[inner man
I've had your jam and water, cheese, olives, wine, and
[bread
And smoked my Nargilleh or pipe, and after went to bed
I've slept in doors, and on your roofs, and sometimes
[on the floor
And not far distant from mine ears, Ponies and Mules
[would roar
I've drank your morning coffee cup, then on my journey
[steered
Pleased with your hospitality, in what'er village I
[appeared

I've ridden your Mountain range o'er, and Pine clad
[Forests too
Where myrtle, flowers, and ferns lent enchantment to
[the view
Your running streams and flowing brooks, I oft have
[sat beside
And quenched my thirst and watched the flocks, graze
[on the other side
As darkness fell upon me, and the Sun got lost to sight
I've seen the shepherds drive them, to their mandra
[home for the night
Then laid me down to rest beneath, a shady carob tree
Retired apart, secluded from world and business free
I've heard the tinkling of their bells, in the valleys all
[around
And when morning came, across the plain I still could
[hear their sound
Straggling down the steep ravines, I've on the summit
[stood
And watched them eat on the pastured slopes, their
[green and only food

I've passed Camels, Mules, and Donkeys, from the villages
[hurrying down
Loaded with Carobs, Wine, and Grain, for a little
[seaport town
Where the merchant's ready for them, and the produce
[place in stores
Until time for exportation, for shipment to foreign shores
Oh where is all your mineral wealth, which you had
[in days of yore
Your Copper, Lead, and other Mines, will they ne'er
[be worked no more
You have now an opportunity, so try and use the brain
And expand some of your stored up cash to open them
[again
Do not hide your gold in chatties, or bury it in the
[ground
Or perhaps the day you want it, it may not by you be
[found
Try to introduce industry, and you'll find it will succeed
And the Johnnies they will help you, if they see you
[are in need

You have lots of means now ready, if you will only try
To improve the soil about your homes, which wasteless
[now does lie
Irrigation should come easy, with water close at hand
And promote more agricultural work, throughout your
[wealthy land
Do away with petty feeling and show you mean to work
United hand and hand together, Greek as well as Turk
Open up the roads and passes, which to your villages lead
That now are narrow and dangerous, to the traveller
[and his steed

You all should lend a helping hand when'er spare
[time you've got
And the Johnnies cannot tell you then, that they have
[done the lot
Be sure a little local aid, that's given with good will
May encourage your present government to further
[help you still

…….

Oh happy Isle of beauty, where sporting does abound
Fishing, Shooting, Hunting, for all the year round
O'er marshy lands and rocky ground, the Sportsman
[he can find
Wild Duck, Snipe, Quail, and Mufflon, and birds of
[every kind
And if he is fond of Horsemanship, or going to the front
He can have a run with the Harriers or join a skilo hunt
Then change the scene to Fishing, or boating in the bay
A sailing trip, and salt sea dip, to keep fatigue away
Isle of changes and of wonders, sunshine, lightning, hail
Terramottos, floods and thunders, sometimes too a gale,
Blowing in from the tempestuous deep, I've heard the
[billows roar
And ships at anchor in the bay, driven wrecked upon
[your shore

……..

Home of Venus Daughter of the foam, you now can
[safely brag
Peace and prosperity you have got, beneath the British
[flag
You need not fear a foreign foe, will dare molest your
[shore
To drive your people from their homes, as they have
[done before
A brighter future waits for thee, thy sorrows they have

[passed

And joy and happiness are thine from now until the last
T'was sad for me to leave you, in the way I had to part
Still I think of by gone pleasures, that are locked up

[in my heart

Your memory shall be always dear, wherever I may roam
As fate has separated me, from making thee my home
May heaven smile upon your isle, and its people happy be
Is the wish of one, that's known you long, now in captivity.

Malta, 25th June 1884.
(The Cyprus Herald 12 July 1884)

Apart from its obvious endeavor at domesticating the threat of the new colony by inflecting it with particularly Arcadian hues that ring familiar in the British colonial imagination, the poem also reveals a curious uncertainty and anxiety about the British role in Cyprus, caused by an awareness of the fragility of authority of colonial rule. In other words, the poem portrays a hybrid discourse which "reveals the ambivalence at the source of traditional discourses on authority and enables a form of subversion, founded on that uncertainty, that turns the discursive conditions of dominance into the grounds of intervention" (Bhabha "Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree Outside Delhi, May 1817" 154). Hybridity, in this instance, renders asunder the alleged univocality of colonial discourse and opens it up, "enabling the reader to trace complex movements of disarming alterity in the colonial text" (Young *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race* 22). Bhabha argues that "hybridity is a problematic of colonial representation and individuation that reverses the effects of the colonial disavowal, so that other 'denied' knowledges enter upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of its authority" (Bhabha "Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree Outside Delhi, May 1817" 156). But what kind of 'denied' knowledges are revealed in this poem? The poem addresses Cyprus thus: "Home of Venus Daughter of the foam, you now can/safely brag/Peace and prosperity you have got, beneath the British/flag/You need not fear a foreign foe, will dare molest your/shore/To drive your people from their homes, as they have/done before/A brighter future waits for thee, thy sorrows they have/passed" (The

Cyprus Herald 12 July 1884). Thus, it creates the impression that British occupation is not an occupation but a benevolent intervention and also that the island is enjoying prosperity in this new arrangement. These words reveal the ambivalence that resides in the very core of colonial authority since it has to undermine its authoritarian rhetoric in order to appear benevolent and benign. Moreover, by disguising the violence and force of colonial occupation, the poem reveals the colonial anxiety caused by the awareness of the local people's distaste of the colonial rule, a distaste that such words anxiously try to placate. The Greek-Cypriot community might have welcomed initially the change from the Ottoman Porte to British rule, but the desire for annexation to Greece, facilitated by the Church and by the majority of the Greek-Cypriot intellectuals both abroad and at home, was steadily growing whereas the Turkish community, although eager to modernize, was still hoping for a return of the old regime and resisted some colonial policies and interventions. Moreover, the new prosperity of the island in the hands of its new rulers that the poem relishes belies the actual situation. In the first years, British rule had been criticized not only from local people but also from the British press for doing nothing towards the prosperity of the island (The Times of Cyprus "Cyprus as a Field for English Enterprise" 5 September 1887).

By domesticating the island as a becalmed arcadia, the poem erases the violence of colonial occupation and makes it seem as if the British subject is a traveler and not an occupier of the island. Indeed, the picturesque imagery of the island with "its running streams and flowing brooks" where the narrator "quenched [his] thirst and watched the flocks, graze/on the other side" removes any potential threat that the new colony poses to the British subject and makes the whole experience of traveling around the island a familiar one, one of 'homecoming' where the British subject [male] can enjoy the quintessentially British sports of "Fishing, shooting, hunting, for all the year round" (The Cyprus Herald 12 July 1884). Indeed, it is amusing that in one of the hunting expeditions organized with the objective to introduce the Cypriots to British sports and athletic ethos, the only Cypriot who rose to the occasion of participating in an otherwise quintessentially colonial sport was ridiculed since he did not fulfill the codified standards of form and presentation of the competition (Morgan 12-13). Moreover, the alleged abundant Cypriot hospitality that the poem praises is curiously and lamentably absent in some travel accounts to the point that the commissioner of Kerynia Scott-Stevenson wakes up the entire village in one of his and his wife's peregrinations and threatens its inhabitants with violence and aggression before scaring them into submission to the British laws of

expected (or forced) hospitality (Scott-Stevenson 235-6). Such an acknowledgement by the poet, though, would have rendered his last stanza of the Cypriots not needing to "fear a foreign foe" that would "drive [them] from their homes" rather problematic. The domestication of the island and its appropriation as part of the empire are sealed in the conclusion of the poem where we are told that the poet will not forget the island, even if "fate has separated [him], from making [it his] home" (The Cyprus Herald 12 July 1884).

In contrast to the depiction of the island as homely for the British subject, there are poems that represent the island as a bleak, awful, and dingy place, an unhomely site for the British subject indeed. One poem in particular, out of quite a few that represent the island in such dull terms, although published eight years later, is interesting for purposes of comparison because it seems to refute all the favorable images that the previous poem produces about the island. The anonymous poem, published in *The Times of Cyprus*, 9 April 1892, is called "A Song of Cyprus" and starts with an epigram that refers to Mallock's *An Enchanted Island*, a favorable and enthusiastic colonial travel book on Cyprus in an ironic gesture that aims to highlight the contrast between the two. Again, quoting the poem in its entirety can provide the reader with a clearer idea of the contrast between the two poems and the contesting discourses they signify. Moreover, it can convey more clearly the opposing visions of 'home' that the two poems help construct: the former renders the island in such benign terms as to encourage its further domestication but also highlights its ancient Greek glory to the extent that the British subject—who poses as the new paragon of civilization—experiences a 'homecoming' when visiting the island; the latter poem swathes the island in such abomination, that it precludes any hope for domestication.

'A SONG OF CYPRUS'
… 'An enchanted Island—'the best climate in
the world'….. 'an ideal life' etc. etc. vide Mallock and others

I. Dust, glare, dank mists, and very
Extreme of heat and chill,
With thieves and curs, and vermin
Are rife on Troad's hill.
The 'bounders' they are many
And decent folk are rare—

Ah! yes, ‘it’s ideal life’
The life we lead out there!!

II. We sigh, we gasp, we swelter
Neath Troad’s blazing sun,
And yet its odds we shiver
Before the day is done;
For when it rains we are soaking
Within our dripping tent,
It’s just the place for fellows
‘On health or pleasure bent’!!

III. Or if you are driven downwards
By rain or heat or fleas,
Try the chief town—you’ll like it
Or you’ll be hard to please—
Thermometer a hundred
And sixteen in the shade,
And eighty—two at midnight—
‘Best climate ever made.’

IV. You never need be lonely
In Nicosia’s walls,
Mosquitoes, bugs, and sandflies
Run riot in her halls.—
The town is very ancient
The smells are ancient too
A legacy of Hellas
Antique but ever new

V. You never need consider
What you will eat or drink,
For appetite is smothered
By all pervading stink,
And should you try for solace
A local cigarette
The remedy you’ll hardly
Be likely to forget!

VI. Our friends who live in London
Well fed, well-housed, well curled,
Say—'Cyprus is delightful—
'Best climate in the world—
'The rides and walks are charming—
'The country is charming too'
Just let them come and see it
This d— —d gigantic 'do—'!!

VII. They say.. 'It's rather distant,
'But if we'd time to spare,
'There is nothing we'd like better
'Than to visit you out there'
Then let them come and try it
But give me half they'd pay
Before they'd spent a week there
Just to get right away!!!

London, February 1892 X.

The bucolic scene that envelops the island in the previous poem and resonates with an allochronic ancient Greece, obfuscating thereby its temporality, is shattered here since, in a particularly sardonic tone, the poem ridicules the island's Hellenistic legacy by equating the 'ancient' with pestilence and degeneration. In this sarcastic poem, emphasis falls on the island's fierce climate, annoying pests, and inadequate food and drink, all of which would make an unhomely experience indeed. The poem leaves no doubt as to where 'home' is. Moreover, it clearly suggests that the island is not worthy of domestication, and the experience of the British subject to the island is not one of 'homecoming' but one of painful exile. The two last stanzas of the poem—where the poet playfully and disingenuously invites "Our friends who live in London/Well fed, well-housed, well curled," ("A Song of Cyprus" The Times of Cyprus 9 April 1892) to come to Cyprus where, as he is claiming, they will not even last a week—seal the image of Cyprus as the undomesticated landscape, in contradistinction to the British 'home' of abundance and warmth.

The contrast between the two poems is one that is pervasive in representations of

the island, not only in literary works such as poems and travel narratives but also in journalistic articles and treatises. Apart from these representations, the Anglophone press of Cyprus included short stories that were written in Britain and bore no direct relationship to the Cypriot context. Irrelevant as they might appear to be, the question remains as to why they were published in the Anglophone press, considering that they were read not only by the British colonial subjects who resided in Cyprus but also by the English-speaking Cypriot literati who were emerging as a reading audience of English. While the stories were probably meant to provide leisure reading, one cannot fail to notice the compelling moralism that permeates them. Indeed, the stories foreground a distinctly staunch patriarchal vision of 'home' as a snug and safe abode that is achieved through the institution of marriage, portraying thus an almost obsessive preoccupation with marriage and Victorian family values. While most of the stories depict marriage as the institution that would ensure the perpetuation of patriarchal values and domestic felicity, there are a couple of stories that subtly question the Victorian values of patriarchal domesticity. Thus, these stories allow us to explore how the theme of 'home' is negotiated and also how these negotiations reflect some tensions within the English rhetoric of empire. These short stories appeared in *The Times of Cyprus*, almost every week for most of the duration of the years of 1893-4. It is indeed interesting how random the inclusion of these literary pieces is, since, neither before nor after this period do we have a consistent succession of short-stories or other literary works included in the paper.

Nevertheless, what is astounding is the consistency, to the point of a fixation, that these stories portray with the themes of marriage and domesticity. Victorian values of domesticity and sexuality came under fierce pressure in the 1880s and 1890s in what George Gissing called the decades of "sexual anarchy" (qtd. in Showalter 3). Indeed, as Showalter argues, it was in this period that the terms 'feminism' and 'homosexuality' first came into use, as "New Women and male aesthetes redefined the meanings of femininity and masculinity" (3). This *fin de siècle* sexual anarchy was accompanied by increased anxiety and fear that these new "emancipated women would bear children outside of marriage in the free union, or worse, that they would not have children at all" (Showalter 3). Apart from the redefinition of sexuality, this period was marked by sexual scandals, both of which, as Showalter argues, "engendered a fierce response in social purity campaigns, a renewed sense of public moral concern, and demands, often successful, for restrictive legislation and censorship… Especially there was a call to reaffirm the importance of marriage as the bulwark against sexual decadence" (3). Evidently, these are

typical anxieties and responses of *fin de siècle* periods, where fears of apocalyptic degeneration engender a stricter polarity of borders, be they sexual, racial, national, or class borders. The fears of racial miscegenation and racial mingling with the 'lower' races that came as part and parcel of imperial adventure and the rise of physical anthropology, whose aim was to legitimize racial differentiation by appealing to scientific positivism, are both testaments of these *fin de siècle* fears, as well as responses of stricter border controls. Indeed, the short-stories that appear in the pages of *The Times of Cyprus* reflect, on the one hand, these border instabilities, turbulences, and anxieties; and on the other, the campaign of reasserting the threatened Victorian values and borders of differentiation through the institution of marriage with its family values of domesticity and sexuality, as well as racial and class differentiation. While most of the stories end in blissful marriage, they follow different plots and thus emphasize different Victorian values before culminating either in the felicitous union or in a dreadful disaster because of the loose morals of the characters which defiled the sacredness of Victorian marriage values. I will refer to three paradigmatic stories: one that celebrates the Victorian gender roles of 'femininity' and 'masculinity', as well as imperial enterprise; one, that forewarns of the dangers of loose morals and sexual promiscuity—attributed to women's dark sexuality—through the eventual calamity that befalls the main character; and one that questions Victorian gender roles and domesticity. My readings intend to illustrate how the theme of domestic felicity is made central in these stories in contesting ways that, on the one hand, reinforce the imperial rhetoric of Victorian domesticity and, on the other, dislocate and de-center it.

The first story called "A Romance of Ramsgate Sands" opens with Mr. Reeves. He is an underwriter at 'Lloyd's' and is anxious about the destiny of a ship called *Honeymoon*—not an accidental name—that he had "heavily underwritten…with a valuable cargo of tea and silk and…[which] was ten days overdue" (The Times of Cyprus 24 January 1894). Mr. Reeves' worry over the fate of the ship is forgotten momentarily when his daughter Miola, who is swimming in the holiday resort of Ramsgate, cries for help as she goes under the sea only to be saved at the last moment by Mr. Willie Forsyth, her most serious suitor, who happened to be passing by. Mr. Forsyth is described as "a gentleman by birth and education," "in physique … a thorough Englishman, as also in 'pluck' and manly qualities." Apart from his good salary, he was also the heir to a decent fortune left to him by his aunt, all of which put him "in as good a position to marry as most of his class." The fear that envelops the beach turns into cries of triumph and praise of Mr. Forsyth's bravery, so that even the formerly unconvinced Mr. Reeves rushes to

congratulate him. At this very moment of fatherly approval, which is more like a blessing to marriage, the pier clock strikes twelve o' clock Greenwich time and the *Honeymoon* is heard to be entering the harbor. The story's end, with the marriage of the two young protagonists, comes to glorify a multiplicity of Victorian values: it reasserts gender roles since the young and vulnerable Miola is in danger no more in the brave and safe hands of Mr. Forsyth, the quintessence of British masculinity; it celebrates imperial enterprise as Mr. Reeves' investment in imperial trade is rewarded by the appearance of *Honeymoon*; and it fortifies class boundaries, since the union of the two young people reaffirms the Victorian value of marrying from one's own class.

Most of the stories indeed follow this pattern of some tribulation of the young protagonists before ending in a blissful marriage. However, there are a few stories which celebrate values of domesticity and the institution of marriage through a reverse plot, where what is chastised is a dark female sexuality steeped in debauchery as well as an emasculated masculinity since they both lead to catastrophe. "Reaping the Whirlwind" is such a story. Mr. Richard Baskerville, or Dick, is an amateur painter who is forced to go back into painting after his father's large fortune is all squandered by his step-mother, "a golden-haired lady, with a bold eye and taste for champagne in tumblers…[whose] business was pleasure" (The Times of Cyprus 14 July 1893 "Reaping the Whirlwind"). Dick and his wife Kitty are in dire straits because of his step-mother's dissolute lifestyle, which does not conform to Victorian values of domesticity and femininity, and thus, Dick, after years, tries his hand at painting once more. After some time of disappointments, he gets a commission for a portrait through the post by a woman he does not know. The woman turns out to be one of his former lovers, Lillie, whom Dick was supposed to marry, but eventually did not. After a long deliberation, Dick accepts to paint her and ends up falling in her arms after a persistent seduction, instigated and orchestrated cunningly by Lillie. Right after the adulterous act Lillie reveals her true intentions, and tells Dick that she wants him to abandon his wife and marry her, before exclaiming to the horror of Dick that if he were to leave her for a second time, "I think I would kill you—and her" (The Times of Cyprus, 14 July 1894 "Reaping the Whirlwind"). Dick, "being a man of strong emotions, and a weak backbone, he was completely miserable" and ends up committing suicide to the utter bewilderment of Kitty, his wife, who closes the story by saying "he was always the best of husbands" (The Times of Cyprus 14 July 1894 "Reaping the Whirlwind"). The tragic end to the story serves as a reminder of the horrors of challenging the established sacred borders of domesticity and sexuality by foregrounding the essential

qualities of each gender for domestic felicity. Lillie's and the step-mother's sexually 'anarchic'—or distinctly non-Victorian—characteristics find no room in these qualities, while Dick's weak backbone and strong emotions fare poorly compared to Willie's "'pluck' and manly qualities" and thorough English composure.

Different to this canonized perspective of marriage as the institution that procures felicity, is a literary essay on the issue that was published in the same paper during this time by Tennessee Chaflin, who later became Lady Cook (17 October 1894). Lady Cook was a known American radical who fought for women's rights and defied various conventions. In the essay, titled "Who Should Propose", Lady Cook questions and disputes some of the most sacred tenets of Victorian values of domesticity. Apart from this literary essay, which I will analyze here in more detail, there are two more essays by Lady Cook that were published around the same time, "Education of the Young" (28 November 1894) and "Honesty" (7 December 1894), which I would like to discuss briefly since while they contest some of the Victorian ideas of imperialism they also collude with imperialism on some others. In "Education of the Young", Lady Cook questions some of the most pious principles of imperial models of education, specifically reproaching the pointlessness of examinations, the standardization of educational curriculum, as well as the rote learning methods in education, though without questioning the colonial belief in the confluence of education and moral progress. Similarly, in "Honesty", she argues about the impossibility of honesty in life, undermining the colonial conceit of scrupulousness and sincerity. It is interesting that amidst this literary corpus of short stories that are predominantly complicit to the piousness of imperial values, there are these stories by Lady Cook that undermine some of them. Indeed, "Who Should Propose" must have been read with horror by some of Lady Cook's contemporaries, especially when she tampers with gender roles. After shattering the romantic image of domestic felicity and the artificiality of the ceremony of courting, Lady Cook, as the story's title suggests, argues that considering that marriage is such a sacred institution in life and determines to such a large extent the happiness of the couple, it should be up to women, too, to propose since "women are far shrewder than men in the matter of sexual choice, and are less governed by passion" (The Times of Cyprus 17 October 1894). She presses her point further by saying that because men and women blindly conform to their expected roles of courtship, they do not reveal their true character and thus end up marrying the wrong people: "Because both masked their failings and displayed their most agreeable qualities and abilities. Because the role of the man was to win, and of the woman to be won. It was his to pursue boldly and hers to coyly retreat.

Thus, he displayed a fictitious courage, and she an artificial modesty, with two wrecked lives as a result" (The Times of Cyprus 17 October 1894). Instead of these "methods that may have been suitable for a barbarous age", Lady Cook insists that women should propose, since "marriage is of more importance to her than to a man" and since "a good woman's happiness centers in her home" (The Times of Cyprus 17 October 1894). While not probing the imperial antinomy that wants women to belong to the private hearth of home and men to be doing the serious business of empire, the story still shocks with questioning some of the parameters of gender roles by casting both masculine courtship and feminine coyness into doubt.

Conclusion

This itinerary through the literary 'topos' of Cyprus in the first years of literary modernity on the island and of British imperial rule reveals a literary terrain of contesting discourses that endeavor to inscribe the Cypriot 'topos' with their own visions of 'home'. Vying for space in the incipient Cypriot topography, we find collisions, collusions, and complicities between patriarchal colonialist discourses, nationalist visions, as well as cosmopolitan, and non-conformist voices, all of which weave a rich fabric of contesting multi-lingualism and multi-perspectivity on the theme of 'home' on the island. English, in this initial phase, inscribes the island with a variety of voices, contributing to a patchwork of contesting and colluding discourses, while also, as a language of empire, it is in itself dislocated by these contestations and collusions. Being a terrain where various ideologies and visions regarding the new colony are inscribed, the English language as 'home', becomes, at times, dislocated and disorientated. While some literary texts during this colonial period extol the virtues of the island and domesticate the foreignness of the new colony in such ways that make the island conducive for the British subject to experience a sense of 'homecoming', others disparage the island and render it unhomely. The next chapter, which explores roughly the same period in the form of travel narratives by British women through the condensed lens of the feminine picturesque, reinforces this dislocation of English, by contesting the alleged omnipotence of imperial authority, the borders of the confluence between 'femininity' and domesticity, as well as the strictures of the genre of imperial romance. Moreover, it shows how the desire to domesticate the island was not necessarily synonymous to a sense of 'homecoming' since the female traveler, even after her implication in the domestication of the island through her aestheticising modality of the feminine picturesque, does not still feel 'at home' in her discourse.

Chapter Two: Women Travellers and the Feminine Picturesque

> The picturesque becomes synonymous with a desire to transfix a dynamic of cultural confrontation into a still life, converting a pictorial imperative into a gesture of self-protection that allows the colonial gaze a license to convert its ability not to see into studiously visual representations. (Suleri 76)

Introduction

Drawing on Scott-Stevenson's *Our Home in Cyprus* (1880), Agnes Smith's *Through Cyprus* (1887) and Mrs. Brassey's *Sunshine and Storm in the East* (1880), this chapter intends to explore the kind of political engagement that the feminine picturesque exemplifies in the colonial context and argue that the genre of the feminine picturesque challenges some established and monolithic views of colonial discourse and of the genre of colonial romance, by adding fresh layers of uncertainty and anxiety to them. Moreover, it aims to illustrate that the production of textual meaning resides at the interplay and imbrications of issues of race, gender, class, and ethnicity, and more specifically at the dislocations of stable meanings produced by such interplay. Lastly, it intends to show how the entrance of women writers in the male homosocial literary space of the new colony obfuscates the neat antinomies of male/colonial adventure/public, on the one hand, and female/colonial domesticity/private, on the other, and thus, adds layers of complexity to the notions of 'home', and 'homecoming'. Indeed, while the sequestering of women travel writers into the feminine picturesque aimed at assuring their confinement within a discourse of femininity and, at the same time intended the perpetuation of the antinomy between male/public and female/private, in essence, it also reinforced the unease that these women felt within such a confining, if not subliminally deranging, space of contesting discourses: being in the public space of the new colonies they were still expected to uphold attitudes of the private realm of domesticity, modesty, and propriety. Interestingly, as Jenkins contends in the context of Victorian women travelers, "Despite their decidedly 'unfeminine' exploits, …women contextualized their actions with culturally appropriate explanations and, in this way, demonstrate the manner by which the 'ideal' of Victorian womanhood was, as Ciolkowshi notes, 'most efficiently created' outside of England (338)"

(18-19).

Mrs. Scott-Stevenson begins her 1880 travel narrative, titled *Our Home in Cyprus* by addressing her mother, and states: "I daresay you will be very much surprised when you hear that I have tried to write an account of our life and riding expeditions in Cyprus. I have been tempted to do so by the fact that the island is still such an unexplored country" (vii). Before closing her introduction, she reminds us for a second time of her aversion to political issues because, as she only too readily admits, "I do not understand these subjects, and would only be repeating the words of others on this point. I reiterate, I have only tried to write *naturally*, and to describe places and scenes which will interest future travellers in Cyprus" (xii, italics in original). In a slightly different manner, but still apologetic, Mrs. Brassey justifies her audacity to publish her narrative *Sunshine and Storm in the East* by relying both on the wider public acceptability of the confessional mode of epistolography for nineteenth century women writers and on her past literary acclaim saying, "I continued my old practice of writing long journal letters home to my father, to be afterwards circulated among other relatives and more intimate friends. The 'Voyage in the Sunbeam' has been so kindly received that I am encouraged to present these letters also to the public" (vii-viii). Perhaps overall somewhat less obedient to the picturesque conventions that nineteenth century women were expected to observe, Agnes Smith, an independent traveler who travels with her female companion around the island in 1887, begins her narrative *Through Cyprus* also with an apologia, saying that "it is just possible that the eyes of two lady travelers may have been able to discern something new and worth telling, albeit they cannot pretend to vie in depth of research with Mr. Lang, nor in antiquarian knowledge with De Cesnola" (1-2).

These apologias for assuming the role of the writer that are pervasive in nineteenth century women's travel narratives, apart from serving to "reassure readers that they would not be competing with men" (Siegel "Intersections: Women's Travel and Theory" 3), also reveal a kind of political engagement with the colonies other than that of the male colonizer. These women are anxious from the outset to highlight their inadequacy to provide political commentaries and thus foreground their collusion with a colonial discourse that sequestered women to the confines of picturesque descriptions. Yet, even such seemingly willing confinement within aesthetic modes of writing cannot immunize them from engaging with political and ideological issues in ways that transgress their prescribed roles. Indeed, behind the unruffled serenity of the picturesque narration, there lurk moments of intense tension and potential violence which the authors do not always

domesticate through their aestheticizing modalities, manifesting thus the profound uncertainty that resides in these texts. Moreover, while evidently eager to rehearse some of the imperial romance forms and features, like the thrills, excitements, and potential hazards of the opened-up zones of the new colonies, these narratives do so from a position of marginality or vicariousness since, unlike the male imperial romance where the male traveler maps, remaps, and 'others' these zones, before he eventually de(feat)s triumphantly the obstacles encountered in these 'othered' zones, the female writer, constricted by the discourses of femininity and domesticity, has to rely on her male colonial companions to achieve such feats and thus, in a seeming obedience, retreats to her picturesque idiom for comfort. Integral as the partnership between romance and imperialism might be in the opening up of lands of mystery, adventure, and 'otherness', this partnership is also ephemeral, since imperialism's need to 'order' and 'remap' the new zones into neat grids for trade, tourism, and investment forces romance writers and other romance-seekers to either become disenchanted with imperialism's methods or to discover 'other' zones of romance that are created by imperialism, such as the espionage adventure zone or the techno-space zones that are created by late imperial romance writers (McClure 2-5). Therefore, imperialism might be 'opening' certain zones for the excitements of romance, but it also creates an anxiety caused by the danger of extinction of these zones by imperialism's obsession with gridding the world. This anxiety is doubly felt by female writers of the nineteenth century, since not only are they witnesses to these disappearing zones of romance, but are also aware of the strictures around them, which render their gender's claim to such incursions inadequate and dubious, and are forced thus to seek comfort in the picturesque. Such retreats to the picturesque, though, should not be misread for obedience, since behind her seeming docility the female writer manipulates language in ways that reveal both the fragility of her discourse as well as the deranging costs of such obedience.

Indeed, the demanding pressures on women travel writers created profound uncertainty, anxiety, and tension in their writing which made them not 'at home' in the discourse they found themselves in. 'Homecoming' for them remained an illusory project since to be 'at home' in colonial discourse meant being confined to aesthetic descriptions and thus being reminded of their own redundancy in the colonial project, whereas being 'at home' in gender and genre meant travelling discursively away from the coziness of the picturesque, since the further they plunged themselves into the picturesque the more they solidified their disempowerment. 'Homecoming' for the nineteenth century British female

travel writer then entailed discursive dislocations or traversing of borders not only of a geographical nature but also of both gender and genre. How much such dislocations and such border transgressions are achieved differs from writer to writer since the appeal of the notion of 'home' as it is constructed by a masculine colonial rhetoric—that excludes the other based on race, whilst perpetuating the confinement of the female in the strictures of femininity and domesticity but ensuring her privilege based on her race—often supersedes the temptation of a struggle for a less exclusive 'home'. This struggle evidently entails a determination to defy the patriarchal vision of 'home' and to engage in an envisioning of more emancipatory 'homes' for women, ones that challenge both racial and gender stereotypes. In order to situate the genre of the feminine picturesque in its proper socio-historical context, I will start with some general remarks about travel and the picturesque. Then, I will explore the relationship between travel and imperialism as well as the insertion of women into this relationship, before proceeding with a discussion of some of the tensions that are produced when women insert themselves into the role of the amateur ethnographer through three paradigmatic texts by British female travellers who write the Cypriot 'topos' with their presence. Lastly, I will analyze the ways that these texts negotiate these tensions and discuss the dislocations and translocations of gender, genre, and colonial discourse on race that result from these negotiations.

Travel and the Picturesque

Looking at the etymological provenance of the word "travel", Kristi Siegel finds that before the eighteenth century and the appearance of the 'Grand Tour', the word was closer in meaning to its Old French root of travailler, or 'to labour', reflecting, thus, the toilsome and gruelling nature of travel, at a time when people travelled more out of necessity rather than in pursuit of pleasure ("Women's Travel and the Rhetoric of Peril: It Is Suicide to Be Abroad" 57). Be that as it may, around the eighteenth century, the nature, purpose, but also significance of travel change. Considering the ubiquity of travel in eighteenth century British literature, James Buzard finds that "it may have owed something to the high degree of acceptance which philosophical empiricism had gained in Britain by the end of the seventeenth century" ("The Grand Tour and after (1660-1840)" 37). The identification of knowledge with experience endowed travelling with a particular significance and enhanced its appeal, as Buzard notes, to the extent that it made "reading about conditions elsewhere…not enough" ("The Grand Tour and after (1660-1840)" 37),

and almost compelled those few who could travel, to do so. Buzard's observations about the pervasive appeal of travelling in British society serve as a theoretical framework for his discussion of the paradigm of the European 'Grand Tour', which entailed travelling to European signposts of civilization as part of the educational polishing and maturing of the young men of the ruling classes during the period that spans from 1660 to 1840. The increasing appeal of travelling and its gradual development from its seventeenth and eighteenth-century 'Grand Tour' character—limited to the few young males of the ruling classes—to the early nineteenth century phenomenon of 'mass tourism', which also saw the emergence of a "new vocabulary of travel experience – that of the 'picturesque'" (Buzard "The Grand Tour and after (1660-1840)" 38) occurred of course in an imperial context, and thus necessitates a few further qualifications.

Buzard's study of the 'Grand Tour' and its ideological significance to the development of discourses that attached themselves to travelling allows us to trace the meanings of some terms that are central to this chapter, such as 'picturesque', 'traveler', 'tourist', 'travel literature'. Indispensable as it might have been for the intellectual, aesthetic, and less publicly-acknowledged sexual development of the young men of the ruling classes for over a century, the 'Grand Tour' came under severe criticism around the middle of the 19th century for a variety of reasons, such as the moral dissolution that travelling away from parental guidance led to, before it lost almost completely its initial character, after it came "within the grasp of 'less socially elevated and less well-educated people' (Brewer, *Pleasures*, p. 632), including women and children" (Buzard "The Grand Tour and after (1660-1840)" 42). As Buzard notes, the eruption of the French revolution and the period of conflict between Britain and France that followed it coincided with the interruption of this somewhat enlarged British travelling to Europe and led to a new paradigm of domestic travel, that was "impelled by several cultural currents, that had been decades in the making" (Buzard "The Grand Tour and after (1660-1840)" 42). What Buzard refers to by 'several cultural currents' is the fascination with and celebration of "the Celtic fringe of Great Britain and, a bit later, new 'Gothic' fantasies about the countries where the dark mysteries of Catholicism held sway" ("The Grand Tour and after (1660-1840)" 43). In time, travel came to be "inextricably bound up with a third strand of cultural and aesthetic attitudes that, like these, opposed Grand-Tour neoclassicism…the *picturesque*" ("The Grand Tour and after (1660-1840)" 45). Indeed, the 'picturesque', as an aesthetic that mediated between the Burkean aesthetic categories of the 'beautiful' and the 'sublime', and despite its indifference to historical, political, or moral considerations—

that paradoxically enough shaped its desirable and much sought-out natural or human sites/sights—emerged against a violent political and historical background of internal colonialism. As Buzard argues, it was only after "the demise of Jacobitism as a viable political force and the dissolution of many Celtic communities in the Highlands of Scotland" ("The Grand Tour and after (1660-1840)" 43), that the Highlands, as the landscape where the Celtic and Gothic revivals were performed, became safe for travelling.

In place of the neoclassic monuments, fertile and verdant landscapes that the European Grand-Tour entailed, the picturesque aesthetic was characterized by profound fluidity, and it was "capable of running the gamut from relatively mild English landscapes to the breathtaking cataracts and chasms of the Alps in stormy weather" (Buzard "The Grand Tour and after (1660-1840)" 45). However, despite its fluidity as an aesthetic category, the picturesque was decidedly anti-classical and celebrated the ruin, the asymmetrical, and the irregular. While similar to the Burkean 'beautiful', the 'picturesque' was "freed from traditional views of beauty and decorum and demanded on the part of the beholder a certain sophisticated appreciation for that which was novel and unconventional" (Bermingham 89). Significantly, the picturesque, as an aesthetic that valued the decorative details and the ornamental features of its objects, with a purpose, "as Gilpin so often noted, to 'please', 'delight', and 'amuse' the Picturesque eye and not to challenge the intellect" (Bermingham 84), was rendered "all surface and thus all femininity" (Bermingham 89). Bermingham illustrates how the imprecision of the picturesque and its appreciation for the unconventional, and thus not for the universal, en(gendered) a certain type and kind of cultivation, where the picturesque eye had to be trained to spot and appreciate the picturesque sight/site (91-92). This scopophilic refinement, of course, was more conducive to men, since the picturesque object was already feminized. Thus, a form of tension is created when women tried to fit into the almost irreconcilable roles of being "both a connoisseur and an object of connoisseurship" (Bermingham 92). This, evidently, does not mean that the picturesque eye was a male prerogative; rather, it comes to explain the overwhelming presence of women as objects of ridicule associated with the picturesque fad that developed at the time (Bermingham 92). Moreover, it begs the question whether indeed the women as travellers fitted unproblematically into the picturesque, as it has been argued (Suleri), or whether in time, the picturesque had undergone such change as to be rendered more conducive to women than it initially was. In any case, while perhaps one of the few available and socially sanctioned literary genres for women travellers in the empire, and certainly more open to women than the scientific, political, or military

commentary, the picturesque was not wholly devoid of its own tensions when women assumed the picturesque gaze. These tensions become evident in the three texts about Cyprus that I will discuss below, since while the picturesque affords some safety by its submission to the broader male colonial discourse, its contours cannot contain the desire of the female writer to assume the male colonial position.

Despite the criticism and ridicule that the spreading of the picturesque amongst the masses brought about—particularly toward women bearers of the picturesque eye— as Buzard speculates, the "very imprecision of the term seems to have aided its dissemination" ("The Grand Tour and after (1660-1840)" 47). The popularization of the picturesque, which was aided by its fluidity and elusiveness as an aesthetic category, created what Buzard calls the "rage for the picturesque" or "picturesque hunters" ("The Grand Tour and after (1660-1840)" 46), which, in combination with technological and institutional developments brought about the phenomenon of mass tourism. Indeed, as Bermingham argues, the popularization of the picturesque brought about its commercialization. Picturesque tourists travelled in suitable costumes with a variety of knick-knacks such as telescopes, magnifying glasses, and compasses required for the picturesque experience, and thus turned the common traveller into a "Picturesque-Tourist" (86-87). Whereas the Grand-Tour was exclusive to the aristocratic circles, picturesque touring "was suited to the pockets and moral sensibilities of the middle classes" and turned Britain into "what the continent had been for the wealthy, that is, a spectacle to be consumed" (Bermingham 86). Nevertheless, the phenomenon of picturesque touring which developed into mass tourism, with its middle-class character, brought about as a reaction to its middle-class character the revival of the old specific ideals of the 'Grand Tour' and "created the honorific sense of 'traveller', which means essentially 'the one who is not a *tourist*'" (Buzard "The Grand Tour and after (1660-1840)" 49). Indeed, the increasing democratization of travel engendered and gradually sharpened the distinction between the 'tourist' and the 'traveller', the latter embodying the attitude of the flaneur in his anti-tourist orientations (Hulme 7). This distinction is crucial indeed in the development of the genre of 'travel writing', since mass tourism made possible—and in turn was made possible—by the advent of the guidebooks, which had "the collateral effect of sharpening the definition and purpose of their texts' opposites, the personal travelogues, which, freed from the guidebook burden, could now specialize in recording an individual traveller's distinctive reactions to the stimuli of the tour" (Buzard "The Grand Tour and after (1660-1840)" 49). The expanding popularity of travel writing that came with

scientific and ethnographic exploration, as well as with the political and military colonization of the 'New World', and which culminated in the nineteenth century, was to be continued in the twentieth century, but with an important difference: the investment of known writers in writing about their travels transformed travel writing to travel literature (Hulme 7).

While having its origins in domestic British touring, and specifically the Scottish Highlands, as has been already noted, the picturesque as an aesthetic category was instrumental also in the larger imperial project. In terms of literary narratives, the picturesque, even within the British domestic touristic context, is implicated in colonial discourses. As Stephen Copley and Peter Garside argue, "in the case of the Scottish Highlands, for instance, the combination of political repression, economic exploitation, and aesthetic sentimentalisation of the Scottish landscape in the early nineteenth century clearly renders the Picturesque 'invention' of the region a hegemonic cultural manifestation of the English colonizing presence" (6-7). The picturesque habits of representation or 'invention' of aesthetically pleasing objects of viewing, whether in terms of nature or people, were inextricably bound with the suppression of the political, historical, and ideological considerations that related to these objects, and thus, the picturesque aesthetic rendered itself easily conducive to the imperial project of representing the new colonies, particularly in the cases where the exotic and picturesque nature of these colonies was integral in their tourist marketing. It is of interest that similar to the genre of imperial romance, where representing the zones of imperial romance meant at the same time their effacement (McClure 2), the picturesque ran the risk of jeopardizing its own object of viewing since, by representing the picturesque site/sight, it elicited attention to it, and thus unwittingly contributed to its commercialization and eventually its transformation, if not effacement. This paradox of the imperial romance and the picturesque is not unrelated to the nostalgia for the fast-disappearing organic totality of the former colonies, which is found throughout literary narratives in the colonial and postcolonial eras. Be that as it may, the politics of the picturesque—and specifically the politics of the feminine picturesque—in the imperial project are better understood by looking first at the broader implications of travel writing in the colonial context.

Travel Writing in the Colonial Context

Travel and writing are inextricably related, since the travails, frissons, and knowledge that come with travelling remain unknown, unless documented and subsequently acknowledged, evaluated, and cherished by an audience. The archetypal travellers Odysseus, Aeneid, or the more contemporary Robinson Crusoe testify to this connection. Similarly, writing as an iterative and itinerating process bespeaks of contours, outlines, off the beaten-track routes and roads as well as travails that ring familiar in travel's ears. Indeed, the very essence and purpose of writing is its dissemination. In the imperial context, this connection was further fortified since commercial and political institutions and sponsors demanded documentation of travels in the form of maps, reports, and other forms of data about the new places from the travellers (Hulme 3). Moreover, the stories that travelled back from these journeys to the faraway places brought 'home' "a sense of curiosity, excitement, adventure, and even moral fervour about European expansionism", (Pratt 3). They thus became catalysts for further travelling, investment, exploration, and colonization of these new places. Indeed, European economic and political expansion in the 'New World' which started in the fifteenth century and culminated in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was facilitated by, and at the same time gave an impetus to, travel writing. As Mary-Louise Pratt argues, "travel books written by Europeans about non-European parts of the world created the imperial order for Europeans 'at home' and gave them their place in it" (3). Travel books in the imperial context, and especially from the eighteenth century onwards, became very popular and more numerous, and the more they spoke about the non-European world, the more they produced, invented, formed it, and othered it for European audiences and in the European imagination, while at same time achieving the creation of "the 'domestic subject' of empire" (Pratt 3). The travel writing that was produced during this period of European expansion is, of course, not homogeneous in content, intention, or form but rather reflects the various 'domestic' institutions' concerns, objectives, preoccupations, biases, and anxieties. As Roy Bridges reflects in his study of British imperialism and travel writing, "Trade, diplomacy, missionary endeavour, and scientific exploration might all contribute to the British expansion and each produced its own travel writing" (53). In spite of its heterogeneity, though, travel writing, to a great extent, was complicit with the imperial project and contributed to it by creating a discourse around it, as Said argues in the context of European 'Orientalism' in the Middle East, that produced it and, thus, contributed to its

domination. Said insists that "without examining Orientalism as a discourse, one cannot possibly understand the enormously systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage—and even produce—the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post-Enlightenment period" (*Orientalism* 3). The first travel accounts of Cyprus by British travellers are part of this systematic discipline that not only produces Cyprus and the Cypriots in the European imagination and for European consumption, but also produces Britain as the enlightened nation and the British traveller as the legitimate representative of this legacy.

Despite its methodological systematicity, and overall scientific and military superiority (or perhaps because of them), European colonialism entailed also various forms of anxiety that were reflected in travel writing. Indeed, apart from the anxieties and uncertainties that individual nations felt regarding their own power vis-à-vis other European colonial powers and about Western progress, or the idea of progress itself, colonialism brought about fears and anxieties about formerly clear distinctions, which now came under serious consideration, if not intense doubting. As Carr argues, "transculturation, miscegenation, the barbarism necessary to impose rule – all conspired to make the question of who was the savage and which the civilized a disturbing one to answer" (73). Colonialism brought about the proximity of distant others and engendered an anxiety in the imperial 'domestic subject', whose own self-identity and assurance started coming under doubt. The anxiety caused by such proximity is reflected in travel accounts in various ways, and the field of post-colonial studies, following Said's example of taking travel writing seriously and analyzing it, has invested travel writing with critical attention in a project to "decolonize knowledge, history, and human relations" (Pratt 3). This effort of decolonization that Pratt refers to does not limit itself to issues of race and ethnicity that are generally foregrounded in the colonial context. Rather, it refers to acts of reading that look at the imbrications of these issues with issues of gender and class, since that is where hegemony resides, that is, at the intersections and imbrications of these issues. While significant in our understanding of colonialism and its discourses, or of colonialism as discourse, I think that such investments in acts of reading for de-colonization, need to be sobered by reminders of broader political considerations that are not in the least perturbed by such acts of reading. In other words, despite the achievements of postcolonial studies in unveiling hegemonic discourses, colonialism and imperialism continue to thrive in renewed configurations, forcing us to be circumspect in our celebrations of the potentialities of postcolonial readings and writings.

Travel Writing and Women

Travel writing of the early colonial period, despite its heterogeneity, was not only instrumental in colonialism but was also predominantly associated with a male discourse. Susan Bassnett observes that "The essence of adventure lies in taking risks and exploring the unknown, so it is hardly surprising to find that early travel accounts tended for the most part to be written by men, who moved more freely in the public sphere" (225). The entrance of women into the public sphere through travelling and writing was from the beginning bound to vie with a gendered discourse that associated men with adventure, exploration, and discovery and women with domesticity and modesty. While it is crucial to avoid the essentialism of implying that women's travel writing is *a priori* different to men's travel writing (Bassnett 227), the question still remains whether women's travel writing exhibits different features and characteristics when compared to that of men. This question becomes further convoluted when it is applied to the colonial context, where the issue of gender is inevitably intersected by race. Considering the overwhelming complicity of male travel writing with the colonial mission, and the identification of colonial discourse with a male subject, we need to ask whether women's travel writing about the empire has a different status and a different perspective. This question conceals a significant ideological assumption: that women, being subjugated or colonized at home by a patriarchal institution, when travelling to the empire, would extend feelings of empathy and kinship towards those colonized by race and/or patriarchy and thus create explicit or implicit resistance to patriarchal colonialism in their narratives (Blake 19). Taking stock of these pitfalls and presumptions that characterized early feminist scholarship (Bassnett 227), many recent studies have brought to light interesting and thought-provoking analyses of women's travel writing in the imperial context. Indeed, if gender matters, it "matters in a way that is irreducibly complex" (Siegel "Intersections: Women's Travel and Theory" 1). It is in this light that I chose to read travel narratives by women in the context of Cyprus, since they exemplify tensions that are revealing of the precariousness of the female voice within the context of imperialism.

One of the most important contributions of recent scholarship of women's travel writing in the imperial context is the acknowledgement of the diversity of writing that characterizes it. This contribution challenges at least two myths: that women are a singular category and that those who recorded their travels were, in one or another way, exceptional

females. This myth marginalizes women's writing by "the setting of a benchmark against which women can be measured" (Bassnett 228-29). While the idea of a woman traveler in the public sphere of the empire that was vastly dominated by men was certainly a novelty, women travelled under various guises and reflected various identities that related to differences of social class (not all women who travelled were middle-class), age, marital status, religious fervour, etc. These variations in their identities reflect subtle and conspicuous differences of styles, preoccupations, biases, intentions, but also anxieties that warrant interpretations that do not conflate them into a single, unitary category. Nevertheless, important as it might be to acknowledge this diversity of women's writing and work within such contours, it should never escape us that these women wrote in a vastly dominated male homosocial world.

As Bassnett observes, the "history of travel writing is linked to the history of mapping and surveying" (231), which were integral processes in the appropriation of new lands. Considering also that the new lands were depicted in female sexual images as virgin lands lying dormant, awaiting penetration and cultivation by male explorers, adventurers, and other colonial experts, few available roles were left for women to travel and little space to inscribe their experience. Entering a literary space that not only denied them unproblematic insertion to the roles of scientists, explorers, or military personnel but also framed them into the binary of either the obedient memsahib or the crazy spinster (Buzard "Victorian Women and the Implications of Empire" 443), the women who chose to document their travels did so aware of their own redundancy. In the intensely gendered colonial space, women as travellers/writers were sequestered within the aestheticizing pleasures of sketching and describing picturesque landscape and human sights/sites. Yet, considering the historical gendered legacy of the picturesque, as well as its paradoxical relation to the historical and the political—in depending on them for its creation while ruthlessly ignoring their complicity in its manifestation—the feminine picturesque emerges as a highly ambivalent discourse, one that colludes with colonialism while at the same time undermining it by revealing the cracks in its masculine and allegedly assured rhetoric. For instance, all three travel narratives on Cyprus that I discuss in this chapter manifest obedience to the picturesque conventions afforded to them. Yet, there are moments when they transgress such policed boundaries and engage in socio-political commentaries. These transgressions, fleeting as they might be, reveal the anxiety of the female traveller caused not only by her realization of her confinement, but also by her fear of too much proximity to the local others.

Sara Mills argues that western women have featured in colonial representations mostly as symbols of home, modesty, and purity, but not as agents, despite the prolificacy of women's travel literature (58). Indeed, the narratives written by women in the late 19th century, which marks the first years of colonial rule in Cyprus, are significant documents of a different kind of political engagement compared to the conventional male colonial travel literature. British women enter the space of empire from a position of a split (colonizers in race, colonized in gender), being not 'at home' in the imperial discourse of a patriarchal colonial power that colonizes them in terms of gender but expects them to bolster the colonial mission from prescribed positions that remain within the strictures of domesticity and femininity. Indeed, the entrance of women into the male homosocial world is marked by an uncertainty exemplified in the subliminal tensions between the seeming placidness of the picturesque descriptions on the one hand, and the relentless awareness of the fragility of authority of these narratives, imposed by the limited role for women in the colonial context, on the other. As Sara Suleri argues, the genre of the picturesque was the only available literary genre for women in the context of colonialism since it aestheticised, and, thereby domesticated, issues pertaining to the colonial encounter, such as fear and anxiety of cross-cultural contact as opposed to offering socio-political commentaries and analyses (75). In other words, the picturesque manifests a collusion with the prescribed roles for women in colonialism: when agency was afforded, it was only within clearly delineated means of expression, and while, the feeling of not being 'at home' in a clearly masculine colonial discourse is compensated by endeavours to domesticate the 'foreign' through the picturesque idiom. To state it as clearly as possible, women pretend that they are 'at home' in the picturesque, which is the only afforded genre to them, but in actuality, they are not. It is in this light that I read a collusion of women's narratives with the patriarchal colonial discourse that they are expected to uphold in maintaining the gendered discourse of colonialism. Such acts of secrecy though, apart from further sequestering women in the confines of domesticity, also conceal a profound anxiety caused by an awareness that the cultural difference that is domesticated could also pose an unread cultural threat. Moreover, such anxiety posits itself peculiarly vis-a-vis the conventional male colonial authority, particularly at this historical moment when the latter expends itself in demonstrations of cultural superiority and power. Indeed, as Suleri argues, the feminine picturesque constitutes a site where the British woman attempts to raise and suppress questions about her own confinement in such aesthetic modalities, as well as her own implication in structures of colonialism, converting the feminine

picturesque, "from its status as confessedly 'minor art' into a dense tale of colonial incertitude" (76). While being complicit with colonial structures, women's entrance into the colonial contact zone with its austerely observed gendered boundaries, their adoption of the role of "amateur ethnographers" (Suleri 75), reveals a more complicated political engagement.

When reading the feminine picturesque in the context of colonial discourse on Cyprus, one is confronted with constant reminders of uncertainty that pertain to the following questions: to what extent is the discourse of the British female travel writer part of colonialism in Cyprus? How much does her picturesque aesthetic collude with the colonial mission and at the same time in her own confinement within her own discourse? Is her confinement an absolute one or does it allow for a space of inscribing difference? To what degree does her anxiety regarding her own discourse in colonialism as well as her fear of cultural difference or proximity alter the overall colonial discourse? Are the three texts selected here paradigmatic of the larger corpus of female narratives on Cyprus? Such questions warrant readings that are attendant to the texts' ideological implications, apart from their aesthetic considerations.

Bakhtin, Hybridity, and Textual Uncertainty

Mikhail Bakhtin's discussion of hybridity in the novel can be very helpful for understanding the provenance of this kind of uncertainty that the feminine picturesque reveals, particularly his discussion on the coexistence of different, and often opposing discourses within the same work, or even within the same utterance. He defines hybridization as "a mixture of two social languages within the limits of a single utterance, between two different linguistic consciousnesses, separated from one another by an epoch, by social differentiation or by some other factor" (Bakhtin 358). Apart from the organic, unintentional hybridization which is an integral mode of language evolution and happens to all languages, there is also the artistic hybridization, which Bakhtin foregrounds, since it is a conscious and intentional process whereby the author inscribes the language with a difference. In Bakthin's words, it refers to the ways authors "introduce into the potentialities of language itself their own actualizing language-intention" (359-60). This intentional hybridizing process is a dialogic one, wherein "two points of view are not mixed, but set against each other dialogically" (360), in a process orchestrated by the author, where "they consciously fight it out on the territory of the utterance" (360). The

outcome of such a dialogic encounter between two often contesting points of view, two epochs, or two social forces, is, as Bakhtin asserts, "an indissoluble concrete unity that is contradictory, multi-speeched and heterogeneous" (365). Indeed, reading the feminine picturesque in the colonial context, one is relentlessly confronted with such hybridity of contesting voices: an imperial and Orientalist attitude, on the one hand, and an uncertain and anxious voice regarding its own status vis-à-vis a masculine imperialism and cross-cultural encounters, on the other. As Suleri rightly observes, "the feminine picturesque develops as a peculiarly dual discourse: on one level, it is obedient, and follows the strictures of sentimentality in complete acceptance of its own minority status. On a more subversive level, it manipulates the language of the picturesque to lend a new violence to fragility, implicitly questioning the symbolic relevance of women to a colonial discourse" (78).

Scott-Stevenson's *Our Home in Cyprus*

At this point, I would like to turn my attention to the three travel narratives. While all subsumed into a general picturesque mode, they also reveal important differences in their negotiation of their own implication in colonial structures as it is revealed in their handling of issues of a military or political nature, as well as their overall stance in cross-cultural encounters. Their personal circumstances explain some of these differences, for whilst Mrs. Scott-Stevenson, the wife of the Assistant-Commissioner of Kyrenia, needs to camouflage any urge to engage with political issues in the serenity of the picturesque because of her husband's position in the colonial government, Agnes Smith, being an independent traveller, feels somewhat less confined by the strictures of the picturesque, and armed with a missionary righteousness, often breaches more openly than her married counterparts the conventions of her aesthetic by offering socio-political commentaries, though without failing to retreat to the safety of the picturesque after each foray. Not surprisingly, when engaging in socio-political analyses, Agnes Smith's narrative substitutes the calm of the picturesque with the composure and assurance of her missionary doctrine, manifesting its complicity with the broader colonial rhetoric. Somewhat different to both, Mrs. Brassey, the wife of Lord Brassey, a wealthy English parliamentarian, is caught between, a) an assurance lent to her by her upper-class status, or what Levine called "a modicum of traditional English superiority" (qtd in. Jenkins 16), which allows her to

make authoritative statements that intrude into colonial affairs; and b) an awareness of propriety and modesty expected of a woman of her class, which keep her in check in these incursions into male colonial affairs and thus envelop her discourse in an idiom of dubiety. Be that as it may, despite their differences, all narratives confine themselves for the most part to the strictures of the picturesque, a confinement that in its attempt to domesticate the difference of the new colonies ensures the authors' own confinement within their own idiom. Such gestures of domestication of cultural difference through aestheticization cannot be performed without allowing some anxiety posed by an unread cultural threat to intrude in the narrative, and such anxiety reveals a fragility that bestows the alleged cultural other with a potential power. In other words, the entrance of women into the male homosocial realm that domesticates the difference and threat of the new colony through aestheticization comes with an increasing necessity for protection, since it functions as a constant reminder of colonialism's vulnerability, adding fresh layers of uncertainty to colonial discourses.

In *Our Home in Cyprus,* Esme Scott-Stevenson seems to be determined from the outset to convince her reader that she found the island particularly pleasing. Reading her narrative closely though, we realize that her determination to present us with an aesthetically pleasing experience, has more to do with the imperatives of her genre rather than her actual experience which is fraught with moments of intense fear of cultural difference or proximity, a proximity that she unsurprisingly tries hard to suppress. Even when her husband is required to attend to affairs pertaining to his position as a colonial officer, our author, who never fails to accompany him, subsumes these events into a more general picturesque narration, domesticating thereby their potential violence. However, despite her unwillingness to address these events openly, she often casts her picturesque mode into uncertainty by allowing moments of fear to invade it, revealing thereby the deep anxiety that preoccupies her in these cross-cultural encounters. Her narrative reads like an attempt at adventure romance, highlighting the virginity of the places she visits, since they had not been prior visited by other Englishmen, and endeavouring to map the new colony with her presence. Yet, in a curious fashion, her adventure/imperial romance is achieved more due to her husband's alleged feats of virility rather than because of her own adventurous deeds. For instance, she informs us that, while riding towards the village of Lefkoniko, two Greek-Cypriots who assumed she was alone, drove some of their animals right against her, almost causing her fall. In a language not dissimilar to that of colonial romance, she says that "My husband came in sight just in time, galloping and cracking his

whip in an ominous manner; and in a second the cowardly Greeks were off their saddles, and ran away, leaving their ponies to their fate" (Scott-Stevenson 286). While evidently intending to extol her husband's virility and gallantry, she implicitly also draws attention to her own powerlessness, and, thereby, to the emerging (male) colonial anxiety about the increasing necessity for protection that the presence of women in the colonies had begot. Moreover, her narration adds a new layer of complexity to the genre of colonial romance since the female as traveller, confined to the domesticity of her femininity, experiences the thrill of romance only vicariously, through her husband's feats.

The serenity of her picturesque is further disturbed when they arrive late at night at the village of Platres and cannot find the landlady of a house promised to them by a colonial officer. When the villagers tell them that they do not have any provisions to give them, her husband resorts to aggression, an aggression that arrests her picturesque narration: "He told them, through the interpreter that he was a Pasha, and would have them all sent to Nicosia, where if needful, the Governor would deport them to another country. This had its effect. We had left our zaptieh at Zie, and they had probably taken us for nobodies. Now a great hubbub arose. They all began to talk, to whimper, and finally to quarrel amongst themselves" (Scott-Stevenson 235). After rousing the whole village and intimidating them to submission, her husband "unceremoniously entered each house he came to and found a plentiful supply of everything" (Scott-Stevenson 236). Instead of perhaps seeing the peasants' refusal to cooperate as an act of resistance, the author, in one of the few times she offers a social commentary, chooses to see it as a gesture indicating lack of hospitality. Yet, faithful to the strictures of her picturesque mode and its overall serenity, she is eager to tell us that this village is simply an exception to the generally impeccable Cypriot hospitality. Despite her determination to remain within pleasing depictions of her travels in Cyprus, this incident, along with many others, reveal her inability to do so, while at the same time, implicitly acknowledging the inevitable cultural terror and anxiety that were attendant to these moments of cross-cultural confrontation. This latter acknowledgment of colonial anxiety caused by these cross-cultural contacts comes to implicitly question the alleged colonial omnipotence by bestowing a potential power on the locals. Indeed, the ostensible composure of her picturesque seems to be constantly discomposed by an undercurrent of anxiety caused by the inevitable cultural contact with the locals. Furthermore, her husband's metamorphosis into a Pasha, with the intention of commanding respect in the locals, echoes with the ambivalence at the heart of colonial authority that Bhabha speaks about ("Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of

Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree Outside Delhi, May 1817" 156), which springs from its hybrid nature and which needs to rely on a different identity in order to achieve its purposes, and thus undermines its own myth of authenticity and purity. Such fraudulent lies, in effect, expose the self-righteous colonial myth of the colonizer as a paragon of integrity and justice, and the colonized as a creature of deception and duplicity.

Shortly after the departure of the local regiment from Kyrenia, where their home is, she says that, "on awakening, I experienced a curious feeling of freedom. I felt for once in my life that I was queen of all I surveyed—that we were absolutely on our own master and mistress, no one to have to obey. The feeling was not only curious, but exhilarating, for I never felt in better spirits in my life" (Scott-Stevenson 69). Less curious for us is perhaps the fact that, even when she assumes the male discourse of ruling over what she sees, she undermines her own claim to such a position by claiming, at the same time, a dubious feeling of freedom from obedience when colonial rule was expending itself in displays of colonial authority based on obedience. Such conflicting statements reveal the deep anxiety at the heart of her narrative. In addition, her exhilaration is only short-lived since her fantasy of being queen of all she surveyed is disturbed by the approach of a cavalcade, only to remind her that she was not as alone as she thought that she was, since apart from Englishmen, the place was, less curiously, inhabited by locals too. After desperately trying to domesticate the threat posed by the man leading the cavalcade, a Greek called Spero, by calmly telling us that "This celebrity deserves more than a passing word" (70), she informs us that he was reported to have been involved in a murder of an Englishman by some brigands, adding that "I never went anywhere afterwards with him as guide without making my husband take his revolver; and I saw old Spero looking askance at it" (70-71). While an object of displaying colonial power, her husband's revolver operates also as a reminder of the cultural fear that the author has allowed to ruffle her otherwise tranquil narrative, adding new layers of fear and uncertainty to the overall colonial encounter that come to question the alleged omnipotence of colonial power. Moreover, by unveiling her picturesque repose and allowing the exposure of her fragility, the author here implicitly questions the symbolic relevance of women to the colonial discourse. In other words, the ruffling of her picturesque becomes synonymous with a reminder that her fragility cannot come without a questioning of her cultural redundancy.

Written at roughly the same time as Mrs. Brassey's *Sunshine and Storm in the East*—both were published in 1880—it is rather peculiar that the two narratives arrive at diametrically opposed viewpoints regarding the severity of fever on the island. As we will

see later on, while Mrs. Brassey in her narrative allows fever in the army to assume feverish proportions and to become a trope that subtly undermines her picturesque idiom as well as the larger colonial discourse, Scott-Stevenson seems less willing to abandon her picturesque idiom in such a conspicuous fashion and to allow such explicit incursions into male colonial affairs, and chooses to dismiss it altogether from the outset, saying, "Fever is *unknown* in this district this year. I have the doctor's authority for saying that he has not heard of one real case of fever yet, and all the peasants tell me the same…I am perfectly convinced the fever was an epidemic all over the Mediterranean last year; and even here, the illness was greatly exaggerated" (Scott-Stevenson x, emphasis in original). Aware of the danger of navigating such rough waters where colonial affairs stand like rocks, Scott-Stevenson chooses to stir away from them and remain within the placid waters of the picturesque idiom.

However important the divergence of the two narratives on the issue of fever is, it is eclipsed by the two narratives' full convergence on their treatment of local women, since they both vilify their appearance. Mrs. Brassey laments the fact that the sight of Cypriot women is not "even picturesque" since "Venus certainly has not left behind much of her beauty as a legacy to this her favourite isle. The women have almost all good eyes and features, but bad complexions, teeth, and figures" (297). The superciliousness and ample sense of superiority that her statement entails—an unjustified sense of superiority if we take seriously Governor Wolseley's comment about her as "very plain woman" (qtd. in Mitsi 122), are not only matched, but even surpassed by Scott-Stevenson, who decides to provide concrete and tangible evidence of her superior English beauty to both her readers as well as to the Cypriot women, by employing her looking-glass. After describing Cypriot women as "perfect hags, looking old before they are twenty, from exposure to the sun, hard work, and coarse food" (Scott-Stevenson 246), she extends her sympathy to them, not for the long and arduous hours they spend in the fields, but instead—faithful to her picturesque—for their lack of mirrors that does not allow them to care for themselves. In perhaps the most telling incident in the book, she says that "I made one of them look at her face side by side with mine in my glass. When she saw the difference in our complexions she was astonished, and stroked down my cheeks, then felt her own, and shook her head quite puzzled" (247). The ascription of the difference in complexion between the narrator and Cypriot women to the latter's lack of a mirror, and, by insinuation, to personal care, serves as a metonymy of English superiority via the whiteness of the narrator's face. Further, such blindness to the effects of work under the

fierce Cypriot sun, apart from upholding the image of "the face of colonial authority…[as] white and clean" (Mitsi 122), and corroborating the Burkean standards of beauty, also points to a moment of collusion of the idiom of the feminine picturesque with colonial authority. Oppressed by fear of proximity to the local women, our female writers choose to distance themselves from them by assuming the authoritative colonial male gaze and attain their subjecthood by reproducing what Trinh T. Minh-ha referred to as the trope of "despising others like himself" (qtd in. Jenkins 20), since as Jenkins argues, "Identity is most secure for the traveller or colonizer by establishing and maintaining difference" (20). Although, the former statement is true for identity-construction processes in general, the latter is certainly heightened by race in the imperial context. Such moments confirm the idea that these journeys were also quests of self-identity that brought about "definitions of selves less possible in England" (Jenkins 15) and corroborate the argument that the English woman as an authoritative subject was constructed first in the colonies and then in England.

When Scott-Stevenson senses that her picturesque narrative is coming to an end, she decides to embellish it with a few sociological remarks regarding the differences between the Cypriots. Yet, her desire to catalogue the Cypriots into a neat picturesque grid ends up revealing her utter inability to see what she so eagerly sets out to describe, manifesting precisely what the epigraph to this chapter maintains. Confusing and conflating the Cypriots, Greeks, and Turks at times, while separating them at others, she only manages to convey her own biased feelings against the Christians of the island who are allegedly antagonistic to British rule because of the Church's infiltration by Russian spies. Yet, such socio-political commentaries are dangerous to sustain, so our author makes sure to return to the safety of her picturesque aesthetic before closing her narrative. After providing a detailed account of the fair of a saint, with a special focus on the dresses and jewellery of a Circassian family, she tells us that "My little book is finished; yet I feel loth to cease writing of the place and people I have grown to love so dearly" (313). Indeed, loth she feels to cease writing, for she decides against it, saving her most picturesque depiction for the end where she narrates the mysterious event surrounding the "Wild Man of Kyrenia", a narration that has very little to do with mystery and much more with a picturesque description of a man of wilderness. Secure in the conventions of the picturesque, she now feels less loth to cease writing and closes her narrative with another quasi-apologia: "during these months not the least pleasure has been the thought that some day I may induce, by the perusal of this book, others to come out to try for themselves if I

have failed in one point, or deviated from in any respect from the truth, in doing justice to what I hope will again be called 'Cyprus the blest, the happy, and the beautiful'" (317). The end seals the collusion of the picturesque with the colonial project: our writer as amateur ethnographer entertains the pleasure of having contributed to the publicity of the new colony as a place for British tourism and investment. Successful as our author wishes this collusion to be, her narrative tells a different story too, one where the woman as amateur ethnographer, questions her own symbolic relevance in a patriarchal colonial rhetoric, by allowing fear and anxiety to enter her narrative, adding, thus, layers of uncertainty and ambivalence both to her genre as well as to the alleged omnipotence of colonial discourse.

Agnes Smith's *Through Cyprus*

Agnes Smith in her narrative *Through Cyprus* is somewhat more sober than Scott-Stevenson and does not regard pleasure as highly as the latter. Without openly contesting the role afforded to her as an amateur ethnographer, she uses the language of her picturesque aesthetic to implicitly question women's redundancy in colonialism. Aware of the male stereotype of the presence of women in the colonial context as objects of distraction, since they could consume men's energies that are better spent on colonial affairs, the author suggests occupations for women that do not infringe on men's energies, such as instruction in scripture and water-colour drawing. Agnes Smith does not only write these suggestions but also puts them into practice, since her entire narrative reads more like a series of cross-cultural encounters where she sets out to prove Christianity's superiority to other religions, and particularly to Islam. While obviously colluding with the afforded peripheral roles for women in colonialism, Agnes Smith's narrative also probes the borders of these roles by engaging more amply and assuredly in socio-political commentary, while unfailingly seeking the safety of the picturesque after each of these comments, thus revealing her reluctance to openly challenge the gendering of colonial discourse as a male discourse.

This constant movement between picturesque descriptions and socio-political commentaries, apart from revealing the author's implicit questioning of the gendering of colonial discourse, also adds another layer of complexity and uncertainty to the genre of colonial romance. For example, while on a tour to the monastery of St. Barnabas, the author and her entourage come to a stream, and the author says, "Very soon we came to a

bit of black mud, through which a stream flowed lazily. The stream did not seem deep, and Violet was prepared to follow Georgie across as his old white horse stepped in" (Smith 115). Instead of leading into a perilous or aggressive moment, the suspense and tension created by the description evaporate into the outrage of the two ladies about the state of their bags: "It was provoking, too, to see that those of our bags and rug-cases which had been slung across Georgie's saddle, and which we took a pride in keeping clean, were in a state too dirty to contemplate with patience" (116). Rather than stressing her exploits in the new colony, the author draws attention to her and her companion's domesticity, manifesting that the inscription of the female voice as amateur ethnographer adds a different layer of complexity to the genre of colonial romance. While eager to assume an imperial voice and offer direct political commentaries, the author is relentlessly aware of the uncertainty of her own claim and thus retreats deeper into the picturesque, after such breaches of femininity, engendering a profoundly Bakhtinian hybrid discourse. Yet, by confining her narrative into a picturesque depiction, she is also ensuring her own confinement into her own discourse and her own self-censorship. Moreover, such self-confinement renders dubious her discourse on women's liberation. In Chapter 8, called "Trikomo to Kythrea," the author and her companion find some women by their tents. After fixing them into her picturesque aesthetic, telling us that they "were neither so pretty nor so tastefully dressed as the women of Greece, but they had handsome gold necklaces", she proceeds to engage them in some conversation. She asks them if they have a school, and, in getting a negative response, she admonishes the locals that "'if your girls don't learn, they will be behind the women of Greece, and of England too'" (Smith 129). Aware of the presence of local men in the vicinity, she drives her point a bit further saying "I then insisted on the fact that they would be much happier as wives and mothers if they not only knew how to cook well, but could interest themselves to some degree in their husband's self-pursuits;" (129). While not openly contesting the Englishwoman's role in colonialism, her comment probes its limits and implicitly questions the peripheral location of the Englishwoman in the colonial context. Subversive as her questioning of women's position may be, her retreat to the picturesque renders it uncertain, if not somewhat dubious. Moreover, her vision of female education as the vehicle for happiness does not escape the domestic confines for women of the Victorian institution of marriage that we have seen in the first chapter, since education can allow women to be happier not by travelling, as she does, but by vicariously sharing the pleasures of public life through their husband's self-pursuits. Moreover, her alleged emancipation rings bizarrely in our ears

considering the fact that women in Britain had yet to attain suffrage. Aware of her own dubious claim as a female traveller/writer, she opts for collusion with the empire instead of forming gender affinities, manifesting thus the imperial character of the nineteenth century movement of British feminism (Burton 145).

Similar to Scott-Stevenson's narrative, *Through Cyprus* also allows the picturesque to be infiltrated and thus disturbed by the possibility of danger through the frequent motif of the jail. In her endeavour to extol the capital work done by the British administration in eradicating crime and administrating justice, the author visits various jails and often engages in discussions on crime rate on the island. Her narrative might intend to be a testimony to the reduction of crime achieved by the British administration; however, it is also a reminder of the cultural threat posed by the unfamiliarity of the new locale and its customs. Indeed, the presence of police seems to be ubiquitous during their tour of the island. In one instance, when a crowd gathers outside their tents, the author tells us that Mr. Cade, the governor of the prison, and Mr. Smith came to see them, because "Seeing the crowd, they had come to offer the services of the constabulary to disperse it" (149). After the author's assurances that this was not necessary, the men reply, "'Very well; but the moment they get troublesome, you have only to tell the nearest policeman, and you will get rid of this annoyance at once'" (149). Apart from functioning as a symbol of power, the ubiquity of the police also acts as a reminder of the cultural threat posed by the locals, undermining thus the alleged omnipotence of the colonial power.

Mrs Brassey's *Sunshine and Storm in the East*

Mrs. Brassey chooses to dedicate her travel narrative to the "Brave True-Hearted Sailors of England, of all Ranks and Services" and bolsters her dedication by citing a few lines from Walter Colton's *Ship and shore: or, leaves from the journal of a cruise to the Levant*:

> I love the sailor: his eventful life,
> His generous spirit—his contempt of danger—
> His firmness in the gale, the wreck, the strife :
> And though a wild and reckless ocean-ranger,
> God grant he make that port, when life is ov'r,
> Where storms are hushed and billows break no more.
> (qtd. in Brassey, no page)

Unable to fully share the thrill and pleasures of the sailor's adventurous and eventful life because of a colonial discourse that identified exploration, cataloguing, mapping, and conquest with a male imperial subject, Mrs. Brassey contents herself and her audience by extolling the virtues and courage of the sailor, while personally finding solace in predominantly aesthetic depictions in her journey to the Mediterranean. Picturesque as the general modality of her narration might be, her narrative differs somewhat from the other two we have seen since, in Mrs. Brassey's writing, we can perhaps see more clearly the desire to probe the limits of her confinement within aesthetic descriptions and toy with the pleasures of transgressing her genre's borders. Such transgressions though, do not always result in liberatory gestures; rather, they either overtly comply with the patriarchal colonial discourse or only implicitly undermine its omnipotence. Indeed, Mrs. Brassey's narrative at times reads like a scientific log, furnishing us with numerical information expected from an explorer on a sponsored mission: "At noon we had run 250 miles from Gibraltar. Latitude 36° 39′ N., longitude 0º 30′ W" (26). However, such mathematical and scientific discourse is difficult to sustain, since she is aware of her own transgression into a gendered territory, and thus, such statements are generally followed by declarations that highlight her femininity by drawing attention to issues of discomfort and vulnerability: "The wind increased to a moderate gale, with a heavy swell from the north-west, which rolled and tumbled us about and prevented any of us sleeping at night" (Brassey 26). Moreover, aware of the redundancy of her scientific claims, she contents herself with concealing a summary of her voyage with numerical information about longitude, latitude, date, and distance covered, not in her narrative, but in the safety of an appendix.

The section on Cyprus in *Sunshine and Storm in the East* is small by comparison to the length of the overall narrative, which consists of two parts, one of a journey undertaken in 1874 to Constantinople and the Ionian Islands and one in 1878 to Cyprus and Constantinople. While reserving some her most outrageous Orientalist descriptions for the section of her journey to Constantinople, her narrative in its entirety displays a remarkable regularity of conflicting discourses, exemplifying what Sara Mills saw as pervasive to nineteenth century women's travel writing, that is, "a mixture of the thoroughly enjoyable (adventure narratives depicting strong, resourceful, women characters in situations rarely found in literature of the period) and the almost impossible (the racism, the concern to present the narrator as feminine, and the lengthy descriptions of the domestic)" (4). Looking at the discursive constraints that nineteenth century women writers had to face

rather than trying to conflate them into one category and argue about their Orientalism or not, Mills' study argues that these texts reveal profound tensions and uncertainties engendered by these discursive constraints from discourses such as Victorian femininity, a masculine imperial discourse, and nineteenth century British feminism (a liberatory but also profoundly imperial project (Burton 145)), whose intersections were at times conflicting and at others symbiotic. Similarly, Mrs. Brassey's narrative embodies also the desire to assume the male imperial voice but aware of the dubiety of her claim, finds refuge in descriptions that highlight her femininity or foreground a picturesque theme. A case in point is when she has to mount Lord John Hay's flagship. After describing in rather masculine tones this flagship saying that it "was a large five-master man-of-war", she proceeds to narrate how she declined the offer for having a chair lowered down for her to be pulled up but instead "preferred mounting by the ordinary steps against the ship's side—not a very wonderful feat after all, as there were ropes to hold on to, and the ship was comparatively steady" (251). Whilst eager to highlight her adventurous nature and dynamism that cannot allow her to climb the ship in a lady-like fashion, she is equally eager to undermine her own 'unfeminine' feat lest she transgresses the confines of her genre and/or irrevocably breaches the parameters of femininity, and she thus rushes to tell us that the ropes and the ship's steadiness made her task easy.

Indeed, Mrs. Brassey's narrative teems with contesting voices that reveal the deep and deranging tensions that are pervasive to nineteenth century women's travel writing. Predominating the narrative is a desire to domesticate the foreignness of the island, to render it homely and thus descriptions such as "we went to have tea with some friends in a Turkish house, which they have already made to look quite pretty and homelike by means of a few flowers and knick-knacks" (Brassey 255) abound in the book. Similarly, picturesque descriptions and depictions of the places visited permeate the narrative: "The view from his balcony was very pretty, looking first over the camp with its now nearly empty white tents, and its huts fast approaching completion, to the town of Nicosia, which from the distance looks a most delightful place, its white churches, belfries and mosques rising towards the blue sky from what appears to be a mass of verdure" (Brassey 269). Yet, Mrs. Brassey seems at times discontent with the strictures of her genre and toys with the idea of a more masculine imperial discourse in such a way that she disregards her gender's exclusion from an imperial discourse that identified the male as the colonial agent and representative. At these moments our author turns her genre's collusion with an imperial rhetoric into an overt complicity. Such moments, when she overtly assumes the

colonial rhetoric by praising the colonial administration for the work that it has done, are not unwelcome from the strictures of her genre. Moreover, they do not cause any tensions in the narrative. Conversely, though, when she subtly entertains ideas of adventure as when she refers to the thrills of hunting—a quintessentially masculine colonial occupation—she ends up revealing the profound split of her role in the imperial project, since she can only relish such gripping adventures that provide integral fodder for the genre of imperial romance from the position of vicariousness: "All the soldiers are looking forward eagerly to the hunting, as there are plenty of hares and foxes about, and the country is not at all bad to ride over, though there are no fences" (Brassey 279).

Moreover, the necessity of remaining within aestheticizing parameters is constantly challenged in her text since the 'otherness' and foreignness of the new colony get the better of her at times, and she allows her narrative to be disquieted, rousing the reader from her/his overall placidity, at the same time, in a way that reminds us of Bakhtin's 'artistic hybridity'. The peril of fever on the island is one of the recurrent motifs that Mrs. Brassey brings forth to disturb her otherwise tranquil narrative. In fact, the danger of fever seems to be constantly at the background, providing a subtext that looms dangerously over the picturesque narration. Early on into the section on Cyprus, the placating and domesticating references to the village of Ktima are suddenly arrested by the following lines:

> A short distance beyond the town is the camp of the 71st. Hitherto the men have been crowded together in tents, without beds, sleeping on the bare ground, with one blanket under and another over them. No wonder, therefore, that out of 105 officers and men, 27 are still down with fever, while many of those who are convalescent show terrible traces of the disease, being hardly able to crawl about, and looking more like ghosts than men. The camp contained an imposing-looking surgery, but unfortunately no supply of proper fever medicine, and the poor doctor was consequently in despair. (Brassey 255)

Apart from the ghostlike men, fever is also swathed in a ghostly and uncanny presence in the passage and comes to menace the otherwise picturesque narration. Perhaps, more disconcerting for those men of empire are the subtle insinuations the narrative makes at colonial ineptitude and lack of organization, challenging the purported colonial efficacy and organizational adroitness. Aware of the transgressive potentialities of her statements, our author returns back to the coziness of the picturesque, where she is expected to be 'at

home': "The site of the camp looks healthy, and the view from it, especially at sunset, when we saw it, is lovely" (255). The mollifying qualities of the picturesque are enough to hold at bay the unhomely danger of the spectres of fever and the trespassing into male colonial affairs.

Conclusion

I would like to conclude by reiterating the uncertainty that the feminine picturesque brings to the discourses of imperialism and to the genre of colonial romance, questioning thereby the reception of 19th century female travel narratives as unequivocally Orientalist. Indeed, the inscription of the female voice in the homosocial sphere of the new colonies through the feminine picturesque provides a dislocation of English, since it develops as a hybrid discourse, manifesting not only collusion with colonialism but also an implicit questioning of its omnipotence by inscribing new layers of anxiety caused not only by an awareness by the female writer of the redundancy of her claim in imperial discourse, but also by her inability to live the thrills of imperial romance unproblematically. Instead of rehearsing the established view of the colonial encounter as a metaphor of rape and ravishment, my analysis shows how the feminine picturesque narrates a different story of the colonial encounter: one where to play the imperial game of ruling is also to be disempowered at the same time. My readings of the three texts illustrate that if gender in travel literature in the empire matters, it does not do so in an overarching way, but to the extent that it is shaped by the discourses of sexuality, colonialism, class, travel and romance, as well as by generic conventions. Being shaped by these discourses, the feminine picturesque, in its turn, also shapes and challenges these discourses and conventions. Confined within aestheticizing modalities in their narratives, these women were expected to reproduce the Victorian values of domesticity and marriage in the empire that we saw in the previous chapter. As such, they did not threaten the imperial opposition of male/public and female/private, since their travel writing colluded with the imperial ideology and made them seem as if they had never left home. However, their narratives tell us another story about 'homecoming': as the tensions, anxieties, and cracks in their narratives reveal, despite domesticating the foreignness of the new colony through their picturesque idiom and themselves by their collusion with the masculine colonial discourse, these women are still not 'at home'. The colonial cosmopolitan spirit that women travellers contributed to through their narratives gives way to a fierce nationalist antagonism that had been in the making from the beginning of British presence on the island and which was intensified through colonialist divisive policies. The quest for home,

with its routes and detours, continues with renewed energies during the period of heightened nationalist zeal, seizing on the tropes of colonial cosmopolitanism and Philhellenism as the means of domesticating the volatile ambience of the 1950s in Cyprus. Yet, similar to the female writer's anxiety about her (mis)fitting discourse in the rhetoric of empire, the 1950s are too volatile to be contained by a discourse as problematic as that of Philhellenism, and thus, fresh seams of anxiety come to be added to the allegedly omnipotent colonial rhetoric.

Part II: Nationalism and its Aftermath

Chapter 3: Empowering Friendships or Befriending Power?

> If I had to choose between betraying my country and betraying my friend I hope I should have the guts to betray my country. (Forster 66)

Introduction

Lawrence Durrell's *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus*, still considered a significant document of the 1950s and an almost indispensable guide to the island's history for the British expat, starts with a reflection on travel that is worthy of Durrell's literary stature, saying that, "Journeys, like artists, are born and not made. A thousand differing circumstances contribute to them, few of them willed or determined by the will – whatever we may think. They flower spontaneously out of the demands of our natures – and the best of them lead us not only outwards in space, but inwards as well. Travel can be one of the most rewarding forms of introspection…" (1). An astute thought on both the spatially centrifugal and the psychically centripetal nature of travel, or of travel's negotiation of the space between the physical movement away from home and the subliminal and introspective process of homecoming, the quote also draws an interesting analogy between journeys and artists, or between movement and art. Indeed, journeys, like art, provide experiences of cultural mediation that often entail a movement beyond established and conventional borders, a movement, in other words, that is concealed in the etymological provenance of 'experience' itself, as a gesture of '*per*/*pera*' or beyond (Porter 51). Such gestures can reveal the porousness of borders, or even problematize the notion of the border itself, as an elusive construct that is erected precisely in discourse.

In the volatile ambience of colonial Cyprus in the early 1950s, with its increasingly entrenched political and cultural markers, exemplified in a frenetic antagonism between colonial and nationalist politics, such a movement beyond the ingrained cultural borders, potentially promised by both travel and art, could perhaps have been auspicious of a different vision, one that ambiguated the binary notions of home/foreign, self/other, East/West. Contrary to its auguring opening of such ambiguation however, *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus* leaves those readers with an anti-imperialist vision—whether in the colonial or post-colonial era—with a bitter taste, since, instead, it reinforces the cultural boundaries

between the colonial masters and their colonized others. Durrell's *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus* taste more bitter for those with an anti-imperial vision than for those endorsing the imperial project. The author's much desired 'homecoming' in Cyprus (Lillios 17), reflected both in the buying and renovating of a house on the island—a process recounted in the book—as well as in his notorious philhellenism that made him feel at home in befriending both Hellenism and its people, falls apart precisely because of his inability to move beyond his own cultural biases, failing thus to de-center the established and conventional connotations of both 'home' and 'philia' or 'friendship'. Indeed, *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus* continues a tradition of British travel writing on Cyprus—a part of which we examined closely in the previous chapter—revealing a continuity of British preoccupations and tropes regarding the island, such as the colonial romance with a rural Oriental and purportedly organic Cyprus and a colonial nostalgia for a fast evanescing arcadian setting. While the British female traveler tries to domesticate the Cypriot landscape and the unfamiliar threat of the new colony, Durrell's *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus* endeavors to domesticate and contain the volatile climate of the 1950s in the island through an appeal to personal friendships that are always construed through the framework of the allegedly perennial Anglo-Hellenic amity. However, similar to the nineteenth century female writer's anxiety caused by the dubiety of her own claim as a colonial representative, Durrell's work on Cyprus, complicated by his incongruous roles as a writer of allegedly transcendental poetics and as a colonial government employee, reveals also an anxiety, caused by the failure of cross-cultural friendship when pitted against national allegiance. While choosing to have E.M. Forster as a guide to Alexandria (MacNiven 264-5), Durrell, while in Cyprus, fails to take stock of Forster's well-known motto on friendship that this chapter has as its epigraph.

Indeed, the only cross-cultural friendships that survive in the book are those between the narrator and the Greek characters that Durrell molds into his colonial and moral framework to the extent that they admire the sight of the English soldiers or accept benignly his patronizing reassurances that he would ensure their offspring's wellbeing in London. Akin to the nineteenth-century female traveler's narrative that intentionally or unintentionally dislocated the purported omnipotence of colonial rhetoric through the inscription of a pervasive anxiety, Durrell's narrative also reveals the cracks of colonial rhetoric by trying desperately to rescue some figment of personal friendship from the "smaller contempts" (Durrell ix) of politics. Despite his anxious, disingenuous, and rather stubborn insistence to keep friendship and politics separate, the book reads more like a reaffirmation of the relationship of the two rather than a negation of it. Similar to the

friendships in the book, his personal friendships to his Greek friends in real life were also affected. This was the case with his friendship to Seferis, the famous Nobel laureate, who also found(ed) a literary homeland in Cyprus around the same time. It is of interest that both writers worked for their respective governments during this time, and the cooling of their former animated friendship provides fertile ground for exploring the interplay of friendship, politics, and national allegiance both in the Cypriot cultural milieu but also in *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus*.

At odds with the main conventional trope of friendship in Durrell's book is another form of friendship, that is often not even intended by the writer, and which transgresses the filiative systems of empire, nation, and gender. These gestures of a different form of friendship plant the seeds of another kind of community, one that Leela Gandhi calls, an "anti-communitarian communitarianism" (*Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-De-Siecle Radicalism, and the Politics of Friendship* 32), precisely because of these friendships' unfulfilled character and the unbinding of established communal relations that they seem to be performing. Such gestures point to a critical vision of community, one where the vision of 'home' or of a 'cosmopolis' appears as "the means to puncture those fantasies of security and invulnerability to which our political imagination remains hostage" (Gandhi *Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-De-Siecle Radicalism, and the Politics of Friendship* 32). Further, these gestures anticipate the work of some contemporary postcolonial Cypriot writers writing in English who intentionally come to dislocate the notions of snug homes and of a putative multi-cultural community, built by nationalist, patriarchal, and European Union discourses that exclude the 'other'—be it the non-citizen, or the gender and sexual other—into what Agamben calls, "a state of non-relationality" (109-10). This endeavor of dislocating received notions of both home and community ambiguates the seemingly natural creation of 'homes' and exposes the pervasive violence of the exclusionary politics at the moment of their founding.

Durrell's decision to work for the colonial government estranged him from his local friends but also cost him the friendship of old friends from Greece, including George Seferis, who also experienced a sense of 'nostos' when he came to the island during the 1950s. Indeed, the island of Cyprus is synonymous with a period of literary flurry in Seferis' literary career, and became a literary muse for the poet who claimed that "Cyprus is a place where the miracle still functions" (qtd. in Beaton 293). In Cyprus, Seferis claimed to have found a Hellenism lost in the geographical space within the Hellenic borders, experiencing thus a sense of homecoming, one that was not only personal but also

national since, in mapping thus the Cypriot 'topos' with a Hellenism of the 'authentic' type, he achieved another homecoming. It is noteworthy that Seferis' location of Cyprus as one of Hellenism's heterotopias reflects a more general tendency of a move to the East that characterized Greek modernism. Oddly, though, as Calotychos argues, "These Greek claims for a regenerative 'Easterness' chart their way by routes that willfully avoid, sidestep, or repress any Turkish element or borrowing" ("(Pre)Occupied Space: Hyphens, Apostrophes and over-Sites in the Literary Imagining of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey" 56). Thus, similar to Durrell's, Seferis' homecoming is not devoid of its own politics of appropriation and domestication, which once more reinforced the binaries of home/foreign, Hellene/non-Hellene, or friend/other. While both famous poets claimed a cosmopolitan vision that transgressed national and cultural borders, their 'homecoming' to the island and their appropriation of it, as well as their own appropriation by it, bespeak a different story, one whose nationalist and communal affiliations leave no room for cross-cultural friendship, or for the potential for a critical cosmopolitan vision.

This chapter intends to explore the cultural terrain of the first part of the twentieth century with a focus on the charged atmosphere of the 1950s in Cyprus, a period which progressively marks a new turn in the island's cultural terrain, mirroring its political tension. Indeed, the 1950s' political instability, constantly fed by the rise of mutually hostile nationalist fervor in the two major communities in a network of colonial politics, inevitably perforates the cultural terrain and permeates cultural attitudes to language, literature, and art, repressing whatever nuanced and critical cultural attitudes existed and erecting monolithic barriers in their place. This new cultural turn is reflected, as this chapter argues, in the triangular relationship between Lawrence Durrell and George Seferis and their personal relationship to the island, which stands as an imaginative 'topos' or a potentially redeeming homeland. The former friendship between the two literary figures, who were great admirers of each other's work, is shaken during this period of mutual appropriation of the island as a 'topos' of a redeeming homecoming, and the two become increasing alienated. The aborted friendship between the two and their individual relation to the island opens a window for exploring the notions of 'home', 'homecoming' and 'cosmopolitanism', as well as the appropriation of such concepts by dominant ideologies such as nationalism and imperialism. I intend to examine these notions and their entwinement through an investigation of the notion of friendship as a migrant trope that problematizes simultaneously the erection and elision of such notions as self/other, home/alien, colonialist/colonized, man/woman. My usage of imperialism is one that

exceeds the conventional usage of it as a cultural and civilizational clash between a putative 'West' and a so-called 'non-West'. In alignment with Leela Gandhi, I use it to denote "a complex analogical system relentlessly mapping hierarchies of race, culture, and civilization upon relationships between genders, species, classes, etc." (*Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-De-Siecle Radicalism, and the Politics of Friendship* 7).

Considering that anti-imperial gestures do not find their exclusive provenance in a putative non-West and that numerous individuals and groups living in the imperial metropolises resisted the conforming apparatus of empire in various ways (Gandhi *Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-De-Siecle Radicalism, and the Politics of Friendship* 1-2), Durrell's reception (both as a person and as a writer), in view of his sworn philhellenism, often reveals a wish to project on him a poetics of transgression toward imperial national affiliations and of friendship to those oppressed by the imperial machine. This appropriation of Durrell as a paradigm of cross-cultural friendship becomes even greater when Durrell becomes one of 'them', as he claims, that is, one of the Cypriot "rogues' gallery of Kerynia" (44). Yet, despite the expectations both of his Greek and Cypriot friends, (and of the post-colonial critic?), Durrell not only quietly supports the imperial cause but works actively to promote its insidious politics. The rhetorical complicity to the colonial politics of Cyprus as it is revealed in his allegedly apolitical *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus* will be more directly addressed in the following chapter through a survey of the two main texts that constitute 'a writing back to the empire', namely Montis' *Closed Doors* and Roufos' *The Age of Bronze*. In this chapter, I am more interested in focusing on how friendship as a trope can be used to unveil the precariousness of discursive borders. The questions I want to ask in this chapter are the following: what sort of friendship is required to overcome the ubiquitous network of imperial power and engage in a critique of empire and its ways? What sort of friendship towards Greece did philhellenism entail, and what anti-colonial promises, if any, are held in such friendship? Is the discourse of philhellenism anti-imperial, or does it entail its own forms of imperial politics? What types of friendships did Durrell's philhellenism allow him to construct, both in his personal life as well as in his travel book on Cyprus? Was Seferis's friendship with the island one that held any promise for the germination of an anti-imperial energy? Considering the failure of cross-cultural friendship in Durrell's sojourn in Cyprus, both in his personal life as well as in the book, do we bury the book in the large graveyard of colonial complicity or can we find any traces of dislocation and de-centering of imperial

rhetoric? Finally, what sort of friendship is entailed (philosophy?) in projects like the current one, which wishes to probe the notion of the border itself in an endeavor to contribute to the wider effort of de-hegemonizing discourse, albeit without ignoring its own collusion with the ongoing erection and annihilation of such borders? An impossible friendship?

As a utopian notion, the notion of friendship is impregnated with the possibility of a(n) (impossible) community which overcomes the binaries of us/them, colonialist/colonized, friend/other, or of gender. Such binaries, erected and pursued obsessively by colonial discourse, and lamentably inherited by most anti-colonial nationalist projects and other nativist discourses, (or by any discourse perhaps), might seem stable and coherent, but, in actuality, such binaries are vulnerable to critiques that look at their slippages, gaps, and cracks. Importantly, the notion of friendship is so entrenched in political thought, that Gandhi avows it to be "endemic to this system" (*Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-De-Siecle Radicalism, and the Politics of Friendship* 27). In other words, the notion of friendship traverses political discourse in the ways that the latter, as Horst Hutter maintains, is "described, explained, and analysed" (qtd. in Gandhi *Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-De-Siecle Radicalism, and the Politics of Friendship* 27). Further, this integral position of friendship in political thought, as Derrida argues, entangles it in a "*schematic* of filiation" (*Politics of Friendship* viii), since the political is inextricably bound to the domestic, as Gandhi argues (*Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-De-Siecle Radicalism, and the Politics of Friendship* 28).

In this chapter I draw primarily on Derridean politics of friendship and Leela Gandhi's theorization of the link between cross-cultural friendship and cosmopolitan projects. I intend to show how the promise of a de-hegemonizing potential in Durrell's homecoming to Cyprus through the gestures of friendship—albeit filtered through his philhellenism—as well as Seferis' sense of homecoming to Cyprus, and his friendship to the island and its people—filtered through his discovery of a putatively authentic Hellenism—were intrinsically problematic projects since they depended on a set of hegemonic coordinates. Contrary to that, Durrell's *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus,* unbeknownst to him perhaps, bears moments of a different sort of friendship which either remain unfulfilled, or reveal some form of unbinding of filiation. As such, they are impregnated with de-hegemonizing potentialities and resonate with the gestures of an impossible community, one that Derrida sees as "never present" and remains "indefinitely perfectible"

(Derrida *Politics of Friendship* 306).

I will start with a discussion on the politics of friendship and their import for anti-colonial thought and critical cosmopolitanism, then move on to a brief account on the socio-political ambience of the 1950s in Cyprus, before discussing the two famous poets' alleged homecomings to Cyprus and their relationship both to each other as well as to the island as a redeeming homeland. Lastly, I will argue that the two poets' aborted friendship reflects the dominant motif of friendship as it unfolds in Durrell's book. My reading of friendship in *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus* will argue that Durrell's dominant and favored trope of friendship is a 'homophilic' one; it is based, in other words, on foregrounded similitude, and it masks minor gestures of 'philoxenic' friendship in the book that are based on the inscription of radical difference. Apart from the permeating anxiety registered in the text through the narrator's desperate but unsuccessful attempts to rescue cross-cultural friendship, alas, often in a disingenuous way, these 'philoxenic' gestures of friendship also de-center the master narrative of colonial certitude and omnipotence by generating the potential for a more critical notion of friendship that points to an impossible community, or a critical cosmopolitanism.

Politics of Friendship

Why friendship? What is, in other words, the aim of a project that posits friendship and its politics as a central trope for the understanding and assessment of the cultural ambience of a 'topos' at a particular historical juncture? While recognizing the current project's inevitable implication in the analysis of the aesthetics and politics of the time discussed, I would like to proceed by asking the following questions: what is the role of friendship in a project that also entails notions of 'home', 'homecoming' and 'cosmopolitanism'? Is the concept of friendship capable of providing an alternative way of unweaving the hegemonic discourses that cluster around the concept of community and of reconfiguring community in such a way that it does not relinquish its utopian or cosmopolitan vision? Can the notion of friendship, in other words, unweave all the stitches knitted on us, by the various systems of filiation, such as family, state, nation, based on such concepts as nature, homogeneity, or other notions of similitude? And then, how does it operate from thereon? Does it substitute similitude with difference? And how do we avoid lapsing back into a community of similitude even if we substitute similitude with difference? How, in other words, do we avoid replicating the self when envisioning a

community, even when it posits itself as a community based on difference, that eschews the systems of filiation? These questions, in effect, endeavor to tease out the problematic at the heart of any envisioning of community that does not address *a priori*, the notion of the subject and the process of inter-subjectivity. Considering imperialism's obsession with rigid cultural boundaries between the colonizer and the colonized, does cross-cultural friendship hold a promise that dilutes such stereotypes, not only by foregrounding the osmoses at different levels that occur at such seemingly impermeable borders but also by questioning the concept of cultural autonomy? Is not such foregrounding of the 'cross-cultural', which takes as its point of origin distinct cultural formations, hegemonic in a different sense, in other words?

Derrida starts his *Politics of Friendship* with a remark attributed to Aristotle: " 'O my friends, there is no friend'" (*Politics of Friendship* 1), which Derrida proceeds to declare as apposite given the impossibility of friendship which carries within it its very possibility as impossible. Yet, while Aristotle perceived friendship as a bond based on mutual virtue, or on similitude, Derrida sees the significance of friendship in its desire towards difference, in its 'philoxenic' form rather than in its 'homophilic' one. This desire towards difference is what Gandhi calls " 'an affective cosmopolitanism,' the ethico-political practice of a desiring self inexorably drawn toward difference" (Gandhi *Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-De-Siecle Radicalism, and the Politics of Friendship* 17). Is such inexorable pull towards difference enough to ensure avoiding relapsing into similitude? I will take up that question in a moment. Before, I would like to touch briefly on the role of friendship in political thought, something that is necessary, in view of our previous reference to Derridean 'philoxenia' and Aristotelian 'homophilia'. Political thought is indeed traversed by friendship, and political thought is inextricably imbued in "a *schematic* of filiation: stock, genus or species, sex (*Geschlecht*), blood, birth, nature, nation – autocthonal or not, tellurian or not" (*Politics of Friendship* viii), as Derrida diagnoses, to the extent, that it reproduces what Gandhi calls, "the perennial romance of self-repetition, similarity, resemblance, the order of the same" (*Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-De-Siecle Radicalism, and the Politics of Friendship* 28); a magnifying glass of the miniature space of the domestic, in effect. Within such a profound and pervasive schematic of filiation, is not Derridean 'philoxenia', or desire to befriend the different, integral in any envisioning of a community that does not relinquish its utopian vision? But again, how do we avoid subsuming the different into the same, even when we opt for Derridean 'philoxenia' over Aristotelian 'homophilia'? How,

in other words, do we keep alive the 'inexorable' pull that Gandhi refers to?

Moving away from a subjective self-sufficiency, Maurice Blanchot, borrowing from Bataille, points to a "principle of insufficiency at the heart of each being . . ." (qtd. in Blanchot 5). The awareness of this subjective insufficiency, as Blanchot maintains, "arises from the fact that it [the subject] puts itself into question, which question needs the other or another to be enacted" (Blanchot 5). Such enactment would inevitably lead to a community, which brings with it closure, if subject-hood continued to be perceived through the theme of individuality, which affirms an identity that is recognizable and thus replicates a community of similitude. However, if individuality comes to be replaced by singularity, it could lead to "a community without affirming an identity, [where] humans co-belong without any representable condition of belonging", as Agamben argues (qtd. in Gandhi *Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-De-Siecle Radicalism, and the Politics of Friendship* 26). Friendship, as Gandhi maintains, is "one name for the co-belonging of nonidentical singularities" (Gandhi *Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-De-Siecle Radicalism, and the Politics of Friendship* 26), in such a way that it echoes Derrida's invitation to "say yes, *to who or what turns up*, before any determination, before any anticipation, before any identification" (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 77). Is a friendship that leads to such co-belonging possible though? Nancy is apposite here. This unlikely bond between the most seemingly heterogeneous entities is what Jean Luc Nancy calls a process of "compearance …[which] does not set itself up, it does not establish itself, it does not emerge among already given subjects (objects). It consists in the appearance of the *between* as such: you *and* I (between us)—a formula in which the *and* does not imply juxtaposition, but exposition. What is exposed in compearance is the following, and we must learn to read it in all its possible combinations: 'you (are/ and/ is) (entirely other than) I' [toi (e(s)t) (tout autre que) moi]. Or again, more simply: *you shares me [toi partages moi]*" (29). Does Nancy's 'compearance' in its fusion and confusion constitute a community? And if it does, what kind of community? Blanchot would tell us that it constitutes an unavowable community, one that is "always threatened, always hoped for, between what we call work, *oeuvre,* and what we call unworking, *désoeuvrement*" (56).

So, what kind of community is left if it is unavowable and inoperative, if it is, in other words, an anti-communitarian community? And where does the 'political' feature in such a community? The community that is referred to here is one which is in the process of becoming through the unworking of the community itself, one where the dislocation and

de-centering of community by such unworking, exposes the inevitability that such discursive dislocations carry in them. They thereby locate processes which are themselves the new utopian 'topos' of unworking. Community then is the sharing of this process of iterative unworking of community's textures. And such sharing, as Nancy tells us, is communicated through writing; writing, through and in which relations of society are unworked and dislocated. Nancy says:

> 'Political' would mean a community ordering itself to the unworking of its communication, or destined to this unworking: a community consciously undergoing the experience of its sharing. To attain such a signification of the 'political' does not depend, or in any case not simply, on what is called a 'political will'. It implies being already engaged in the community, that is to say, undergoing, in whatever manner, the experience of community as communication: it implies writing. (40-41)

So, the 'political' in this sense is the actual sharing of the community, which is inscribed by the unworking of community as it is structured by societal bonds and political organization. In other words, what is presented here is the process by which (or the sharing in which) a community *is* not, but *is becoming*, through violating and rupturing the communion of community. In other words, it is a non-communitarian, inoperative, and unavowable community. But what exactly is it that this non-communitarian community undoes, or unworks through sharing of the process of unworking, in writing, as Nancy insists? If community in its political and social organization presupposes the individual human being as its regulative and immanent building block, then this is precisely "the stumbling block to a thinking of community" (3), as Nancy asserts. This means that a non-communitarian community "is, if it is, nothing other than what it undoes, in its very principle—and at its closure or on its limit—the autarchy of absolute immanence" (Nancy 4). Nancy arrives exactly where Agamben arrived earlier, namely at the point where individuality is replaced by singularity so that any vision of community is impregnated with its own unworking and unbinding processes of nonidentification (Nancy 6-7).

How does this discussion on friendship and community help us in revisiting the tense atmosphere of the 1950s in Cyprus, where the literary figures of George Seferis and Lawrence Durrell made their homecomings? Considering the two authors' putative internationalist and cosmopolitan aesthetics, swathed in a poetics of homelessness in the case of the latter, and in the poetics of a universal Hellenism of the former, as we saw

earlier, as well as the two authors' genuine friendship but also political and diplomatic positions, the former discussion serves as a preamble from where we can assess the two authors' homecomings to the island and their politics of friendship to each other, and to the island and its people, as well as their visions of 'home' and community. In this visitation and evaluation of their poetics and politics, I am hoping to indicate the hegemonic ideologies that informed their work and friendship but also draw potentially de-hegemonizing gestures of the kind of friendship referred to in the preliminary discussion.

Durrell and his Homelessness

Discussing Durrell's quest for home, Anna Lillios argues that "Durrell most likely had a fluid definition of home…The line between travel and residence is often blurred in Durrell's works, but the lack of clear-cut boundaries marks his work as representative of twentieth-century fiction" (Lillios 18). Drawing on Rosemary Marangoly George's *The Politics of Home,* that carefully unweaves the hegemonic textures of snug homes and exposes the exclusionary politics at the heart of all home-building projects, and on Edward Said's *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays,* that provides nuanced readings of exile, she quotes Bolivar Le Franc to suggest that Durrell "is an exile who never ever really had a homeland to begin with. An expatriate without a patria" (qtd. in Lillios 18). Despite his 'homelessness', she continues, strangely enough, but "Fortunately, Durrell, did not seem to suffer from the rootlessness that seems to be the typical fate of exiles" (Lillios 18). This rootlessness is something Said describes in his work on exile: "Exile is strangely compelling to think about but terrible to experience. It is the unhealable rift forced between a human being and a native place, between the self and its true home: its essential sadness can never be surmounted" (Said *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays* 184). Is Durrell's exile the same as the one that Said refers to when speaking about a rift between a native place and the self? And if Durrell is as homeless and deracinated as Lillios claims, could he then be included in Said's unfortunate exiles whose pain seems to be deriving from their loss of physical dwelling? Is the forced exile that Said refers to the same as Durrell's colonial and male privileged traveling? Is it as strange as Lillios implies that Durrell "does not admit to such sadness" (Lillios 18) as the one that Said diagnoses in forced exile? Moreover, is Said's reference to 'true home' here different from Marangoly George's—whom Lillios also quotes in presenting Durrell as a paragon of homelessness—notion of home as "the desired place that is fought for and established as the exclusive

domain of a few. It is not a neutral place. It is community" (George 9)? I think that these questions are not difficult to answer. Yet, what is indeed peculiar is that Lillios chooses to quote from these two works whose nuanced readings of 'home' and 'exile' point to an endeavor to de-hegemonize the discourses that cluster around these terms. Although the carefully selected quotes from these works in Lillios' article intend to ease the development of her argument, namely, that Durrell is an exile whose poetics of homelessness grant him a place in the home of poetics of homelessness, what her article in fact reveals is the danger of uncritical readings of concepts such as home, homelessness, homecoming, or exile, and which allow the re-appropriation of these terms in such ways that become easily hegemonic. For how could one gloss over Durrell's explicit national and imperial loyalties—at least during the time he was in Cyprus—manifested so abundantly in his allegedly non-political book, and contend about homelessness at the heart of his poetics? Comments such as "Outside all this, of course, *our* moral and legal title to the island was unassailable" (Durrell 185, my emphasis), make any claims to Durrell's poetics of homelessness suspicious, if not outright absurd.

Nevertheless, instead of dismissing Lillios' thesis about Durrell's alleged poetics of homelessness and deracination, I would like to actually probe it a bit further since it conveys an entry point to the issues that this chapter grapples with. Why this desire to drape Durrell in such poetics of exile and homelessness? And why selectively quote from critical works that confound our sense of 'home' and 'exile' if one is not willing to continue working within such nuanced contours? Is there perhaps a desire to continue the reception of Durrell in a discourse of uncritical philhellenism through an appeal to the "lack of clearcut boundaries [that] marks his work as representative of twentieth century fiction" (Lillios 18) and to his overall 'homelessness'? Could someone who worked for the imperial British government as a director for the press, claim homelessness? And could this desire to couch Durrell's poetics in homelessness be a disguise of an equally strong desire to absolve the discourse of philhellenism from its own peculiar implication in the imperial drama? Is not his alleged 'homelessness' at odds perhaps with his equally ambivalent 'philhellenism'? Could someone, in other words, be a friend of Hellenism (which Hellenism?) and still be claiming 'homelessness'? Is not Seferis also a philhellene, and, if he is, is he then a friend of the same Hellenism as the one Durrell allegedly befriended? How do the two differ in their philhellenism? Moreover, is Seferis' poetics, with its strong universal theme and its poetic "spatial atopia" (Leontis 138), also a representative of 'homelessness'? And would not such 'homelessness' appear odd in view

of the illustrious 'homecomings' to Cyprus of both writers and their implication in graphing the Cypriot 'topos' with an identity? All these questions are of course crucial for situating Durrell's and Seferis' presence in the cultural terrain of the 1950s in Cyprus, and for assessing their poetics and their claim to a cosmopolitan vision. Moreover, they are important in mapping English's engagement with the Cypriot 'topos' and the dialectic between them. In short, these questions are significant in illustrating how Durrell's and Seferis' politics vis-à-vis the island, manifested in their alleged homecomings, constitute similar, yet different, hegemonic projects that reinforce cultural boundaries between colonized/colonizer, self/other, and home/foreign. On the one hand, Durrell's collusion, if not outright complicity with imperialism, in his greatest project of a homecoming to the island, namely his book, *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus*, primarily reinforced such cultural barriers; on the other, Seferis' homecoming in an authentic Hellenism in Cyprus (and simultaneous home-bringing of (t)his particular Hellenism in Cyprus) with its fantasies of cultural purity, abandoned the non-Hellene to the eternity of alterity.

Durrell's and Seferis' Friendship

But let us cast a glance at the friendship of the two poets, in a gesture that aims to diagnose if it held any promise of unbinding filiative systems, family, nation, or any other form of filiative community, in such a way as to re-envision community in a critical manner that could contribute toward a wider effort of de-centering hegemony. The two writers met in Corfu during the "fall of *annus mirabilis*, in 1939, through their common friend, Dr. Theodoros Stephanides" (Raizis 246). Their friendship, based, among other things, on mutual interest in literary and cultural issues, and more particularly on a common admiration for T.S. Eliot's work, grew stronger and culminated during WWII when their countries struggled side by side against the German foe (Raizis 246-7). Their countries' alliance during the war against fascist Germany had an important role in their personal friendship since their patriotic and nationalistic feelings were channeled towards a common purpose. During this time, their friendship was further fortified by a mutual admiration of each other's work, which led them to translating each other's poetry (Beaton 177). Indeed, Seferis' first international recognition is not unrelated to Durrell's efforts to promote his work. As Edmund Keeley confirms, Durrell's promotion of Seferis's work, first in the *Personal Landscape* issues during their Cairo years and subsequently in the *King of Asine and Other Poems*, brought Seferis his first substantial recognition abroad"

(Keeley 237).

Durrell regarded Seferis very highly, and the two spent pleasurable times together. Their memorable year in Corfu in 1939, together with Henry Miller, George Katsimbalis who was immortalized in Miller's *The Colossus of Marousi*, and Theodore Stephanides, always held a special place in their lives, and quite often they endeavored to relive it, especially Durrell. An incident that took place in 1947, described by Keeley as, "in retrospect [having] the aura of a last supper for the little band of prewar friends" (237)—because the group never met collectively again but also because of the later cooling of the friendship between Durrell and Seferis—conveys the spirit of their friendship. Keeley relates the details of this meeting based on a letter by Durrell to Henri Miller:

> Seferis, Katsimbalis, Ghika, and Durrell's new friend Rex Warner gathered in a 'quiet booklined room' (Seferis's?) to listen to a record Miller had sent Durrell and to hear Miller's 'burring' voice read out several 'long ghostly sequences' from his *Tropic of Cancer*. The strangeness of hearing his friend's voice in this way, took Durrell back to his days with Miller in Paris and Corfu. Seferis and Katsimbalis had tears in their eyes, he reports. When it came to say goodbye to them, Durrell gave them the record, and they thanked him as if he had given them 'a portion of you, a hand or an arm or a voice.' Durrell then imagines Seferis 'there alone now listening to [the record] and shaking his head with that sad smile as he repeats: 'Ah Miller, Miller, what fellow'. (237)

The 1950s in Cyprus and the involvement of the two authors in the Cypriot political affairs from official positions were momentous for the future of their friendship since Durrell's participation and implication in imperial affairs from the position of Director of Information Services streamlined his attitude with that of the official imperial policy and estranged him from his former friends. Nevertheless, his initial sojourn on the island belied his subsequent alienation from his Greek and Cypriot friends. Indeed, as Durrell describes in a letter to Austen Harrison the autumn of 1953, "Seferiades [Seferis] turned up last night and we had a splendid evening. I do wish you had been there. I think you would like him—such a massive intellectual sensibility with such gentleness and humour" (qtd. in David Roessel "Letters of Lawrence Durrell to Austen Harrison" 7). So, it all started well for Durrell, and this propitious beginning is mirrored in the first half of his *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus*. Similar to this evening described by Durrell in the letter above, the book is

laden with other festive evenings that evince his merrymaking in Cyprus. Despite the absence of any Cypriots and Greeks from these festivities in the book (even Seferis is curiously erased from the dinner table and substituted by Sir Harry Luke in the book in the discussion about hermaphrodites (Durrell 101-2)), the first part of the book reflects the warm reception that Durrell enjoyed in the island at the beginning. Indeed, as Roessel maintains, "Durrell's first year on Cyprus was a halcyon time. He met nearly all the Cypriot writers of note, such as Pantellis Mechanikos, Nikos Kranidiotis, and Kypros Chrysanthis, and received a warmer welcome than that given any other English writer" ("Rodis Roufos on Bitter Lemons: A Suppressed Section of *the Age of Bronze*" 131). Yet, it all changed, and it changed rather abruptly when Durrell accepted the official position of Director of Information Services, a decision that surprised, disappointed, and appalled almost all of his friends, and particularly his Greek and Cypriot friends. As Keeley asserts,

> George Seferis was especially distressed by what he perceived to be a crucial change in Durrell's political posture. He apparently expected that in Cyprus his young friend would remain consistently partial to Greece's national interest and persistently ironic about his British compatriots, as he had been during his early days in Greece and even during his wartime service as press officer in Egypt. (235-6)

Seferis manifested his disillusionment and disgust at Durrell's politically protean nature by avoiding his former friend in his subsequent visits to the island, but also by referring explicitly to him in letters to George Savvides and to George Theotokas. In a letter to the first, he declines an offer to contribute to the *Anglo-Hellenic Review*, in which Savvides was the editor:

> But when I see intellectual institutions—quite artfully, I agree—placed in the service of these gentlemen [men who are simply after power, like conquerors of the past], I tend to become suspicious. And when I see intellectuals and friends (e.g. Durrell) become propagandists for these gentlemen and use their friendships they had in Greece in order to infiltrate and enslave consciences, then I become absolutely suspicious. Conclusion: I would not feel comfortable if I contributed to the *Anglo-Hellenic Review*. And I say: It is a pity that I am forced to say such things. (qtd. in David Roessel 44)

Seferis' suspicion of the *Anglo-Hellenic Review*—which was shared by his Greek-Cypriot literary counterparts who eschewed completely Durrell's *Cyprus Review*—was justified by another incident which involved Durrell and which took place in Cyprus. As narrated triumphantly by Durrell in a letter to Austen Harrison, Seferis read poetry to the students at the Pancyprian Gymnasium where Durrell taught. Durrell proudly says in his letter to Harrison, "My pupils gave Seferis a huge oration yesterday and he read with great humility and sweetness" (David Roessel "Letters of Lawrence Durrell to Austen Harrison" 11). Durrell's description of the event rings indeed false, in light of Seferis' wrath at how he felt manipulated by the colonial cultural authorities. In a different tone that reveals his disgust at Durrell's role in imperial propaganda, Seferis describes the incident in a letter to Theotokas as one that made him feel like a Quisling. I translate:

> In front of my friend, Maurice Cardiff, who runs the British Institute there, I, Seferis, was made to feel, like a Quisling, and I told him that I would never again set foot in his institute….It is to his honor, that he understood how I felt, and showed his embarrassment for this tragic lack of logic of our times. I have bitter and great doubts if Durrell who undertook the responsibility for the propaganda on the island, would have the same moral ground. (Σεφέρης 157)

Seferis showed his aversion to Durrell's involvement in the Cypriot affairs also in his creative work on Cyprus. In his "In the District of Kerynia" (Στα Περίχωρα της Κερύνειας), there is mention of a poet, who is commonly thought to be Durrell (David Roessel "Letters of Lawrence Durrell to Austen Harrison" 12). The lines that are spoken by two British women and which refer to this poet are certainly unfavorable:

> —Did you meet the poet,
> or whatever he was, staying here last month?
> He called feeling palimpsestic libido:
> most unusual; no one knows
> what he means. A cynic and a philhellene.
> —An introverted snob. (Seferis 465)

The Seferian reference to Durrell's philhellenism here is evidently ironic and shows Seferis' disappointment with his former friend, yet it is odd that, once again, Durrell, whether consciously or unintentionally, misses the irony of this comment completely,

saying in a letter to Austen Harrison:

> At the moment Seferiades [Seferis] is lecturing heavily everywhere and writing me up as a Philhellenese [sic] so perhaps they will hesitate. I'm still trying to collar him for an afternoon or evening. Will ring you up if I do. (qtd. in David Roessel "Letters of Lawrence Durrell to Austen Harrison" 11)

Harrison's phone did not ring, and Durrell never hosted Seferis again in Cyprus since by then Seferis was not actually writing up Durrell as a Philhellene but literally wrote him off from Hellenism's record of chosen friends. While Durrell's comments about Seferis in Cyprus appear to be jubilant, if not boastful, I think that there is a lurking anxiety behind his elation caused by his awareness that his collusion with the imperial machine is taxing his friendships. His biographer MacNiven informs us that when Seferis was planning a second visit to the island, Durrell, using a humbler tone that revealed some anxiety about his friendships, "told Diamantis, [a common friend] that he would be happy to see Seferis, but added 'Now that I am a government servant, he might not want to see me'" (413). Durrell's anxiety about his friends' disaffection because of his new role in the government, as we will see further down, pervades his *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus* and is certainly understandable in view of MacNiven's comments that Durrell's Greek and Cypriot friends "hinted darkly that Durrell had been a plant from the beginning, his teaching at the Gymnasium a blind to bring his ear within range of the heady whispers of Enotist plotting" (412).

From this point, their friendship is shaken, and the two try to navigate their loaded vessels in rough waters since they both serve in crucial posts for the island and its future. Durrell chooses to resign and move away from the island saying, "As for Cyprus, delighted as I am with the settlement which is following the pattern I proposed in the ECONOMIST at the outbreak of this nonsense: nevertheless I am simply on another planet now", (David Roessel "Letters of Lawrence Durrell to Austen Harrison" 25), in words that not only acknowledge his own complicity in the Cypriot affairs but also reflect accurately his egocentric nature (or is it his homelessness?). Seferis, on the other hand, tries hard to make an impression on his country's political position in the international conferences in which Greece participates with regards to the Cyprus Question by insisting that a trap lies ahead (Beaton 350). In vain though.

What did Seferis find so disturbing in Durrell's position in the government that

estranged him from him? And was Seferis' involvement in the island's affairs not problematic in itself? What is the import of their aborted friendship in reading Durrell's trope of friendship in his *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus*? Considering the strength and genuineness of the friendship between the two writers, how do we assess its later tarnishing? Did it resemble in any sense the kind of friendship that Derrida, Blanchot, and Nancy refer to? Did it hold, in its cross-cultural manifestation, any utopian promise of a critical community? All these questions are interrelated and by addressing the last one directly, I am also addressing the others indirectly. I will answer this last question with a categorical no, not because of the impossibility of such friendship—as the one discussed with reference to Derrida, Blanchot, and Nancy—that entails a movement towards a utopic horizon; but instead, because of the very presence of a 'topos' in the friendship of the two writers, and in their investment from incompatible perspectives in such a 'topos'. In other words, while in Corfu, and later on in Athens, the two authors both invested their literary and political energies—albeit in different ways—towards the revival of an eternal Hellenism that grounded itself in a 'topos' defined by Greece, despite Seferis' alleged spatial atopia. While Durrell's sensual and imaginative topography of Greece, (as encapsulated in his book *Prospero's Cell*, "Other countries may offer you discoveries in manners or lore or landscape; Greece offers you something harder – the discovery of yourself" (qtd. in MacNiven 107)), brought about a contagious attraction to Greece and afforded him a place in the pantheon of philhellenism, Seferis' topography of Hellenism, despite his methodical mapping of it in an aesthetic tradition that strangely married Hellenism and modernism, still presupposed the Hellenic 'topos' as the link with the Hellenic 'physis' (nature) (Leontis 138-9). As Gourgouris argues with regards to Seferis, and his nostalgia for utopia, "in *seeing* utopia, Seferis *abolishes* it" (Gourgouris 224).

While in Cyprus though, the two authors seem to be contesting the very definition of the Cypriot 'topos', which they both try to write through their respective country's identity and, in the case of Durrell, through his own paternalistic views as well. Durrell's work in the *Cyprus Review* and his desire to inscribe the Cypriot 'topos' with an identity, of British engineering admittedly, is what profoundly revolts Seferis, who proceeds to say in his part that he found(ed) a Hellenism of the most authentic type in the Cypriot 'topos', bringing Hellenism home in a journey in which he acts as the Odyssean navigator. Seferis says characteristically: "from here one experiences Greece as (suddenly) spacious, broader. The sense that there exists a world where people speak Greek: a Greek world, but one that doesn't depend on the Greek Government – and this last contributes to this sense of

spaciousness" (qtd. in Beaton 307). Seferis' expanded Hellenism and the inscription of the Cypriot 'topos' with an eternal Hellenism, which in Seferis' poetic is synonymous with a universal humanism (Leontis 160):"I've fallen in love with this place. Maybe because I've found here things still living, that have been lost in that other Greece" (qtd. in Beaton 310). Conveniently for Seferis, Cyprus provides an expanded plane where his topography of a "Hellenic Hellenism" (Leontis 138) can materialize and thus achieves his long-awaited personal and Hellenic homecoming. Leontis is apposite here for defining Seferis' vision of nostos: "Yet, according to Seferis's interwar topography, Hellenism continued to exist and spread as an exiled force, as it had in ancient times. By situating Hellenic letters temporarily outside Hellas, Seferis was able to define the conditions for Hellenism's homecoming" (Leontis 138).

While respecting and acknowledging Seferis' love for the island and efforts from a diplomatic position to thwart a catastrophic settlement, one must note that Seferis' poetic appropriation of the island as a 'topos' of an eternal Hellenism—and thus, a homeland for him and his Hellenism—was not devoid of its own implication in mapping the island with a particular hegemonic identity-making project. Despite his caveats about the importance of encouraging the support of Turkish Cypriot community (Beaton 321), Seferis' Hellenic topography of Cyprus made it more "the topos of a Greek loss, and not a Turkish present" (Calotychos "(Pre)Occupied Space: Hyphens, Apostrophes and over-Sites in the Literary Imagining of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey" 56). Indeed, both authors in their encounter in Cyprus, are afflicted with an incurable nostalgia for an authenticity—albeit of different kinds—of an Edenic nature, which they try to appease by inscribing the Cypriot 'topos' with their own individual visions of a homeland. As such, they not only share the nostalgia of the previous British writers for a golden age but also anticipate the nostalgia of later Cypriot writers for an authentic community. While Seferis writes the Cypriot 'topos' with an authentic Hellenism in response to colonial allegations of a lack of Greekness on the island, Durrell's work, as it is exemplified both in his book as well as his editorial post in the *Cyprus Review*, manifests an irremediable longing for an authentic arcadian Cyprus and a concomitant disappointment at its disappearance, because of the 'terrorists' of EOKA, as he lamentably claims. Since their nostalgia is grounded in a 'topos', albeit from opposing perspectives, their individual endeavors at homecoming constitute incompatible projects that strain their friendship and reveal its very 'topical' nature, its very investment, in other words, on an idea of home as a spatial object that is inextricably linked to a patria. Such a vision leaves little room for utopia, or for utopian visions of 'home', friendship',

and ‘community’.

Bitter Lemons of Cyprus and Friendship

I would like at this point to shift my attention to Durrell’s *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus* and look closely at the trope of friendship as it unfolds in the book. My reading of the book aims, on the one hand, to illustrate how his treatment of friendship to the Greek characters in the book and to the island as a whole is similar to the motif of friendship to Seferis, as I examined it earlier; and, on the other, to tease out some moments of subversive and de-hegemonising friendship in the book. The latter probably go unnoticed by the author but, as I will argue, they could be seen as the seeds of a critical cosmopolitan community, perpetually deferred, nonetheless.

When Durrell starts working at the Pancyprian Gymnasium as a teacher, in *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus*, he declares that “This indeed was the perfect laboratory in which to study national sentiment in its embryonic state …” (130). Indeed, the role of the anthropologist or scientist was not unknown to Durrell, who in an earlier passage in the book asserts that,

> That is why I wished to experience it through its people rather than its landscape, to enjoy the sensation of sharing a common life with the humble villagers of the place; and later to expand my field of investigation to its history – the lamp which illumines national character – in order to offer my live subjects a frame against which to set themselves. (45)

Durrell’s trope of friendship in the book—a veritably dominant trope—follows similar lines, as Durrell assumes the role of the anthropologist and seems to be testing Anglo-Hellenic friendship based on his personal contacts with the local people. As early as in his first contact of some length with a Cypriot in the book, he sighs with relief that “the old sentimental tie was still alive, that it had not been killed by wooden administration and bad manners” (14). Despite the tenderness and humor that describes his friendships with the locals on the island, one cannot help but notice the anxiety of Durrell to appear as an honest and true friend to them, as one of them, linked to them through their mutual love for each other’s country. Yet, reading the book closely, we see that Durrell’s honesty towards his friends comes into question since he can neither marry his incompatible roles of being one of the villagers and work for the colonial government at the same time nor fully shed his anthropological and orientalist garments, and has a paternalistic tone unless surrounded

by his British friends who seem to be the chosen ones sharing his table and providing his intellectual fodder: "But while these fellow villagers of mine brought me knowledge of saints and seasons, of icons and wine, the swallows were beginning to gather – the human swallows which make life endurable for those who elect to live on islands" (Durrell 93). Importantly, all of the festivities in Durrell's home described in the book entail British friends of his, and none of them has a single Cypriot, despite his allegedly many friendships; indeed, we saw earlier that even Seferis was removed from the dinner table and substituted by Sir Harry Luke, as Roessel indicates (David Roessel "Letters of Lawrence Durrell to Austen Harrison" 8-9). Thus, Durrell's literal and figurative 'home' seems to be favoring an ethnically 'homophilic' friendship rather than a 'philoxenic' one. But before I proceed with a more detailed examination of Durrell's politics of friendship in the book, I think that a brief synopsis of the book would help us in the following discussion.

Bitter Lemons of Cyprus recounts Durrell's coming to the island in the 1950s where he plans to stay for a while and heal himself from Belgrade and a tempestuous marital life (MacNiven 385). While claiming to be "not a political book, but simply a somewhat impressionistic study about the moods and atmospheres of Cyprus during the troubled years of 1953-6" (Durrell ix), in actuality, the book oscillates between Durrell's endeavor to build a home in Cyprus—both literally and metaphorically—and his attempt to graph/graft an identity on the island through his overtly political comments on the turbulent situation, especially after 1955, both on the military and political front. The first part of the book abounds in beautifully written prose that narrates comic incidents from a rural Cyprus—albeit with the right dose of a colonial nostalgia of a bucolic life and colonial romance for adventure—and yarns the threads of friendship both with the local villagers but also with the island, though this is a friendship imbued with a condescending paternalism and based on the ideology of philhellenism. However, the ambience in the latter part of the book changes since the latter half of the book narrates the tension between these threads of friendship and the pervasive fear instilled by the terrorist rebels of EOKA, as the book defines them. Near the end of the book, we find Durrell walking away from his village, passing from a crowded square in the midst of a "heavy ominous silence" (Durrell 268). Lest we interpret this as a victory of terror and as a defeat of his vision of eternal Anglo-Hellenic amity that at times seems to be the central trope of the book, he hits a final stroke by having "the small brown agile Andreas, running for all his sixty years like a boy of sixteen" to announce to him that his boy "came back. He did not join EOKA

because he won a scholarship to London instead" (Durrell 269). The EOKA 'extremists' might have destroyed Durrell's and his British predecessors' arcadian field of colonial romance, but Durrell has the final say. Indeed, in a paternalistic tone, he confidently provides reassurance for the continuation of Anglo-Hellenic friendship, in a framework that also assures that the concurrent power structures are not challenged.

Since *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus* is a travel book on Cyprus, and also given Durrell's desire expressed in his 'Preface' to convey a feeling of verisimilitude in the book, I will grant him this wish and treat it, at least initially, as the true story of the writer himself. Durrell's reception in the village of Bellapais, where he buys an old house that he renovates, is indeed warm and friendly, upholding the Cypriot "iron law of hospitality" (Durrell 79), as he informs us. Indeed, in the first part of the book, in particular, the locals embrace Durrell since, according to what his co-villager Andreas says to him, "'After all you come to us as a neighbor, not to make the 'big gentleman' with us'" (Durrell 110). Yet, Durrell is not that consistent or honest with his local friends, and despite his openness and his amicability, his repeated and tiring allusions to the undying Anglo-Hellenic friendship, and his desire to appear as one of the villagers in a move that could plant the seeds of some form of unworking of affective relations based on alleged national homogeneity and nature, he does not forget who his compatriots are and repeatedly in the book he refers to 'our' interests. I quote: "In a sense it was *our* failure to project the British ethos, to make available to the Cypriot the amplitude of *our* own civic and cultural resources, which had contributed to his sense of neglect, to the frustrated feeling he had of being an outsider" (Durrell 140 my emphasis). Durrell's tone and intention are different in this last quote compared to the ones we saw earlier. Instead of being one of them (the Cypriots), Durrell here is patently one of the others, the British. His comment attains further significance if we see it alongside "Foreign Minister Anthony Eden's desire, in 1955, to promote the idea of a university in Cyprus which, in collaboration with its British counterparts, would push the Cypriots away from Athens" (Calotychos "'Lawrence Durrell, the Bitterest Lemon?': Cyps and Brits Loving Each Other to Death in Cyprus, 1953-57" 183). Moreover, his scholarly, and patronizing, tone is one that belies Andreas' comment that Durrell is not making the 'big gentleman'. Faithful to his overall role as an anthropologist/scientist conducting an experiment, Durrell provides his Orientalist diagnosis about the poor state of the Cypriot cultural milieu. One is left wondering whether his co-villagers felt indeed as neglected by the British ethos as Durrell diagnoses them to be.

Nevertheless, as I argued earlier, even friendship cannot escape Durrell's scientific laboratory and he never misses an opportunity to give it a test. In an incident where Morais, a co-villager of Durrell, expresses his disapproval at Durrell's move to his village, saying, "in such pure patois that I [Durrell] could not follow it … 'And now if we are going to have the swine actually living in our villages . . . It's bad enough to have them as masters'", Durrell tells us that, "He [Morais] was not receiving any moral support from his audience […] for it infringed the iron law of hospitality" (79). Durrell's clever manipulation of the scene—where Morais not only offends the guest but also the law of hospitality, all in an incomprehensible patois which disqualifies him—does not stop here. He proceeds to test his colonial subjects' response to his law of Greek character: "Besides, being of a somewhat scientific turn of mind I wished to see whether Morais would prove an exception to the law I had formulated about Greek character, namely: 'to disarm a Greek you have only to embrace him'" (Durrell 80). Morais indeed responded successfully to Durrell's experiment of an embrace and looked "absolutely amazed and put out of countenance. He began to stammer out something, but I ducked back into the door and left him to the mercy of his friends who had shown an evident delight and appreciation of this little performance" (Durrell 80). The anthropologist turns actor. Durrell's experiment grants Morais the longed-for Greek identity, yet it does not absolve him from his hopeless and incomprehensible patois. It is indeed noteworthy that the two Cypriot characters—Frangos and Morais—who show any form of reservation or disapproval to Durrell's presence amidst them, are portrayed as not speaking Greek but simply the patois: being unfriendly to Durrell is not a Greek trait but simply a Cypriot peculiarity.

Durrell's theatricality—a common colonial trope when depicting the so-called third-world—which is abundantly manifested in the book and more particularly with regards to his friendships to the locals, is not unrelated to a form of dissimulation. Durrell's designs are contrary to what Andreas says (or is it Durrell speaking on behalf of Andreas?) about Durrell's neighborliness and humility, and his *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus* is part of these designs, that are unknown to his so-called friends, particularly when he assumes the position of the Director of Information Services, which also includes the editing of the magazine *Cyprus Review*. His intention in editing the *Cyprus Review* as he avows in his *Spirit of Place* was to create "'something to stand the government in good stead—something worth owning'" (qtd. in David Roessel 41). Furthermore, he wishes to get British writers to write about Cyprus so that "'we can begin to work on the doughy shapeless mass of Cyprus social life and give the island an identity. . . . Important people

coming here and bothering to write about it will make life seem all the more worth living for us Cypriots'" (qtd. in David Roessel 41). Us Cypriots? Which Cypriots is Durrell referring to here? Does his comment not sound peculiar when throughout the book he refers to 'us Brits'? And how would his co-villagers have felt had they read his comments about "the doughy shapeless mass of Cyprus social life" that needs an identity, of British engineering, of course?

Well, we would not need to worry about that since Durrell works assiduously in the book to disguise the incompatible politics of his two roles, always pulling out of his sleeve some form of philhellenism or the Anglo-Greek amity when anyone dares to question his motives. Moreover, contrary to his co-villagers' belief about his code of neighborliness, he often relies on his superior knowledge of things Greek to disarm them. As he unabashedly says, "Now if I wish to bring pressure upon my neighbor I simply say to him: 'My dear fellow, no Greek would do that, charge that, think that, etc. You astonish me'… I am afraid I have become quite unscrupulous in my use of this weapon" (Durrell 115-6). Perhaps, it was such attitudes by Durrell that compelled his Cypriot friend, the painter Adamantios Diamantis, to exclaim in a letter to Seferis, "'God save us from these philhellenes'" (qtd. in David Roessel "Letters of Lawrence Durrell to Austen Harrison" 12). Indeed, Durrell's philhellenism and his alacrity to flaunt his superior knowledge of Greek history are politically pernicious at times and often reflect an antinomy of his rational, Western, scientific, and thus allegedly male knowledge versus the villagers' irrational, Oriental, and capricious, and thus allegedly female impulsive conception of the world. In a paradigmatic passage where he discusses the imminent execution of Karaolis, a young EOKA fighter, he bemoans the lack of Socratic logic in the Cypriots: "Once again I could not help remarking how absent was any conception of abstract guilt – abstract justice. Who could discern in the thought-processes of a modern Greek the exercise of a logic which was Socratic? They thought like Persian women, capriciously, waywardly, moving from impulse to impulse, completely under the domination of mood" (Durrell 244). As Petra Tournay argues, Durrell's attitude "reflects an attitude which according to Said, 'encouraged a peculiarly (not to say invidiously) male conception of the world'" (161). In one subtle stroke, Durrell appropriates for himself the classical past of the island and divests the Cypriots of their heritage since, if they cannot think rationally like Socrates (or like himself), modern Greeks and Cypriots do not deserve this heritage, as he insinuates. More perniciously though, his comment aims at the emasculation of the Cypriot male and thus his belittlement, since he thinks like a Persian woman. Apart from

confirming Durrell's profoundly sexist discourse, this comment also confirms the inextricable relationship between the discourses of colonialism and masculinity.

Such statements though cannot immunize Durrell from internal turmoil. Thus, similar to the anxiety that we diagnosed with regards to his friendship to Seferis after the latter avoids him because of his decision to work for the colonial government, Durrell is here overwhelmed by anxiety also because of the effects his new official position has on his friendship to the villagers. The much-abused and tiring flaunting of the undying Anglo-Hellenic friendship is but a disguise of a profound anxiety caused by his awareness that when you befriend power you risk the disempowering of your friendships. In other words, Durrell's collusion with imperial drama, if not outright complicity, cannot go without either overtly tarnishing his friendships or, since he chooses the covert way of dissimulation, to reveal a pervasive anxiety that dislocates his otherwise manly and assured narrative.

De-hegemonising Friendship

Contrary to Durrell's dominant motif of friendship in the book—which reiterates the fatigued concept of Anglo-Hellenic amity and views personal friendship along the affective bonds of state and national affiliations—there are moments in the book that are impregnated with de-hegemonizing potentialities but which escape the narrator, who seems to be foregrounding the former form of friendship. This is where I want to turn my attention to now. These de-hegemonizing gestures come close to the kind of friendship outlined earlier in this chapter, the one envisioned by Derrida, Blanchot, and Nancy, because they manifest the process of unworking and unbinding the affective formations that have clustered around the concepts of friendship and community, based on alleged homogeneity, nature, and similitude. In other words, my reading of these moments in the book aims to unbind friendship from the politics of similitude it has been forced to adhere to through the violent and almost exclusive appropriation of friendship as a 'homophilic' affective bond, usually between co-citizens, in a politics of friendship that posits the polis, the state, or the nation as the only means of being-in-common. This move from a 'homophilic' to a 'philoxenic' politics of friendship—not in the disingenuous and facile manner of Durrell but in a manner that upholds Foucauldian parrhesia—brings under interrogation the 'political' as well. Instead of viewing the political as ethical responsibility based on these affective formations of similitude, my reading will suggest

that the political consists in 'philoxenic' gestures of friendship, which, in practicing the unbinding of 'homophilic' affective bonds, aim to bring praxis as close to the ahorizontal horizon of utopia as possible, while never relinquishing the knowledge of the possibility of such a project as impossible. Following Derrida, I want to tease out the contradiction within such concepts as friendship, community, cosmopolitanism, between an unconditional imperative and a conditional rendering of the terms that result in praxis. As Derrida says, with regards to hospitality:

> All these questions remain obscure and difficult and we must neither conceal them from ourselves nor, for a moment, imagine ourselves to have mastered them. It is a question of knowing how to transform and improve the law, and of knowing if this improvement is possible within an historical space which takes place *between* the Law of unconditional hospitality, offered *a priori* to every other, to all newcomers, *whoever they may be*, and *the* conditional laws of a right to hospitality, without which *The* unconditional Law of hospitality would be in danger or remaining a pious and irresponsible desire, without form and without potency, and of even being perverted at any moment. (*On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness* 22-3)

This is precisely where the 'political' resides, in the negotiation between these two imperatives, the unconditional' and the 'conditional', or rather in the effort to bring the latter as close to the former as possible. According to Derrida, such an effort is enacted not in order "to paralyse political action, but, on the contrary, in order to enable it" (Critchley and Kearney x).

I will quote at length a passage that in my opinion is paradigmatic of such a moment that is infused with the potential of a subversive friendship, which is indeed evaded by Durrell. The dialogue is between Durrell and Frangos, a local character who 'horrified' everyone earlier in the book in Clito's tavern by launching a verbal attack on the "damned English and those who endured them with such patience" (Durrell 29), only to be rendered speechless, looking like a "cornered bull", by Durrell's witty, yet untruthful reference to a dead brother who is supposed to have died at Thermopylae, defending the Greeks. Dissimulation is not unknown to Durrell, and, once more, he shows his alacrity at pulling any card from his sleeve, true or false, moral or immoral, in order to extricate himself from the situation by deceiving the illiterate Frangos who does not seem to know

that the battle of Thermopylae occurred a couple of thousand years before. Colonial discourse acknowledges its own reliance on falsehood in order to extricate itself from a potentially dangerous situation, undermining thus its self-righteous discourse. The evening finishes with Durrell magnanimously buying drinks for everyone in order to *save* Frangos from the embarrassment of having insulted the great philhellene. But I am digressing. Back to Frangos and Durrell and their promisingly subversive interchange:

> 'Ho there, Englishman, we drank together, did we not?'
>
> 'We did. To the palikars of all nations'
>
> 'God be with them.'
>
> 'God be with them'
>
> There was silence. He appeared to be struggling against his innate friendliness. 'What have you come to Bellapaix for?' he asked me at last in a loud, provocative tone, but without any real sting in it. It was as if his self-possession were not quite complete: perhaps my brother's death at Thermopylae had holed him below the water-line.
>
> 'I have come to learn to drink,' I said drily, and he gave a great snort of laughter and banged his knee until the dust flew out of the folds of his baggy trousers. 'Do you hear that?' he said, turning to his family for approval. 'To drink! Good! Excellent! Then turning back to me he boomed: 'I shall be your master.'
>
> 'Agreed.'
>
> 'And what will you give me in exchange?'
>
> 'Whatever you wish.'
>
> 'Even my freedom?'
>
> I was about to extricate myself from this small predicament by a sophistry which would not have damaged friendly relations when a welcome interruption occurred. (Durrell 84-5)

The slave giving the master his freedom. Is the dull Frangos onto something here? The colonized subject in his new role as master asks the colonial writer in his new role as slave, for a favor, and the new slave—either because of his inability to forgo his former all-powerfulness continues to behave as omnipotent master, or because of the continuation of the twisting of the roles—is ready and able to grant the master any wish. And what does the new master ask for? His freedom! In this continuous twisting of roles, we can already

see the outlines of a new form of relationship that comes together because of the mutual unbinding of the two characters of their established positions and roles. This strongly resonates with Derrida's idea of true hospitality, where host and guest become indistinguishable in the ongoing mixing of roles and positions: "The guest (hôte) becomes the host (hôte) of the host (hôte). These substitutions make everyone into everyone's hostage. Such are the laws of hospitality" (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 125). Yet, Durrell's narrator, unable to continue working within such (un)friendly contours, is looking for a sophistry. But, is not sophistry unknown, if not inimical to Socratic philosophy? And did not our narrator lament the lack of Socratic logic in his Cypriot friends? Indeed, this fruitful moment, inseminated with such de-hegemonizing potentialities, is glossed over by Durrell, who probably registers the incident in the book, as banter and thus as a sign of the establishment of friendly relations between himself and the most vociferous of anti-English detractors. The incident implies that friendship away from the "small contempts" (Durrell ix) of politics can overcome the terror instilled by politically motivated extremists who threaten Cyprus' and Durrell's fictitious characters' innocence. Durrell's philhellenism reigns again.

The book entails other gestures of unbinding communal bonds that find their meaning in similitude and homogeneity, bonds in other words that reiterate the romance of familial self-repetition. The cross-cultural friendship extended by the villagers towards Durrell is, at certain moments, such a friendship, since it is genuine and it upholds Foucault's idea of parrhesia: the harmony between the bios and the word. For, how are we to perceive the innumerable gifts brought to him, or the affection and attentions lavished so open-heartedly onto him by his co-villagers in the midst of so much violence, despite his nationality? These cross-cultural or cross-national affects and attentions reach an unprecedented level when the muktar of his village decides to give him a gun to protect himself, in a gesture that unworks and unbinds the national affiliations and points to a more critical community. The passage can help us in our reading of this moment:

> Of the crisis hardly a word was said, save by the muktar whose responsibilities weighed so heavily upon him that he felt permitted to ignore the laws of tact. 'Aren't you afraid to come up here?' he said. 'Why should I be?' 'Are you armed?' 'No.' He sighed. 'I will lend you a gun.' 'Against who – Andreas or Mr Honey?' He laughed heartily at this. 'No. None of us would harm you. But people come here from outside, at night, in cars. (Durrell 198)

Evidently, one could protest that not all people embrace the national cause at times of revolutions in the name of the nation. Yet, here, we do not have a gesture that undermines the national cause of Enosis but one that posits the 'philoxenic' bond of personal affection and friendship higher than the bond imposed or inherited by a national doctrine. Thus, Durrell's attempt to make us read this incident as one where the muktar offers him a gun because the latter believes that there are a few EOKA rebels that could harm him—thus sharing Durrell's and the official British view of the situation—fails in view of the fact that the overwhelming majority of Greek-Cypriots at the time were supporters of Enosis (Calotychos "'Lawrence Durrell, the Bitterest Lemon?': Cyps and Brits Loving Each Other to Death in Cyprus, 1953-57" 169) and fervently anti-British. Unwittingly, Durrell here inscribes a gesture that transgresses the national bonds of affiliation, one that favors personal cross-cultural friendship over national affiliation. Yet, the question here should not be the kind of friendship extended by the locals to Durrell, but instead, the kind of friendship extended by Durrell to the locals. For, apart from the fact that his house is one where the rule of hospitality seems to be extended only to his ethnically 'homophilic' kind, containing no 'philoxenic' traces, there is also the problem of parrhesia, of honest speech. Foucault says that "*Parrhesia* as it appears in the field of philosophical activity in Greco-Roman culture is not primarily a concept or theme, but a practice which tries to shape the specific relations individuals have to themselves…. [so] that the decisive criterion which identifies the *parrhesiastes* is not to be found in his birth, nor in his citizenship, nor in his intellectual competence, but in the harmony which exists between his *logos* and his *bios*" (40). What Foucault is indicating here, albeit in a more complex manner, relates to the difference between a friend and a flatterer, the latter of whom he endows with a high degree of philautia, or self-love (Michel Foucault 51).

Durrell indeed is one who resembles the latter rather than the former, since he does very little unstitching of national or familial affiliations himself but prefers to rely on the cliché, deeply romantic, and uncritical concept of Anglo-Hellenic amity instead of viewing critically his own part in these friendships. In addition, his idea of cross-cultural friendship, construed through culture as impermeable and thus concealing a fear of contagion, lacks parrhesia, or truthfulness. Indeed, it seems that his co-villagers know very little about Durrell's implication in the political situation, an implication that leaves little room for true friendship or any unstitching of conventional and familial bonds of community. Even when he decides to leave the island, since "most of the swallows had

gone", and despite the fact that he would prefer to leave immediately, he decides to let his contract lapse instead of hurrying away because it could "give the Greek press grounds for believing that I had resigned on policy grounds, which would have been unfair to *my masters*" (228). Interestingly, Durrell, the deracinated, paragon of homelessness, the paradigm of freedom, acts in accordance to his masters' interests. Do his co-villagers know about his masters? And if they do, would they still be offering him a gun? Does Durrell's attitude reflect at all his friends' parrhesia? The answer is definitely no, and, while Durrell works assiduously at disguising his own insidious attitude in the Cypriot affairs behind the veil of Anglo-Hellenic amity, he realizes that his case might not be wholly convincing. Thus, he insinuates that his less and less frequent visits to the village, are not because of the fact that his dubious role and his lack of parrhesia start becoming known to his co-villagers but due to the fact that he does not want to jeopardize his friends' lives by being seen with them. Such barbarity, such terrorism, "typically Balkan" as he says, started pervading the island, that he "could not bear to think of Andreas of Frangos or fat Anthemos having to answer for 'treachery'" (231). Selflessness and self-sacrifice indeed! Only if they could be the result of parrhesia and not of a political maneuver based on philautia.

For, in claiming that he abstains from going to the village in order to protect his co-villagers, Durrell implicitly foregrounds the lunacy of EOKA's arbitrary killing, and thus shifts the attention away from his own duplicitous politics. Thus, in order to strengthen his case, he provides us with an example of atrocity, namely the murder of his friend Panos by EOKA. As Roessel reveals, the murder of Panos is not an event based on truth (David Roessel "Rodis Roufos on Bitter Lemons: A Suppressed Section of *the Age of Bronze*" 133), which raises questions about its appearance in an otherwise 'truthful' travel narrative. And why Panos, among so many other Greek-Cypriot characters in the book? Panos' eloquent and articulate views on the situation which stress the unfairness of the British politics on Cyprus render him an unlikely target by EOKA, yet Durrell's orchestration of his death allows him to underline a particular view of EOKA, one of arbitrariness and lunacy. Of course, Durrell needs to justify to his British readers why Panos was worthy of his friendship—since Panos lacks the naivety and romantic roughness that make the rest of the Cypriots exotic and thus palatable to a British audience—and thus tempers Panos' anti-British political views with Panos' childish admiration of the English soldiers' physique and his elation at being called a gentleman by one of them (Durrell 247) as well as by his alacrity to scold anyone who might be offensive or insensitive towards Durrell. Moreover,

as Calotychos argues, even Panos' pro-Enosis view on the political and military front "brings fatalism and not action to the fore. It is the final Romantic *cri de coeur* for the oneness of experience. It is the final Romantic cry of totality before the fall; before the encroachment of nationality, race, and religion" ("'Lawrence Durrell, the Bitterest Lemon?': Cyps and Brits Loving Each Other to Death in Cyprus, 1953-57" 181). In effect, Durrell molds Panos' views to reflect his own nostalgia and disappointment at the evanescence of a prelapsarian Cyprus.

Durrell's realization of the failure of his facile philhellenism and his eternal Anglo-Hellenic friendship to contain the violence that is erupting creates a lurking anxiety in the text that he tries to disguise towards the end by having one of his co-villagers running to him to tell him that his son who was being accosted by EOKA is off to London with a scholarship. This end where the colonial subject's education and transformation is entrusted to the motherly embrace of the colonial metropolis is one that functions as a palliative against Durrell's anxiety about the failure of cross-cultural friendship when pitted against national allegiance and of his personal feeling of guilt about his dual and dubious role in Cyprus. Yet, his awareness that gestures of befriending power break up empowered friendships cannot be missed in the book, and the pervasive awareness of the narrator, registered by the "ominous silence" (Durrell 268) that he encounters in his final return to the village cannot be erased by colonialist benevolence in the shape of scholarships to London. This pervasive anxiety dislocates Durrell's otherwise self-assured narrative and comes to add fresh layers of anxiety on the idiom of English in Cyprus. In addition, Durrell's co-villagers' gestures of friendship that at moments reflect the unbinding of filiative systems that we have noted, as well as the promises of a utopian kind of friendship that remain unfulfilled in the book, come to provide nuanced layers of dislocation of English. As such, they anticipate the work of contemporary Cypriot writers whose works endeavor to unbind the snug nature of notions such as 'home' and 'community' and reveal the exclusionary politics in any envisioning of 'home'. This contemporary literature will have to wait though, since, before we attend to them, we will need to attend to the nostalgia for the struggle of the 1950s and for a halcyon Greek past that pervades two anti-colonial narratives that endeavor to answer back to *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus* at a tense period that also marks the beginning of post-national aesthetics or a nostalgia for an unrealized community through a memoir from the diaspora.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Durrell's greatest homecoming to the island—namely his book *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus*, where he assiduously works to construct both a physical home and a figurative one fails. Its failure to construct a viable home for both the author as well as the colonial regime serves as a constant reminder that viable homes are "places that are recognized as such by those within and those without" (George 9). In spite of Durrell's disguise as one of the Cypriots, those naive and simple Cypriots did not recognize themselves in Durrell's 'home' as people 'within'. And when they recognized themselves as those 'without', Durrell's 'home' had little to do with their own vision of a 'homeland'. While Durrell wishes to experience a sense of 'homecoming' while on the island by domesticating the violence of the 1950s through his purported cosmopolitanism but mainly through his faith in the work of Anglo-Hellenic friendship, the nationalist imaginaries are working concurrently towards the confining of the notion of 'home' within ethnically homogeneous lines. Thus, Durrell's wish for 'homecoming' on the island is not fulfilled since his cosmopolitan idiom was a disguise for his colonial politics that were incompatible with the nationalist vision of 'home' that was gaining momentum on the island. Indeed, the violent years of the 1950s, as they unfold in the book, reflect the violence that is always present at the establishment of 'homes', be it physical, ideological, or emotional, since home "is community… [and] [b]oth home and community provide such substantial pleasures that have been so thoroughly assumed as natural that it may seem unproductive to point to exclusions that found such abodes" (George 9). Unproductive as it may seem to point at such exclusions, it is not only by pointing but by foregrounding such exclusions that we begin to understand the violence that is always present at the founding of such notions. It is perhaps the few unlikely and unintended gestures of friendship in the book that provide the most rigorous de-centering of hegemonic imaginings of 'home', in disorienting, yet liberating ways, by pointing to an impossible community that is always deferred, and always composed of the most unlikely companions.

Chapter 4: From Nostalgia for the Past to Nostalgia for the Future: Nationalism and its Aftermath

> Nostalgia, it can be said, is universal and persistent; only other men's nostalgias offend. (Williams 12)

> Nostalgia speaks in riddles and puzzles, so one must face them in order not to become its next victim—or its next victimizer. (Boym xvii)

Introduction

Is nostalgia pervasive? Is it, in other words, a mood that affects all of us at one time or another? And if it is, has it always been the case, from time immemorial? While acknowledging the Homeric or, more specifically, the Odyssean resonance of the term, can we safely argue that the archetypal nostalgia of Odysseus for return to Ithaka is the same nostalgia that is acutely and widely felt today in our postcolonial, diasporic and fragmented world? Is the etymological essence of the word adequate to explain its pervasive presence in modernity or does it demand a genealogical investigation in our effort to better understand not only nostalgia's mood but also its politics of representation? Furthermore, is nostalgia, with its longing, or 'algia', for 'nostos' necessarily an escapist trope of pleasurable arrival or can its iterative process of longing for return also form a point of departure which evokes the dislocation and discontinuity that such return entails?

While nostalgia is a widespread mood that is acutely felt in such a way that it brings both the nostalgic subject and object into crisis by revealing temporal and spatial discontinuities and dislocations (as well as continuities and (re)locations), its representation does not always reveal this crisis. Indeed, opening up the field of representation of nostalgia in a project that acknowledges its own implication as part of such representation, allows us to give in to nostalgia's irresistible melody, while also critically probing nostalgia's modalities through their different manifestations, so that we bring nostalgia's etymological provenance in dialogue with its own historicity. Radstone asserts that, "Nostalgia constitutes both a way of knowing the world – or, better put, a way of knowing worlds – and a discourse on knowledge" (189). As such, it demands an examination that never loses sight of its dual nature as both subject and object of

investigation, sign of both homesickness and homecoming. It is by way of coming back home that we (could) find that home is no more. Indeed, a genealogical examination of nostalgia's modalities "might bring us to redefine critical modernity and its temporal ambivalence and cultural contradictions" (Boym 31). As such nostalgia becomes something akin to Derrida's *pharmakon*, that is both remedy or poison (Derrida *Dissemination* 98-101).

In my analysis of the post-independence years in Cyprus, I would like to look into the various nostalgias of the time not only as a diagnostician of the term and of the times (or of the object of nostalgia) but also as a subject of nostalgia who is affected by it by engaging in this very project. In selecting moments or modes of nostalgia from particular texts, I do not intend to simply prove their nostalgic modalities; rather, I would like to bring these modes of nostalgia to the fore as paradigms that can tell us something about nostalgia itself as well as its historical fluctuations in modernity. Nicholas Dames, in a gesture laden with nostalgia, encourages us to treat nostalgia "not as a symptom that *explains* something, but as a force that *does* something" (272); I think that we need to do both. Nostalgia has a functional aspect, but it is also a symptom of modernity and a response to the trauma of modernity. In effect, such a historicity avoids the reification of nostalgia into categories that see it as essentially bad or good, restorative or reflective, uncritical or critical. Such binaries end up distancing theory from nostalgia, and from the nostalgic longing that drives theory (or any form of writing) in the first place. Rather than allowing theory to fill up our ears with the wax of theoretical armory and shield us from nostalgia's irresistible allure, it is preferable to acknowledge our own longing for the Sirens' omniscience of the past, and bound to the mast, listen to their song in a gesture that, like Odysseus', points to a position where as "subject[s] [we] need not be subjected to them [Sirens]" (Adorno and Horkheimer 59). In other words, instead of distancing ourselves from nostalgia as a reified category of desirable or pernicious engagement with the past that we select or discard, we need to find a position from where we yield to its pervasive lure, while eluding its omnipotent negation of the future in exchange for a promise of an omniscient past. It is from such a position that we can perhaps critically face the fear that the two epigraphs entail: of other people's nostalgia as well as of nostalgia itself. After all, Odysseus' preemptive move of tying himself to the mast and preventing himself from surrendering to the Sirens' song and lure implicitly suggests his own nostalgic longing for the immemorial reality and omniscience that the Sirens represent. For let us not forget that the Sirens' "allurement is that of losing one self in the past"

(Adorno and Horkheimer 32) because of "their irresistible promise of pleasure as which their song is heard" (Adorno and Horkheimer 32). So, we need to listen to the pleasures of nostalgia while being aware both of the Sirens' ability to transform the disaster of the past into pleasure and the inevitability of surrender to them if we hear them completely unbound. Like Odysseus, the treatment of nostalgia needs to do justice to both levels, to imbibe its moods, flows, and pulsations, while also examining (or diagnosing) its uses, modalities, and functions. Nostalgia needs, in other words, to be treated both as a malady as well as a cure, something akin to pharmakon, a poison as well as remedy.

In this chapter, I would like to revisit the tense cultural milieu of post-independence Cyprus and examine closely the treatment of the past in two anti-colonial narratives, namely Costas Montis' *Closed Doors* and Rodis Roufos' *The Age of Bronze*, both written at the beginning of the new nation state in the early 1960s. Both of these texts have a clear political agenda since they grapple with the essentialist formulations of perhaps the most well-known colonial text on Cyprus, namely Lawrence Durrell's *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus*; indeed, they constitute discursive attempts at 'writing back' to the empire. Subsequently, I will draw on *Plucked in a Far-off Land*, a later text written by the diaspora Turkish-Cypriot Taner Baybars and which engages in a different kind of project and thus provides a different kind of engagement with the past: one that brings the anamnesis of the past and its representation in crisis, revealing a nostalgia for the multi-lingual and multi-cultural community of the 1940s that was fast disappearing in the 1960s when the book was written. Baybars', in other words, is a nostalgia for an unrealized community. This latter nostalgia of the book is not unrelated to the reappearance of the book in the last twenty years, at a time of increasing political emphasis on rapprochement and multi-culturalism on the island. Hence, nostalgia is not only directed to the past but can also be revived to mobilize visions of the future in such ways as to reveal its functional aspect as well, the aspect of what it *does*, in other words. Nostalgia indeed is both retrospective and prospective (Boym xvi), diagnostic and prognostic, deconstructive of the past and reconstructive of the future. Hence, my interest does not solely lie in communities of the past but also in unrealized communities of the future, unimaginable opportunities and failed projects. It is in this spirit that I read the title of the chapter, since nostalgia anticipates the past but also precipitates the future. At first glance, such a comparison between anti-colonial texts with an overt political aim and a post-national memoir from the diaspora might seem asymmetric; however, through my analysis, I intend to precisely tease out the political implications of Baybars' nostalgic narrative too; they might be more

covert but are nonetheless entwined in the memoir's nostalgia for a community that has failed to come to be. Moreover, by bringing nostalgia's universal mood in dialogue with its own particular historicity, I hope to show that any approach that treats nostalgia in reified terms ends up reproducing, in theory, the feelings of animosity and apprehension towards certain nostalgias, so powerfully evoked in our two epigraphs. As such, these approaches fail to see nostalgia as a source and a discourse on knowledge itself, falling short of "a fuller understanding of the past and how it has shaped the present, for good or bad, and how it has shaped the self in connection with others" (Walder 9). Before looking into these texts, I will explore the complications of the concept of nostalgia.

Nostalgia

Nostalgia comes from the ancient Greek words, 'nostos', meaning homecoming, and 'algia', meaning longing or pain. Thus, in essence, it means longing for return back home, and as such, it implies that its presence is felt when in absence from home. In other words, nostalgia, etymologically, at least, implies some form of displacement from home, whether it is a temporal or spatial displacement, or both. Yet, as Boym reminds us, nostalgia is only "nostalgically Greek" since "it did not originate in ancient Greece" (3). In contrast to its modern usage to indicate a pervasive irremediable longing for a past time and place (place, or displacement, is especially salient in our post-colonial diasporic world) or for the impossibility of return to such a past, the initial usage of the word in the 17th century referred specifically to a longing for return home that afflicted various displaced people, mainly the Swiss soldiers that fought abroad. Coined by the Swiss doctor Johannes Hofer in his medical dissertation in 1688 (Boym 3), the term's itinerary started from psychology before passing onto poetry, cultural studies and philosophy ((Boym 14). But, as Boym rightfully asks, "How did it happen that a provincial ailment, *maladie du pays*, became a disease of the modern age, *mal du siècle*" (7)? The shift of the term from the medical field to the cultural terrain, involved not only its progressive association with negative connotations—to sentimental and cliché forms of attachment to the past—but also, as Pickering and Keightley maintain, "this involved a shift from spatial dislocation to temporal dislocation, and the sense of feeling oneself a stranger in a new period that contrasted negatively with an earlier time in which one felt, or imagined, oneself at home" (922). Hence nostalgia changed from a curable 17th century disease into an incurable condition of modernity.

While the spreading of nostalgia in its initial phase elicited responses ranging from benign treatments such as the return of the soldiers back to their homeland to malign threats of burying alive the nostalgic soldiers as a means of preventing the spread of nostalgia among the Russian army's ranks (Boym 5), later views of nostalgia tended to view it as a modern symptom of incapacitating attachment—and thus incurable—to a past that is fast disappearing in our modern world. Another interesting ambivalence and incongruity that nostalgia engendered was its relation to patriotism. Indeed, while for Hofer, "homesickness was an expression of patriotic fervor…for American doctor Theodor Calhoun it revealed a lack of manliness that disgraced the nation" (Walder 8). Such oscillations and elusiveness in nostalgia's diagnosis, treatment, and meaning alert us to the necessity of supplementing nostalgia's etymology with a historical investigation.

Nostalgia, as Boym reminds us, is "coeval with modernity itself" (xvi), and appears "roughly at the historical moment when the conception of time and history were undergoing radical change" (8). The Renaissance brought about a new perspective on time that supplanted the Messianic time of Christianity with an increasingly secular concept of "homogeneous, empty time" (Benjamin 261) and thus with an increasingly progressive view of life. Such a view of time as linear and empty, in Benjaminian terms, is particularly conducive to nostalgia, as Walder argues (10), since it keeps the future open and free of Messianic closure, and, at the same time, it renders the past available to glorification. However, the idea of progress, as Boym suggests, focused on "improvement in the future, not reflection on the past" (10), and perhaps here resides some of the negativity towards nostalgia that pervades contemporary discourses. At the same time, progress, both as idea but more importantly as a narrative, does not entail only the temporal but traverses the spatial too. Indeed, as Raymond Williams shows clearly, industrial capitalism and its narratives of progress obfuscated not only the interrelations between the country and the city—which are presented as reified and fixed categories that emerged from a rupture of an allegedly organic totality at a specific historical *time*—but also the interrelationships between metropolises and colonies that emerged as a result of the *spatial* expansion to the non-European sites that was an integral part of the idea of progress (Williams 286-87). In other words, nostalgia, after its removal from the medical field and its entrance into cultural parlance, might be seen as associated with a longing that refers to temporal dislocation; yet, we should not lose sight of the spatial dimension that was also paramount. Boym goes as far as to say that "nostalgia was not merely an expression of local longing, but a result of a new understanding of time and space that made the division into 'local'

and ‘universal’ possible. The nostalgic creature has internalized this division, but instead of aspiring for the universal and the progressive, he looks backward and yearns for the particular” (11). But which ‘particular’ is the nostalgic subject of modernity yearning for and why? I think that Raymond Williams is once again apposite here; indeed, the power asymmetries that colonial powers and their hegemonic role in industrial capitalism brought about to the non-West engendered and intensified a discontent with the present not only in the West but also in the non-West. As such, the modern subject not only becomes discontent with the present and thus nostalgic of a golden past (in such ways that the particular may be favored but is often traversed and increasingly confused by the global product of industrial capitalism) but also becomes increasingly aware of the location of her/his voice and her/his nostalgia, as East/West, colonized/colonizer etc. (Williams 283-88). And so, the modern subject stops looking wholesome and breaks into a host of partial subjects out of which some could and can voice their nostalgias and some could not and cannot. Thus, as nostalgic scholars (or subjects) of nostalgia, we should beware of the danger of over-emphasizing and thus over-identifying with those other subjects of nostalgia such as the subalterns, oppressed, and colonized, who are indeed unable to represent their nostalgias in such ways that we turn their subject position into an object position.

It is indeed the particular that the Romantics aspired to as a response to the universalizing discourse of Enlightenment, and it is this emphasis on the particular that romantic nationalism celebrated when it appropriated the nostalgia of the Romantic poets and changed it into official policy or institutionalized memory (Boym 14). However, as Boym argues, whereas the Romantic poets express a nostalgic sentiment for the particularity of experience and a longing for “its own sake” (Boym 13), “the official memory of the nation-state does not tolerate useless nostalgia, nostalgia for its own sake” (Boym 14) and turns it into national belonging. I am not wholly convinced that what appears to be anti-nationalist nostalgia, or even nostalgia that is cosmopolitan in its vision, is not also subject to similar processes of appropriation. Nostalgia is retrospective but also prospective, as we have already seen, and, as such, it can be appropriated for different, often antithetical, projects, as our analysis in this chapter will argue. Nostalgia also pervaded the discourse of modernism with its focus on the fragility of the present and sensorial memory (Walder 9), and nearer to our own time, the discourse of post-coloniality with its emphasis on spatial displacement, migration, and exile. Despite its pervasive presence, nostalgia started accreting negative hues and appeared “outmoded and

unscientific" (Boym 16), or as the opposite of progress, "against which it is negatively viewed as reactionary, sentimental, or melancholic" (Pickering and Keightley 919). Contrary to the old belief that progress will eradicate nostalgia, the opposite happened: "progress didn't cure nostalgia but exacerbated it" (Boym xiv), to the point that it clothed it in a mantle of negativity. Indeed, today, nostalgia is generally treated as a crippling mode of engagement with the past, or perhaps, as "always suspect" (Atia and Davies 181). Yet, as we have seen, nostalgia, similar to the nation-state, emerged as a particular response to the traumas of modernity, and, as such, it can be both an object of investigation but also a subject of the investigation of modernity's ambivalences and contradictions.

The sentimental and hackneyed forms of representing the fast disappearing past are only one side of the story of modernity, though. The fragmentation of reality in modernity, where the acceleration of time and of information intensifies enormously the sense of loss, brought about not only sentimental attachment to idealized versions of the past but also a critical reengagement with the past as a form of reaction to that very historical acceleration. Nostalgia, being a response to this modern intensified form of change, entails both of these processes and, as such, reveals an integral paradox of modernity, namely the rapid evanescence of the past due to modernity's historical acceleration and the concurrent over-imposition of the past in the form of various forms of obsession with cultural artefacts, mementos, and souvenirs as well as national archives and heritages. Viewing nostalgia as a necessarily debilitating trope of sentimental attachment to the past through pastiche forms and trite mementoes, reveals a failure to grasp this very paradox of modernity. What is needed is a more critical analysis that points to the possibility of other forms of engagement with the past that reveal the discontinuities and ambivalences that are present in our engagement with the past but do not treat the past as insularly disconnected from the present. In other words, nostalgia, like the *pharmakon*, can be both poison and cure. It is this dual nature of nostalgia that prompts Atia and Davies to say that "Nostalgia is both the bitter-sweet side-effect of modernity, and a potential causing of a deadening hostility to the changes that modernity brings" (181).

Whatever its subject or object of investigation, nostalgia is a negotiation between continuities and discontinuities, between the fragments and strands of the self or of the collective past that are recalled in the present, albeit in ways that uncannily reveal both the continuities and discontinuities of such a process. It is in this direction that I would like to turn my attention now, and discuss how nostalgia, when seen as a negotiating process between the continuities and discontinuities of self, or between identity and difference,

reveals an integral predicament of modernity, namely that "as subjects of modernity, the continuity of our identity resides precisely in our most personal discontinuities". Nostalgia, thus, points to how "nostalgic emotion might be nothing less than the felt awareness of how identity is entangled with difference" (Atia and Davies 184).

In discussing nostalgia, Boym differentiates between two kinds of nostalgia, the restorative and the reflective, the latter entailing a "delaying of homecoming—wistfully, ironically, desperately" (xviii), while the former stresses the 'nostos' part of the word in a process that culminates in the restoration of home, and thus in the alleviation or erasure of 'algos' that results from it. While "restorative nostalgia does not think of itself as nostalgia, but rather as truth and tradition…and protects the absolute truth", reflective nostalgia, "calls it into doubt" (xviii). Jeff Malpas takes Boym to task by contending that what she understands by 'restorative nostalgia' is not nostalgia but 'mythophilia', since Boym's 'restorative nostalgia' does not recognize itself as nostalgia, and thus, as he argues, it lacks both 'algos' and 'nostos'. He says characteristically that,

> such 'nostalgia', if it is to be called that, not only lacks any sense of pain, of *algos*, but strictly speaking it also lacks any proper sense of home, of *nostos*, since it lacks any sense that what is at issue is what already belongs to it, and to which it might be said to belong, and so lacks any sense that what is at issue is its own sense of itself, its own sense of identity. Such 'nostalgia' is scarcely nostalgia at all, but corresponds instead to the mythophilia that remains fixated on a past of which it has no memory of its own, and that loses itself in the attempt to realise that mythical and unremembered past. (96)

Malpas' point is significant because of its caveat of the danger of drawing too simple a distinction between the enabling and disabling usages of nostalgia. He argues that nostalgia, when it is self-referential, is critical because, situated as it is between 'nostos' and 'algos', it can only entail a remembering of self as dislocated and discontinuous. In essence then, what allows nostalgia to remain critical, and not fall into what Boym calls 'restorative' function, and what Malpas calls 'mythophilia', is the sense of dislocation, displacement, and discontinuity of self that any 'nostos' or homecoming into the past, evokes in the present in the form of 'algos'. If, in other words, the object and subject of nostalgia do not entail any form of temporal discontinuity or spatial dislocation of themselves in their anamnestic return, then their criticality is jeopardized. Moreover, one

of the dangers of such a binary is the fact that it condemns the so called 'restorative' forms of nostalgia to the waste bin without seeing them as reactions and responses to the trauma of modernity that often offer solace and compensation (i.e. in the form of nationalist memory) for the sense of loss that modernity exacerbated.

Indeed, as Malpas puts it, "The mood of nostalgia, so closely linked to memory, is thus always one that remains somewhere *between nostos* and *algos* – between the return home and the pain of its irrevocable loss" (89). If nostalgia then entails the relationship between 'nostos' and 'algos', why is it then that in theory it is generally treated as a crippling trope that, in favoring idealized versions of the past, paralyses action in the present and the future? Does not such a view of nostalgia, which is dominant in theory, also presuppose an indulgence granted to the temporal at the cost of the spatial? Nostalgia though engages both the temporal and the spatial through its relationship to the past via the concept of home. Home as it is remembered entails a-being-in-place that not only fuses time and space but confuses them too. In exemplifying precisely these complexities of time and place, but also of the individual and the collective or of the self and the world that are inherent in the concept of nostalgia, Jeff Malpas draws on the autobiographical aspect of nostalgia and on Heidegger's notion of Dasein. He says characteristically that,

> Autobiographical memory is thus always a memory of self and world given as a memory of a specific being-in-a-place. Since nostalgia is itself a certain form of autobiographical memory – or, at least, incorporates autobiographical memory within it – so nostalgia takes the form of a remembrance of, and a longing for, a certain being-in-place that is also, of course, a certain being-at-home. (94)

Malpas here is alluding to the self-referential aspect of nostalgia, which binds it inextricably to a 'topos' and not only to time, through the sense of self whose fragmented remembrance always implicates a place.

Such an understanding of nostalgia's relationship to both time and place, as well as to the autobiographical mode, does not constrict its use to individual processes, as he asserts, since

> What we are nostalgic for as a society, and not merely as individuals, is always that which we already identify as belonging to us and to which we also belong, and that is articulated through characteristic places and landscapes that have collective resonance as part of collective memory. We

> are not, and cannot be, nostalgic for that which does not belong, or is not already taken to belong, to our own heritage and our own sense of identity. (Malpas 95)

But what about the political and ideological implications in such processes of collective remembering that are usually associated with such disabling notions of nostalgia, that are prevalent in theory, and particularly in theorizations of anti-colonial nationalist narratives as well as of colonial narratives of imperial nostalgia that Boym's restorative nostalgia refers to? Malpas employs the term 'mythophilia' to refer to such processes, since as he argues, they constitute,

> a longing not for what is remembered, but for what is known only through its retelling, through story and myth. Such longing falls short of nostalgia precisely because of the mythical character of that which it desires and valorises – a past of which we ourselves have no experience and in which we were never ourselves engaged. Such mythophilia is not nostalgic, even though it may share some features with nostalgia, and even though it may sometimes contribute to a nostalgic sensibility. (95)

While implying an uncomplicated distinction between myth and reality, and in so doing, almost avowing to a denial of fragmentation and incompleteness that is part of a critical notion of nostalgic re-membering—or of any remembering—Malpas' deployment of 'mythophilia' to describe certain processes that are generally used to define nostalgia liberates the concept from such delimiting usages and allows us to further explore its fecund possibilities for a critical discourse of the relationship between the self and home. It reminds us, in other words, that "Nostalgia is …both nostos and algos, and neither comes to presence without the other" (Malpas 96). As such, it implies that the self is always in tension with the present as well as past time and place, since nostalgia implies a feeling of estrangement from a former temporality and spatiality that is acutely felt in the present. These dislocations are of course within the self as well, as Malpas reminds us, since the self is constructed through the engagement with the world, or is thought as being-in-place. In other words, nostalgia entails a return to self that is no longer present but which is, nonetheless, retrievable as part of the self, or as remembered as being-in-time in such spectral encounters that entail both homecoming and homesickness, continuity and discontinuity, identity and difference, or both 'nostos' and 'algos', and remind us that

nostalgia is not necessarily a form of escapism, but also an iterative process of critical re-engagement with temporality and spatiality. This uncanny return to a sense of the self is what is impregnated with possibilities that are erased in traditional connotations of nostalgia as an escapist mode into the past, since such spectral returns, while not pointing to a future praxis, nonetheless resolutely retain the future as an open possibility**.** While always returning us to a home, in other words, nostalgia could lead us to an unhomely home, which is by definition open, uncertain, and in crisis by its concurrent encapsulation of being-at-home and of doubting both the continuity of being as being as well as the home as home. The question is whether it is acknowledged as such in the various forms of articulation of this nostalgic feeling, or transformed into truth and orthodoxy in re-membering the past. If the latter is at play, is the initial nostalgic mood that activates the homecoming still present as the same nostalgia in the fulfillment of the longing (pleasure, *cure*), or does it renew itself in other forms of longing and belonging which are obviously marked by renewed forms of nostalgia (longing, *poison*)?

Writing Back to the Empire: Montis' *Closed Doors* and Roufos' *Age of Bronze*

I would like now to turn to the narratives that I mentioned in my introduction in order to read their treatment of the past and examine their aesthetics in relation to nostalgia. While the 1950s in Cyprus were marked by full-scale violence between EOKA and the British colonial forces and by a ceaseless antagonism between the rising nationalisms of the two major communities, the much-desired independence of 1960 did not redeem the island from its nationalist hysterias. Indeed, the 1960 independence was received as a lukewarm compromise or "as a rest stop to the road for something more cherished" (Calotychos "Interdisciplinary Perspectives: Difference at the Heart of Cypriot Identity and Its Study" 4) by both major communities that were pursuing mutually inimical nationalist imaginaries. Consequently, the escalation of incompatible nationalist drives continued into the years after independence and made the task of peaceful coexistence for the two communities unviable.

Apart from bringing a colonial cultural cosmopolitanism on the island, the early British topography of Cyprus brought also an Oriental depiction of the island and its people but also a nostalgia for a bucolic past that was fast disappearing. These discourses, which were often intertwined in their deployment, continued and were even accentuated in the later years of British colonialism, especially during the years of anti-colonial war**.**

They also permeated policy-making in education. Paradoxically, while the official British colonial discourse was one that denied the Cypriot claims for ethnic identification with Greece or Turkey, the colonial reports on education reveal that apart from the pragmatic and functionalist reasons for religiously separate schools, there was also a desire to keep them separated because of racial reasons. Discussing Talbot and Cape's *Report* on education of 1913, Gregoriou argues that while the report tries to defend the administrative effectiveness of this separation, it often "slides into a naturalistic description of ethnic educational separation which projects behind the separation of schools a transcendental separation of races" (253). Thus, on the one hand, the British denied the Cypriot claims for Greek and Turkish racial origins, while, on the other, justified their educational separation along racial lines. The colonial depiction of the Cypriots as mixed race people went hand in hand with the post-1931 colonial educational policy for a purportedly cosmopolitan outlook on education that prevented any particular emphasis on Greek or Turkish history and geography, and denied the thorny Greek-Cypriot claims of a Greek authentic heritage. As Gregoriou argues, "The colonial takeover of educational control was articulated in the idiom of Imperial cosmopolitanism and was, in turn, re-articulated and resisted by Greek Cypriots in the idiom of de-Hellenization" (254). It is within this cultural background that we are to theorize the responses from Cypriots that endeavored, in the name of a patriarchal nationalism, to contest both of these claims, namely that of the impurity of Cypriotness as well as the imperial cosmopolitan outlook. Therefore, in Greek-Cypriot anti-colonial narratives, as we will see, cosmopolitanism is fervently and systematically repudiated in the name of a patriarchal nationalism. Since the Turkish-Cypriot community, as a minority, deemed the end of colonialism with premonition, because of its fear of annihilation by the larger Greek-Cypriot community, it did not create any considerable anti-colonial literature. On the other hand, the Greek-Cypriot nationalist discourse of Enosis, which was based on 19th century European romantic ideals of nationalism, left little room for the ethnic others who lived on the island or for any other alternative imaginary for the emerging nation-state. In this sense, Greek-Cypriot nationalism became collusive with colonialism in inheriting and perpetuating the colonialist discourse of race or its nostalgia for racial purity, by separating itself from its allegedly racial other, the Turkish-Cypriots, whom it abandoned to the alterity of an alleged Oriental decadence and backwardness in its claims to origins of an authentic Greek classical past, the same past of European nation-states, in other words. As such, anti-colonial literature in Cyprus was from its outset a hybrid discourse that not only contested

colonial stereotypes but also mobilized them in order to ascertain its own superiority from its racial others, the Turkish-Cypriots.

Texts in this first phase after independence, such as *Closed Doors* and *The Bronze Age*, try, on the one hand, to rectify the dislocating experience of colonialism by relocating the past into the present through an anamnestic and nostalgic homecoming into a putatively authentic and racially pure past that allows the construction of an unwavering, proud, and homogeneous 'homeland' in the present; on the other, they labor to conceal the inevitability of dislocation and disruption that any anamnesis of the past entails through the discourse of a patriarchal nationalism. In contrast, later texts such as Taner Baybars' *Plucked-in a Far-off Land* have a less overt political agenda and provide a different and perhaps more nuanced depiction of the past by ambiguating the process of anamnesis through the inscription of a fallible memory. Indeed, Baybars' text, written from the diaspora in the late 1960s, revisits the 1930s and 1940s in Cyprus and nostalgically reassembles a multi-cultural community that failed to come into being, pointing thus to a different kind of nostalgia that opens itself to other interpretations of the past and to other homecomings. It would be erroneous to lose sight of the covert political agenda of the text, that of an anti-nationalist politics, that becomes particularly salient in the recent reappearance of the book in the 21st century at a time of increased emphasis on rapprochement between the two communities and multi-culturalism on the island. Such rapprochement is of course not uniformly pursued but consists rather of various discourses that reveal various degrees of criticality towards the issue, including also forms of nostalgia for the allegedly good old days when we all used to live together peacefully.

While acknowledging the partiality of Montis' view on the struggle as "an answer to *Bitter Lemons* of Lawrence Durrell", as its title clearly states—David Roessel's introduction of Montis' book also uncritically accepts it as the 'Cypriot' view, without probing into the complexity of the 'Cypriot'. Indeed, the book oscillates between an inscription of a profound nostalgia that swathes the anti-colonial struggle, and a foregrouding of colonial trauma that is almost unfailingly used to elevate the struggle. But, in embracing the struggle so ardently, the text often sacrifices the 'longing' part of nostalgia for 'nostos'. Indeed, at times, the nostalgia for the struggle that is emitted in the text is so passionate that it seems to fully surrender to the lure of the symbols of the struggle, marking thus a homecoming into an elevated past, where longing dissolves into belonging. What is conspicuously absent from this belonging, though, are the racial others, the Turkish-Cypriots, whose only appearance in the text, are as 'Turks' "who

stirred from the depths of Asia, from the depths of centuries past, armed with knives and axes" (Montis 113), fighting alongside the British to quell the struggle. Yet, even the author seems surprised at this putative metamorphosis of the 'Turks', since, as he painstakingly avows, "The Turks we saw now were not the ones we had known earlier", in words that effuse nostalgia for the alleged good old days. Indeed, "Who had changed them?" (113), the author asks naively, in a question that reveals that nostalgia can be not only profoundly appealing but also profoundly selective in its engagement with the past; or is it the latter that intensifies the former? Malpas would tell us that such nostalgia is not nostalgia at all but simply mythophilia, whereas Boym would deem it as 'restorative' nostalgia. I prefer to read it both as a *symptom*—of a colonial trauma that nationalism comes to appropriate under another monophonic discourse and as a *force* that does something—in this case, colluding with unproblematic readings of the past and complying thus with those discourses that aim in the erasure of the past polyphony in an effort to render it monophonically homely for its *selected* inhabitants. Indeed, the discourse of Enosis that drove the Cypriot struggle for decolonization and which the text re-members nostalgically had already defined the 'Cypriot' along Cypriot-Greek lines since it compromised its longing for a broader freedom for the sake of belonging into the Greek imaginary and thus left no room for the Cypriot-Turk and the Cypriot-Greek to dream the nation together.

Roessel's introduction, perhaps unintentionally, also raises a point of utmost salience for post-colonial studies. He says that "while *Bitter Lemons* (1957) has sold over two million copies, *Closed Doors* has never appeared in English translation and readers of Durrell are unaware of its existence. This translation finally allows Montis's voice to be heard by those who cannot read Greek" (David. Roessel ix). However, this almost tautological relationship between the 'post-colonial' or 'anti-colonial' and English or French or any other metropolitan dominant language, needs probing. It is as if in order to merit sufficient attention by such categories, one needs to write in the colonizer's language, pointing thus to a hegemony of English or of the other colonial languages. Costas Montis' *Closed Doors*, written in Greek in 1960 and only translated into English in 2004, has a trajectory which is paradigmatic on this issue. However, while Roessel is right in pointing out that Durrell's readers had remained unaware of the existence of Montis' scathing response to *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus,* I am not wholly convinced that they do not remain so, even after its publication into English. The appearance of a few academic articles on the dialogue between the two texts should not be taken as a sign of the work's

wider circulation and acclaim. While the interested tourist continues to travel with *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus* as a guide to the island's past, Montis' translated book remains for the most part on academics' shelves, reminding us that, apart from the language of a text, other issues are also at play in determining the degree of a text's circulation. Nevertheless, the book is a significant document both of the times as well as of the wider field of 'anti-colonial' literature. In it, we are plunged into an infectious nostalgia for freedom, for the struggle against colonialism, and for an organic community that fights together, all of which stem from this community's alleged origins in a halcyon past of ancient Greek civilization. Labeling its nostalgia 'restorative' or 'unreflective' might indeed prevent us from seeing it as an explicitly political response to the trauma of colonialism. Such nostalgia is not dissimilar to the nostalgia found in Fanon's writings about the role of the struggle and violence in anti-colonial revolutions. However, the challenge is not only to be infected by such nostalgia but also to pay heed to Fanon's caveats against nationalist perils: "The people engaged in the struggle who because of it command and know these facts, go forward, freed from colonialism and forewarned of all attempts at mystification, inoculated against all national anthems" (147). Alas, how many nationalist movements, or texts that corroborate such movements, do indeed pay attention to such caveats?

But let us cast a closer look at the text itself. Montis' text is a first person narration from the perspective of a young fifteen year-old boy who gives us an insider's view of the years of the anti-colonial struggle in a gesture that is doubly political since it allows Montis to contest Durrell's view of EOKA as a small group of 'hotheads' and also to create an irony of one of the dearest colonial tropes, namely that of the natives as children (Petra Tournay-Theodotou 361). Furthermore, Montis' choice of a child-narrator seems to be an ironic response to Durrell's narrator's feigned naivety. Whereas, in other words, Durrell's narrator pretends to be naive—when it suits him—Montis uses a narrator that is by nature naïve, and his naivety often complements the overall nostalgic and romantic narration of the past in the novel. The young narrator takes us from a romantic and intoxicating stage of the national revolt that teems with nostalgia to the disaster and trauma that befalls his family with the death of his older brother Nicos, a member of EOKA. The novel is unremitting in its writing back to *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus* and re-inscribes the violence exercised by the colonial regime in the shape of torture, curfews, and destruction of property that the protagonist and his family relentlessly experience and which is utterly glossed over in Durrell's work. Referring specifically to torture, Montis uses the suffering of one character, Antonis, the milkman, and says: "(we all knew) what sort of chains they

have used on his back; what fists hit the stomach; what blood would be coughed up, how many times they would hold his head under water until he would lose consciousness…" (45). Furthermore, whereas Durrell claims that the anti-colonial struggle was supported by a few terrorists and that the rest of the Cypriots loved England too much to be fighting against it (128), in a phrase that is laden with a nostalgic mood for an alleged eternal Anglo-Hellenic amity, Montis comes to celebrate nostalgically the whole island's immersion into the struggle: "So the revolution spread through the cities and villages, the mountains and plains. It encompassed the old and the young—men, women, and children" (22). Indeed, Montis' work reads like a well-studied and well-drafted answer to Durrell. The list of issues for which Montis takes Durrell to task is long, and I do not have the space to provide an exhaustive reading of its anti-colonial tropes. Nevertheless, it is clear that the book aims at a direct contestation of the dominant views of *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus*.

Similar in its endeavor to 'write back' directly to the empire in an effort to contest the British colonial view of the anti-colonial struggle for independence is *The Age of Bronze*, which was written in 1960 by Greek diplomat Rodis Roufos. Roufos' text, written directly in English, tries to reclaim 'home', engaging in acts of abrogation of colonial hegemony constructed through the textual representation of the Cypriot 'topos', the Cypriot people, but most importantly, of that colossal event in the nationalist imaginary of the struggle itself. Roufos' text is also exceedingly alert at contesting Durrell's colonialist views and chooses to insert the fictional character of Harry, whose name bears a close likeness to Durrell's nickname, Larry, into his story to show the duplicity of Durrell's character, who is presented as a philhellene at times and as a British Tory at others. Roufos' text rewrites the story of the anti-colonial struggle through the character of Alexis, an educated young Cypriot cosmopolite (Alexis has lived in Athens, Paris and Heidelberg), who gradually abandons his cosmopolitan ideas and immerses himself in the anti-colonial struggle, before being arrested by the British forces and sentenced to death. The gradual transformation of Alexis from a cosmopolite intellectual into a nationalist guerrilla fighter allows Roufos not only to foreground the romantic allure of the anti-colonial struggle and the rejection of cosmopolitanism in the name of nationalism but also to grant us entry into the small British society of Cyprus since Alexis' intellectualism allows him to move with ease in both British and Cypriot societies that were largely segregated at the time. This entry into British society enables Roufos to depict some execrable characters and attitudes that frequented this society and thus contest some of Durrell's views about the Cypriots as well as the British. Roufos provides us with one of Alexis' impressions of this British

society early on in the novel: "Most of the British I met at first were rather dull civil servants of indifferent educational background, chiefly interested in nursing a colonial superiority feeling as a compensation for any inferiority complex they might have suffered at home" (25). This dull group of British colonials has some exceptions of course, a fact that *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus* underlines too. However, unlike the inclusion of Durrell in these exceptional British that his memoir not only implies but overtly self-proclaims, in Roufos' work, Alexis, while initially including Harry (or Larry) in these exceptional British, he comes to reconsider his view later on. Through Alexis' involvement in the struggle, Roufos, like Montis, also shows the torment and suffering of the Cypriot people at the hands on the British and disputes the implied benevolence and fairness of the British in Durrell's book. The examples of British violence and brutality abound in the novel and are deployed in a well-orchestrated endeavor to invert the colonialist binary of civilized vs. uncivilized.

More importantly, though, Roufos and Montis take issue with the colonialist denial of the Greekness of Cypriots. Indeed, while certainly important and successful in refuting the colonialist pernicious stereotypes, the two texts end up reproducing the colonialist discourse of racial purity in an endeavor to foreground the authenticity of the Greek-Cypriots' origins in classical Hellenism. In their attempt to contest the colonialist claim of the Cypriots' racial impurity, the two texts imbibe a nostalgic sensibility for a halcyon past of Greek splendor. It is in this spirit of nostalgia that I read the epigraph in Roufos' novel, an epigraph from Hesiod's *Works and Days*. I quote: "'And Father Zeus created a third race of mortals, the Men of Bronze…strong and terrible, they lived for war…they had fearless hearts of steel'" (Roufos). Moreover, the book abounds in references to gods, heroes, and events from ancient Greece that aim at establishing a connection between the Cypriot people (or, rather, the Greek-Cypriots) and classical Greece. Similarly, Montis' work refers to the "Mycenaean ancestry" of the Cypriots, who "held the strings which controlled our brains" (58), as well as to various monumentalized battles from Greek national historiography which aim in underlining the Greekness and the racial purity of the Cypriots. It is interesting that even when Montis inscribes the distinction between the Greeks and the Cypriots, he does so only for allowing the Cypriots to live up to the standard of bravery and fortitude that Greeks set up through their history of resistance, thus gaining entry to the glory of Greece. I quote:

> We wanted all of the fighters to be Cypriots. Even Dighenis. No, especially Dighenis. Perhaps we were overwhelmed by provincial pride;

> children are quite susceptible to provincial pride, because whether they were Greeks or Cypriots, we wanted to claim them 'all', and, besides, there was need for experience we did not have. Perhaps, we thought that Greece had her fair share of glorious events and that we should take this one for ourselves. (You have to understand this was a special case. We didn't want to be left out of the dance of Roumeli, of the Morea, and of Crete…). (22)

These forays into the past, and more specifically into the ancient Greek tradition and to glorious events from the historical record of the Greek nation, that the two texts engage in, are characterized by an insatiable nostalgia for an authentic, pure, and unalloyed Greek past that they aim to transpose into the present, where the event of the struggle reigns supreme. Both texts celebrate the event of the struggle in various ways, and thus their nostalgia is also geared towards the reminiscence of the struggle whose ideological impetus evidently comes from discourses that are carefully inscribed in both novels. I would like to quote at length one passage from *Closed Doors* that conveys the latter's nostalgia for the struggle and for nationalist symbols. Montis says:

> Once or twice a year we would get up at four in the morning in order to sing hymns and other songs first in the cobblestone square in front of the Archbishop's Palace and then in front of the Consulate (for us there was only one consulate—the Greek). Then we marched with Greek flags to the rhythm of drums and the blare of trumpets, the music beating upon our fifteen years and resounding within us….Finally, everyone would squeeze together inside the Phaneromeni Cathedral to cry for 'Enosis', a demand for liberation that echoed from time to time as the ultimate aspiration of every Greek territory outside of the borders of the free motherland. At school we wrote enthusiastic essays about freedom and we drew large, neat, straight-lined blue and white flags. Our breasts swelled with an odd emotion when we heard speeches about Greece, like when you want to cry but struggle to control yourself. (Montis 3-4)

The profound wounds and traumas that follow as a result of the struggle are the main ingredients of the glorification of the struggle and of the imagined nation in the offing. Indeed, the death of the narrator's brother Nicos plunges the whole household into insufferable sorrow, yet what prevails is the national symbol of the flag that his mother

covers his bed with. The abrogation of motherly pain and its transubstantiation into nationalist glory reaches its apogee in the story of another woman, the mother of Panayides, who "did not let out a single tear at the hanging of her son" and who avowed "I accept no condolences! I am celebrating!" (Montis 101) in response to those who tried to comfort her. The nostalgia for such self-abnegation in the glory of the nation that such moments emit is powerful indeed, yet equally powerful is what is left out, namely, the mothers' ineluctable and natural urge to mourn their children. The nation becomes not only the idea for sacrifice but also the director of mourning, swathing the latter in a nostalgic glorification of itself. Sacrifice and self-abnegation in the name of the nation are indispensable ingredients of nationalist ideology. Indeed, as Anderson in his seminal study on nationalism says, "Ultimately it is this fraternity that makes it possible, over the past two centuries, for so many millions of people, not so much to kill, as willingly to die, for such limited imaginings" (7). Thus, it should be no surprise that sacrifice for the nation is also integral in the *Age of Bronze*. Roufos chooses to employ the archetypal tragedy of *Iphigenia* and the homonymous character's sacrifice as a metaphor for the sacrifice of the Cypriot people in the name of the struggle. In the novel, Alexis and his students stage up a performance of the tragedy shortly before the onset of the struggle. The performance is a huge success, and, as the narrator tells us, "The tragic princess speaking of her duty to her country, in words so well timed to the venture on which Cyprus was now embarking, evoked a thrill of the purest emotion in all of us" (Roufos 104). Indeed, by the end of the play, when even Achilles reveals his admiration for Iphigenia's self-denial, the narrator avows that "Everybody felt like the hero and the applause became thunderous when Iphigeneia [sic] started towards the altar of the sacrifice accompanied by the sympathetic mourning of the chorus" (Roufos 105). Whereas Iphigenia was given immortality and ascended to the gods, the Cypriots, like other sacrificial subjects in the name of nationalism, are promised immortality through a place in the pantheon of national heroes, so evocatively re-membered by history schoolbooks and by the cenotaphs of the unknown soldiers that decorate (or haunt) every modern city.

In the process of seeking and finding 'home' in a transparent past, which characterizes the two texts, what is glaringly absent is any form of dislocation or discontinuity. Quite the contrary, the homesickness or 'algos' for the ancient Greek glorious past seems to find satiety in the presentation of this past as present in an immaculate, wholesome, and unadulterated way. The two texts, in other words, remember the past in such an unproblematic fashion that it is presented in the present in such a

dominant mode that leaves little room for any other narratives. As such, anti-colonialist discourse becomes collusive with colonialism in perpetuating the latter's nostalgia of an alleged past racial purity, abandoning thus the non-Greeks to the eternity of alterity. While Montis, as we have already seen, conveniently transfigured in one sentence the Cypriot-Turkish former peaceful neighbors into hordes of blood-thirsty and treacherous Turks, Roufos chooses the odd good Turk, a more subtle and dramatic trope, to convey the same idea, namely that 'our' old neighbors have been deceived by the British and turned against us. Roufos inscribes the story of Ali precisely to refute the allegations that EOKA was inimical to the Cypriot-Turks. Ali is initially described as "a skinny little boy in rags squatting near his [Lefteris'] doorstep and crying" (Roufos 40) since the old woman who used to look after him had died, and, being an orphan, he had no one else. Alexis, Lefteris, and the other students, all of whom end up joining EOKA, decide to put him up in the porter's lodge at the school which was not used, despite their initial thoughts to give him back to the Turkish authorities. The decision to help Ali, as we are told, was taken as "'proof of our good-will towards the Turks'" (Roufos 40). Ali is adopted by the school, takes lessons, and displays "astonishing intelligence" (one wonders at who is astonished and why), and later finds a job and a roof for himself. Before bidding goodbye to everyone and expressing his gratitude, Ali has a touching, yet revealing confession to make that is conveyed in the following dialogue:

> 'I have seen how kind you Christians are,'… 'I will never believe the lies some people are saying about you.'
>
> 'What lies?' asked Lefteris.
>
> 'That if you Greeks take over Cyprus you will oppress us, and take away our bread from us, and not allow us to live in peace.'
>
> Lefteris was shocked. 'Who tells you such nonsense?'
>
> 'Oh, a few of our people,' answered Ali. 'But never mind, we don't believe it We have lived together so long, we have nothing against each other'. (Roufos 62)

Déjà vu? The text's nostalgia for the good old times when we all used to live peacefully together is not different to Montis' text's nostalgia. What both texts forgo to answer is 'who says so?' While Montis employs the voice of his child narrator and unequivocally states this as a fact, Roufos tries a riskier, yet subtler way out of it by giving voice to the racial other, to Ali, in a gesture that aims to quell any doubts about the authenticity of the

statement. Yet, borrowing from Bhabha's idea of the hybrid nature of colonial discourse, we can clearly see here a moment where the nationalist discourse undermines itself in its endeavour to fortify its own credibility ("Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree Outside Delhi, May 1817" 156). Is it easy to gloss over the fears of the Cypriot-Turks about oppression as lies and nonsense, considering that they are not actors in the imagining of the emerging nation-state? Roufos' gesture of giving voice to Ali in order to dispel those fears, is not adequate or convincing in view of Ali's later cooperation with EOKA. Furthermore, Ali's tragic end is used by Roufos as an additional reason for us not to distrust him and his nostalgia for the 'good old days', since he uses Ali's execution to reinforce the image of the 'treacherous Turk'. In the novel, Ali gets a job in the auxiliary police, and, through his position, he helps EOKA and specifically Alexis. The end of the book finds Ali dead at the hands of Turkish extremists who suspected Ali's pro-Greek sympathies. Before dying, though, he makes sure to state "in the presence of independent witnesses that he had seen his killers, and that they were Turks. Thus even with his last words he cleared his Greek friends of any suspicion that might have been used as a pretext for fresh anti-Greek riots" (251). Ali's death serves as a reminder of the perfidiousness of the Turks, since one of their own, albeit an exceptional one, is killed by them. However, Ali's last minute confession serves also as a reminder that there were exceptional Turks, and those are the peaceful ones. Nostalgia reigns again. Be that as it may, the representation of nostalgia that reigns in both of these anti-colonial nationalist texts is one that lacks irony when it deals with the past. Instead, in its anamnestic return to the past, it surrenders much of its longing into codified ways of belonging. Boym rightly points out the paradox at the heart of nostalgia, "in the sense that longing can make us more empathetic toward fellow humans, yet the moment we try to repair longing with belonging, the apprehension of loss with a rediscovery of identity, we often part ways and put an end to mutual understanding" (xv). Nationalist ideology, in its endeavour to reconstitute an ideal home for its chosen people, invites us to listen to its alluring music (or national anthem) completely unbound and thus forego our critical ability to listen to its allure while eluding it, or more simply, to listen to it critically, aware of the fact that its promise for an ideal home is homely for some but unhomely for others.

Taner Baybars' *Plucked in a Far-off Land*

In contrast, *Plucked in a Far-off Land* reveals a different kind of nostalgia and demands a different reading of nostalgia as such. Written in the 1960s and published in 1970, in the midst of nationalist frenzy and political turmoil on the island, the book revisits the 1930s and 1940s and attempts to salvage mnemonic fragments from being engulfed by the monophonic nationalist version of the past and its monolithic depictions of history, community, and identity. The text is not devoid of its own political agenda, though; indeed, the text exudes a nostalgia for another time, another place, and another community. Confronted with the rising nationalist sentiments of the 1960s, the text looks nostalgically at another time where another community failed to come into fruition. The political project that the text envisions is evidently different—if not antithetical—to the one of the texts by Montis and Roufos. Indeed, Baybars' text, in its return to the past, aims to assemble vestiges of the past that reveal the possibility of another version of community that failed to become because it was never imagined. Hence, the text has a different approach to the past as well as to the process of recollection of the past, one where irony plays a significant role. We can see this irony very lucidly when Baybars re-members the beginnings of Turkish nationalism on the island. The section is ironically called "Battle of May 19", and what starts off as a historical narration ends up in a parody of nationalism. We are told that "May 19 is one of the cornerstones in Turkish history. In 1919 Ataturk came ashore at Samsum and that was the beginning of the New Turkey. This day in Nicosia was celebrated every year" (Baybars 140). The sombre tone of the text continues and suddenly turns somewhat dramatic, if not conspiratorial: "We were about to disperse, the afternoon classes were unofficially called off, when Ozkul and some other boys from his grade asked us to return to school after lunch. The secret tone, the secret intention" (141). The dramatic tone of the text continues, but, at the next sentence, it is parodied by the insertion of irony:

> When we met at the back of our school, all boys, Ozkul stood on the steps of the entrance and said something like: Today we must take revenge on those who killed our brothers on the Turkish soil. We shouted our consent. Then we were platooned neatly, one sixther heading each juvenile group, and dispersed in the fields, keeping contact with other groups through coded whistles. (141)

The ironic military vocabulary of the narration intensifies both the drama as well as the parody of the scene, which culminates in an attack on some Cypriot-Greek boys and the 'arrest' of one of them, little Andrikos, whom the narrator acknowledges and tries to protect. The expected retaliation from the Cypriot-Greek boys never comes. Instead, a much more formidable foe makes its appearance, their fathers, who end up bastinadoing them, shouting in the process "Do you think I am going to let this kind of barbarism continue? When I do everything to teach them good manners, brotherhood and all the necessary qualities a civilised person requires? Oh, no. Another slap" (143). The whole scene, despite its inglorious end, is swathed in nostalgia, a nostalgia for childhood but also a nostalgia for a *brotherhood* that failed to come into being. Unlike the glorification of the struggle or of monumental events of the nation, the text's nostalgia parodies nationalism and points to a different sort of community. While remembering or imagining an unimagined past, the text employs irony and underlines the impossibility of such a task.

Indeed, the impossibility of remembering the past is highlighted to such an extent and in so many subtle ways that the book can also be read as an endeavour to trace the processes and workings of memory. Baybars says, "In my memory this summer ritual remained as a perennial event. The images are all fused into one year, one long uninterrupted year. The days are memorable through various smells, each one indicating a certain time of the day or even a certain period of the month….It is thus that images live" (206-7). Time and place melt, and what remain are various smells that evoke different images. These images "mean a lot to me only and nothing, absolutely nothing, to anyone else. It is like the character in a story by Borges, who writes a poem of a single line which contains not only the description of the palace, but everything in it in minute detail. At that the emperor exclaims: You have robbed me of my palace! This palace could have been the collective and indivisible entity of the images which lived in the Emperor's mind" (207). If someone were to do the same to him, the author avows that he would have shouted with joy: "You have regained my palace for me", underlining the impossibility to "bring back those small moments which I cannot recapture in verse or prose" (207).

The highly personal theme and tone of the text cannot be glossed over. Written from the diaspora, the text is a personal memoir of childhood, if not a nostalgic celebration of it, and a discursive return to another time and place. The personal motif, though, cannot take place outside temporal and the spatial coordinates, and these coordinates are traversed by particular forms of the collective. Indeed, through his return to his childhood, the author draws various micrographic pictures of the society of the time, and through these

pictures he imagines a community that remained unimaginable at the time of his childhood.

The seven sets of "Images" in which the book is sectioned portray a different picture of home and a different idea of community from the one that the nationalist narratives impose. In the book, there are: Cypriot-Turks who speak Greek; or Cypriot-Greeks who are gracious and generous like Kostari, the coach driver who takes the narrator's family to an outing where he drinks, eats, and sings with the Cypriot-Turkish family; or Cypriot-Turks like his father who castigates and punishes him for his aggression towards his Greek and Armenian neighbours. The community that emerges from the narrative is a multi-lingual and multi-cultural one, with its tensions and problems, but also with its festive interactions and exchanges among its various groups, resisting thereby both the nationalist narratives of monophonic community and inter-communal hatred, as well as the neo-liberal discourses of a certain uncritical multi-culturalism of Eurocentric routes (Yashin "Introduction" 8), that obfuscate tensions based on racial and ethnic hierarchies in the name of a multi-cultural façade of various foods and clothes. It would be a mistake to assume that the book eschews the tense political situation of the times because it does not. In fact, the book does reveal the beginning of nationalism in both communities. Yet, faithful to its more covert political agenda, it does not make nationalism central to its narration. The nationalist nostalgia of the two anti-colonial texts is transformed here into a nostalgia for the purity of childhood with its slow and organic lifestyle and for a multi-cultural and multi-lingual community. Indeed, in the narrative, nationalism is just one amidst many political discourses that were vying for space at the time, including cross-cultural brotherhood. Moreover, the book constantly brings attention to its own fictionality, underlining thus the process of formation of a story or of a past, in such a way that it anticipates the work of later Cypriot writers, but also of other diasporic writers, who are concerned with both the sense of loss that their material realities entail but also with inventive and imaginative processes that are warranted by such elusive and fragmented pasts. In an incident teeming with amusement, the narrator speaks about playing with some boys he met during a visit to a relative's house and how he knitted a story about himself having been schooled in various remote parts of Turkey, stressing this fact by affecting an Istanbul accent. When his lies are unveiled, he says that "The jeering of the boys didn't upset me so much as the demolition of those stories I had been telling them, now convinced that they had actually happened" (212). The narrative closes by leaving behind it a nostalgic version of the past in general and of childhood in particular, one that is laden with fragmented sets of memories that the author tries passionately to salvage,

aware of the impossibility of such a task. Its end is the end of childhood, symbolically represented with the narrator's circumcision. In a passage that imbibes a nostalgic mood, we read about this past time, before "Wisdom would interfere with feelings. At no time again would I be able to shut my eyes with feelings. But with thoughts. And once you begin to think childhood is over. The paradise is lost. The rest of your life is an attempt to regain it. Some of us succeed, some of us do not" (222). His childhood paradise is one that is porous, one that he knits by bringing all these vestiges together, foregrounding concurrently the process of the formation of this paradise and thus rendering it partial, dislocating, and inchoate but still important enough to be rescued in its discontinuity from the monophonic nationalist narratives. In other words, the nostalgia that pervades the text is one that enables a series of homecomings into a past self only to find that the return is an uncanny and spectral one.

Such returns, Rushdie would tell us, would result in the creation of "fictions, not actual cities and villages, invisible ones, imaginary homelands" (10); one "is obliged to deal in broken mirrors, some of whose fragments have been irretrievably lost." (11) It is here that there resides the most important difference between such a text as *Plucked-In a Far Off Land* and texts such as *Closed Doors* and *The Age of Bronze*, namely in its self-reflexivity, in its author's awareness that some fragments have been irretrievably lost. Indeed "Nothing replaces the past and no past comes to an end even if the end is the end of a penis" (222), as Baybars exclaims. It is therefore not in the kind of nostalgia that they emit that the three texts differ. As far as nostalgia is concerned, they are all nostalgic in the same way that we are when dealing with the past. Whether they emit nostalgia for a halcyon past and an elevated and pure struggle or for a community that failed to come into existence, they are similar in their unquenched drive to imagine a certain community. The question is whether, in their engagement with the past, they tie themselves to the mast and hear the past's irresistible allure while eluding it or whether they give in to the past unbound and turn their nostos into belonging, where home is homely. While all three texts turn the longing into belonging, Baybars' text does so in such a way that the uncanny anamnesis of the past shows the impossibility of the homeliness of such returns. However, the recent reappearance of the book at a time of increased foregrounding of such discourses as multi-culturalism and rapprochement reveal our contemporary society's nostalgia for a society that did not come to be, and, thus, turns the predominantly personal hue of this text into a collective project that is acutely political. The danger here is that the projects propelled by such nostalgias, in their endeavour to re-imagine community, may

sacrifice the critical position between longing and belonging, or the point of crisis, for renewed homely promises. And I am very much afraid that they do so to a large extent.

Conclusion

It is thus that nostalgia becomes critical by putting in crisis the very process of its representation of the negotiation between homesickness and homecoming. Nostalgia, as various historical events of trauma and displacement remind us, is not simply an artifice or a fictional trope, but also a material reality of homesickness that is part and parcel of the process of survival in the knowledge of the impossibility of homecoming. Nostalgia is not just the algia of loss but also the romance of nostos. The challenge is to hear the enchantments of the past while bound to the mast, critically aware of nostos' capacity to conceal the dislocations and discontinuities of return or of the unhomeliness of home. The critical awareness of such spectral homecomings to a dislocated self or home that any nostos entails does not eclipse the algos or longing for return. Indeed, while all three narratives that we saw are nostalgic in their own ways, it is only Baybars' text that implicitly questions its own nostalgia by inscribing a doubtful memory that playfully, yet critically, undermines the seriousness of its nostalgic longing for return to an unimagined community. In contrast to Baybars' text, anti-colonial and nationalist literary texts promised a re-orientation of the sense of 'home' that was lost due to colonialism. The nostalgia for ethnic purity that Montis' and Roufos' texts imbibe is characteristic of the ways in which anti-colonial and nationalist narratives envisaged the island as 'home': a homely and ethnically homogeneous place. Resisting such visions of community, Baybars' text anticipates later postcolonial narratives in English by Cypriots that not only question the possibility for anamnesis of the past, but wherever such returns do occur, they generally constitute iterative homecomings to such unhomely homes that keep the future open, uncertain, and in crisis, instead of foreclosing it in ideal and homely homes.

Part III: Contemporary Cypriot Anglophone Literature

Chapter 5: Cypriot Anglophone Literature: Providing Hospitality to the Ghosts of the Past

> To offer hospitality is it necessary to start from the certain existence of a dwelling, or is rather only starting from the dislocation of the shelterness, the homeless, that the authenticity of hospitality can open up? Perhaps only the one who endures the experience of being deprived of a home can offer hospitality. (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 56)
>
> How many people today live in a language that it is not their own? Or no longer, or not yet, even know their own and know poorly the major language they are forced to serve? This is the problem of immigrants, and especially of their children, the problem of minorities, the problem of a minor literature, but also a problem for all of us: how to tear a minor literature away from its own language, allowing it to challenge the language and making it follow a sober revolutionary path? How to become a nomad and an immigrant and a gypsy in relation to one's language? Kafka answers: steal the baby from its crib, walk the tightrope. (Deleuze and Guattari 19)
>
> Deleuze and Guattari themselves admit that there is a fine line between territorializing and deterritorializing processes, and it is easy for their work to be appropriated to the most divergent and even contradictory of ends. (Polan xxvi)

Introduction

As I am writing this chapter in the summer of 2013 the current socio-political context in the island seems to be predominantly marked by two incompatible nostalgias: a nostalgia for authenticity and for heteronormativity with regards to ethnic, sexual, and cultural identities that has permeated and fed various political and cultural institutions, and has led to the rise of xenophobia, homophobia, and nationalism; but also, a nostalgia for rapprochement, sexual freedom, openness, and peace which has brought about new configurations and visions of political, sexual, and cultural identities but which has also been, to a large extent, appropriated and, thus, compromised, by supranational entities like

the EU and various NGOs. The official literary institutions in the two main communities promote and reflect almost absolutely the first kind of nostalgia, reiterate the nationalist agenda, and continue to hold sacred the links between not only ethnicity and language but also between national identity and sexuality in their understanding of literature. A brief look into most literary anthologies corroborates the truth of the observation: the vast majority of anthologies of Cypriot literature include literary works only in Greek (observe how the term 'Cypriot' has been appropriated to mean Greek-Cypriot) (Yashin "Three Generations, Three Identities, Three 'Patriae' within Twentieth-Century Cypriot Poetry" 223), while anthologies of Turkish-Cypriot Literature—compromised by their titles—usually include only literary works in Turkish (Kahraman 34). However, there are notable exceptions, especially in the last fifteen years or so, that come to contest the salience between language and ethnicity that identity construction and the understanding of literature have been invested with. Indeed, recently, we observe an increasing number of literary journals and magazines such as *Cadences, In Focus, Arteri* and more recently *The Cyprus Dossier* that include literary, philosophical, and artistic works in juxtapositions that are novel and which often contest the dominant ideology. Moreover, some literary anthologies have appeared that juxtapose works from different languages in their original, or works from various languages of the island translated into English and presented thematically, rather than according to the language they are written in (i.e. Costello). Such novel approaches reflect the second type of nostalgia, namely for a community of fluid and flexible ethnic and sexual identities, that either failed to come to be or is in the making.

Indeed, the opening of the checkpoints in 2003 which gave access to Cypriots across the divide to cross-over was an important catalyst for the formation of new literary, cultural, and political communities that seemed unfeasible before. English as a lingua franca was instrumental in the formation of these communities (Stephanides "An Island in Translation" 51). It is interesting that an increasing corpus of literature written in English by Cypriots started appearing at this chronological juncture and has given, perhaps, some of the impetus for the appearance of these literary journals and forums. Be that as it may, the current literary scene is embellished by the appearance of an expanding corpus of literature in English that, sadly, remains unrecognized and unknown for the most part. In this last section of my thesis I will discuss this literary corpus. My discussion will focus on what I deem as the most dominant common characteristic of this corpus, namely its *obsession* with 'otherness'. As I will argue, this literature's obsession with 'otherness' is not unrelated to the peculiar position that this literature finds itself in, that is, 'not at home'

in local or international literary categories, a position that brings it to proximity to what Deleuze and Guattari call 'minor literature'. Whilst it is not a large corpus of literature, contemporary Cypriot Anglophone literature is growing steadily and constitutes a noteworthy corpus. It is difficult to say accurately how many Cypriot writers who write in English exist in Cyprus and in diaspora, but it is safe to say that there is a small number of them who share similar concerns. In my discussion I will only draw on the work of the latter, namely, the ones I consider to be the most important representatives of this literature with regards to the 'minor' character of their work as well as their preoccupation with issues pertaining to 'otherness', power asymmetries, and aesthetics of dislocation. The growth of this corpus of literature is so rapid that during my engagement with the project various new voices emerged. It is impossible to discuss the work of all of these voices in the present thesis, thus I am aware of my own implication in the construction (perhaps even canonization) of this corpus through the process of selection based on the above criteria. My discussion will draw on the works of Alev Adil, Aydin Mehmet Ali, Miranda Hoplaros, Andriana Ierodiaconou, Nora Nadjarian, Stephanos Stephanides, and Lysandros Pitharas. These writers share a preoccupation with an(other) politics and construct an(other) aesthetic with regards to ethnic, cultural, and sexual identities, which renders them recalcitrant to the nationalist vision of home. However, it is important here to underline that it is not their linguistic medium per se that endows them with such a contesting position, but the actual aesthetic and political concerns of their works. Indeed, there are numerous works written in English that are either complicit to the dominant ideology or are easily appropriated by it. As a counterexample of a work of literature that is written in English and is easily appropriated by the dominant ideology I will discuss the work of Andreas Koumi, *The Cypriot*.

I borrow the term *obsession* in my diagnosis of this contemporary corpus of literature from Dufourmantelle's use of it when she describes Derrida's reading of various texts but also his treatment of themes such as hospitality, friendship, secrecy etc. Specifically, with the term she refers to the 'nocturnal side of speech" or "to that which, in a philosophical kind of thinking, does not belong to the order of the day, the visible, and memory" (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 2). It refers, in other words, to the dark, invisible, and often impossible contours of both writing and reading since, as Michel de Certeau underlined, "writing is born and deals with the acknowledged doubt of an explicit division, in sum of the impossibility of one's own place" (qtd. in Bensmaïa ix). It is this acknowledgement of the impossibility of 'being at home' or of homecoming that opens up

(or invites) the 'self' to itself, or to its multiple forms of 'otherness' that constitute it since the self exists always *with* the other. Indeed, as Douzinas reminds us, "The self-conscious subject created through the other's desire can never be self-identical: he is an amalgam of selfhood and otherness, of sameness and difference" (37-8)—or, of continuities and discontinuities, I would add. It is this fragmentation at the core of the subject that compels it to speak (or write) in acts that try to repair the fragmentation, but which, at the same time, fashion the self and the other, or the nexus between identity and difference. This acknowledgement, though, renders the subject particularly open to ghostly visitations (with or without invitation) from its other neglected (or effaced) parts and pasts. Similarly, it renders it vulnerable to the appeal of discourses that either conceal the fragmentation or promise its reparation through belonging (i.e. nationalism, neo-liberal multi-culturalism, and even most versions of cosmopolitanism). In this third and final part of my thesis, I would like to map the corpus of Cypriot literature written in English through its two main areas of obsession with 'otherness': firstly, its obsession with the ghosts of 'other' pasts that continue to haunt the present, clamoring to be heard; and, secondly, with 'other' sexual identities that are brutally excluded from the heteronormativity of all national institutions, including the institution of literature. The territorialization of sexuality through heteronormativity, imposed and closely observed by national institutions, is another form of colonization of those 'others' whose very sexuality constitutes a threat to the gender roles upheld by the nation. Thus, the contestation of such inflexible boundaries assumes particular urgency in projects that aim to contribute to the de-colonization of discourse. While the latter is an impossible task since language is colonizing, it is the ongoing effort towards that impossibility that brings about the ethical task of literature. The latter preoccupation of this contemporary literature written in English by Cypriots will be more directly discussed in the next chapter.

The two chapters grapple with two related forms of otherness. The first (this chapter) deals explicitly with those 'other' pasts that the collusion of historiography and canonized fiction with nationalist ideology has condemned to the dustbin of oblivion. It is the threat of annihilation of these 'other' pasts that possesses the narratives that I will be discussing, and their excavation and resuscitation, as I will be arguing, assumes a political urgency. Moreover, their resuscitation swathes them in a ghostly apparition that haunts the texts, and echoes something of that "nocturnal side of speech" (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 2) that I alluded to earlier. The last chapter (Chapter 6) deals more specifically with gender disruptions that are performed in these narratives, and which come

to contest the heteronormativity of gender and sexual identities that nationalist ideology swathed itself in. The narratives I will be discussing come to contest these monolithic identities, by either inserting in the past ignored or marginalized sexual possibilities, or by exposing the constructive nature of the seemingly natural boundaries of established sexual identities**.** I would like to note here that in the analysis that follows regarding Cypriot literature written in English I will not discuss thoroughly the work of each writer that I consider to be a representative of this corpus, but, instead, refer selectively to those works of theirs that relate most pertinently to my arguments. Therefore, some of the literary works that I will be discussing in the present chapter will also be referred to in the subsequent chapter.

Cypriots who Write in English

At this stage, I think it that it is necessary to reflect on the spatial and temporal particularities of this literary corpus. Whilst all of the writers included in this thesis under the name of 'Contemporary Cypriot Anglophone Literature' have come in one way or another to use English as their literary language, not all of them came to inhabit English for the same reasons. More importantly, though, all of the writers discussed here inhabit English with a sense of discomfort and discomfiture since English is, after all, the language of their colonizer. Nevertheless, writing in English in Cyprus, in a place of heightened surveillance exercised by the nationalist institutions, comes also with a sense of relief and relative literary freedom, since it allows the writers in question a space of limited observance from the strictures of the nationalist discourses and enables them to mediate their own cultures from a fresh perspective. From this relatively unobserved space of English, these writers have managed to create a literary aesthetic that engages with Cypriot issues and themes from a perspective that contests the nationalist and patriarchal discourses and opens windows to other literatures that foreground racial and ethnic minority issues, sexual oppression, as well as the traumas of migration and exile.

Let us start with the issue of language and its attendant anxiety. The relationship of the writer to her language is one that, when probed, could reveal a great deal of the issues at stake since it is by altering the language that most of the works become 'minor'. Stephanides, one of the Cypriot writers I am discussing, broaches this tense relationship to English in his memoir fragment, titled "a litany in my slumber" where he weaves the textures of his childhood. Having been transported from Cyprus to Manchester by his

father, whom he names Demosthenes, he tells us that "All I did was to refuse to speak English. In Cyprus they wanted to ban English from schools. Why did I have to learn it and why did I have to stay here?" (Stephanides "A Litany in My Slumber" 2). While he ended up learning the English language to the extent that it became his literary language, his sense of being an interloper in the language never left him, since he never felt at home in the facile and uncritical identification of language with national culture. He says characteristically that,

> When I was a student in Britain many years ago, as a migrant out of language and out of place, a 'Hellene' and a 'post-colonial' Cypriot, I was troubled by the linear periodization of my literary studies, which led me from Bewolf to T.S. Eliot and left me asking myself where I belong – looking for chance connections and turbulence that brought me into that classroom. In the too easy alignment of language, culture, and nation, I was always wanting to move sideward and across, above and below. (Stephanides "Transculturating for Worldiness" 1)

Alev Adil, another Cypriot writer who writes in English, expresses a similar discomfiture with the established national categories of literary circulation imposed on writers by nations and places, and by extension with the category of English literature:

> Is being a Cypriot in English a translation or a mutation of identity? I write in English, in the language of the island's colonial masters, I am heir to their literature; their ties of language, education and literary engagement are more binding than biology. I feel fraudulent if I claim to be a Cypriot poet. It is easier to see myself as a British writer, as part of London's rich multiculturalism. However, that multiculturalism, whilst affording a measure of inclusivity, still cannot solve the question of my Cypriot identity. (Adil "Translating and Mutating Identities: Cypriots Who Write in English" 5)

The issue of language is one that resonates loudly in the context of postcolonial literatures as we can see from the famous debate between Ngugi wa Thiong'o and Chinua Achebe. While the first rejected the English language as a medium that is always contaminated with the colonial legacy and chose to write in his native tongue, the latter felt that, as an

African, he could appropriate the English language and foreground his particular difference through it. Returning to Cypriot literature in English, it is important to explore how certain Cypriot writers came to inhabit English in the first place, and why this literature makes its appearance around forty years after the purported end of the island's colonization, in contrast to other colonial paradigms which started flourishing immediately after de-colonization in the 1950s and 1960s. Moreover, looking at the personal itineraries of the writers I am discussing here can shed some light on the reasons for this dislocation with regards to language.

Nora Nadjarian is an Armenian Cypriot. She was born in Cyprus and went to an Armenian school until she was eleven years old. In a private interview she said that "English is my academic and literary language not my mother-tongue. Armenian is my soul language". Nadjarian went to *Foley's* private English school in Limassol at the age of eleven and then proceeded to go to Britain for her tertiary education. As she said, she writes in English because her education has been all in English and thus English became her strongest language. She also pointed out that if she had gone to a Greek-speaking school she would be writing in Greek, most probably. Nadjarian is an example of some Cypriots who end up becoming more dexterous and proficient in English than in their mother-tongue, be it Greek or Turkish, due to the rather prominent role of British education on the island through the various British private schools and also through the large number of Cypriots who go the Britain for their tertiary education. Nadjarian's British education meant that she was exposed to English literature from a young age. She said that she still reads literature mostly in English. However, despite her British education and her writing in English, Nadjarian was an oddity in Cyprus when she first started writing in English some years ago. Moreover, she still feels like an oddity when she recites her poetry in Britain as she says, since she is not British yet she writes in English. Living permanently on the island, she writes about local issues mostly, but always from a perspective that challenges the insularity of the 'local'. Moreover, her writing foregrounds her own sense of discomfiture within English. Such discomfiture is the main theme of her poem "Mother Tongue" that poses a series of questions that foreground precisely the multilingualism of many writers who straddle various cultures: "Which language do you dream in,/ swear in, cry in, asked the questionnaire./ How many languages do you swim in,/ drown in, breathe in, mime in?/ Do you know how many tongues have adopted/ your voice?" (Nadjarian *Cleft in Twain* 26). The end of the poem offers some answers to these questions, yet the reader is left with a haunting sense of ambivalence since the postcolonial

predicament of the writer is such that there are no easy answers to these questions:

> In which language,
> and how clearly, do you say: my mother tongue
> is somewhere in the recesses of my mind.
> I am not an orphan. I have a mother.
> She put me to bed one night
> and went away. The film we made
> together has long been silent. But I still
> hear her voice in the keyhole of my heart. (Nadjarian *Cleft in Twain* 26)

A similar experience with coming late into English is Andriana Ierodaconou's experience. Born in Cyprus, she grew to be bilingual due to her private education at the English School of Nicosia in Cyprus. She continued her tertiary education in Britain and graduated from St. Hugh's College, Oxford with a degree in Biochemistry. Ierodiaconou is an interesting case of someone who writes her poetry in Greek and her novels in English. She claims that English afforded her novels a neutrality that she did not feel that Greek in Cyprus could allow her to have on such controversial times as the ones that her novels concern. Moreover, she insists that in such a tense cultural milieu, English allows the writer more freedom to engage with issues that have remained sealed in controversy and dispute. However, such literary decisions are both enabling and disabling, as she herself is aware. Her entrance into the English language is the product of her British education whose prominent presence in Cyprus is the result of colonialism. Her novels, as we will see in this part of the thesis, foreground her sense of these multiple tensions and her discomfiture with the dominant discourses, be they of historiography, nationalism, or patriarchy. Ierodiaconou lives currently in France but keeps regular contact with the island and its emerging voices of anti-conformism to the status-quo.

Unlike Ierodiaconou, who left the island for studies and then decided to live out of Cyprus, Alev Adil and Aydin Mehmet Ali, although born in Cyprus, had to leave the island because of the unsettling political situation. Aydin Mehmet Ali is an example of someone whose initial exile changed into a choice to be away from what used to be home. She left the island in 1963 at the beginning of intercommunal violence after the island's independence, at the age of 16 on a scholarship to the US with the plan to return to the Girls' Lycée to continue, graduate and go to university in Turkey. As the 1963/1964 conflict broke out she was forced to go to London from the US and was unable to return to

the island because of the political instability. Aydin Mehmet Ali's short personal literary essay, "My London", begins with precisely this predicament when she says that "London is where I came to seek refuge from a war. My arrival a historical accident, a history created by others, one I was forced to live. My stay, a choice." (Mehmet Ali 87). In this short narrative the notions of 'home' and 'abroad' are blurred since the narrative seems to be shifting between the two, interrogating them both in the process, and advocating at the same time an identity politics of becoming or rootlessness. This personal literary essay traverses London both spatially and temporally—a journey that critically revisits orthodox notions of 'home', 'nation', 'community'. In the narrative we learn that, "While divisions and nationalist discourse raged in Cyprus, Cypriot men quietly drank coffee and played backgammon and cards in the sanctity of mixed coffee houses, named after villages in the 'homelands'" (Mehmet Ali 91). Tempting as it might be to depict London as a multi-cultural oasis from whose safety one can view home critically, the story resists this temptation, and instead issues an admonition that "the wars in Iraq, Afghanistan and Palestine, and the inevitable Bombings in London have become the pretext to rob us of rights and freedoms as citizens of this City and take us back to the dark ages and leave race equality in shreds" (Mehmet Ali 93). The author's itinerary through time and space in London is one that exemplifies what Leela Ghandhi has called "mutual transformations" (*Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction* 129-35), since as the author says, "London, I love. She created me as I created her. She would be something else if it were not for me, and others like me who came to stay" (Mehmet Ali 87). Being out of place though is not the only form of dislocation for the author, who is also in some respect out of language, or rather, in a position of discomfiture with regards to English. In other words, it is not only London that has been an agent and an object of transformation for the author but also the English language. English, in other words, allowed her to foreground her sense of dislocation that is attendant to exile while at the same time, it has undergone a change in her writings, since it is pollinated with her own diasporic experience that involves vignettes of Cypriot, Turkish, and Greek history and culture.

Similarly, Alev Adil was born in Cyprus and had to leave the island at a young age because of political instability. Having an English mother, Adil's relationship to English is somewhat different to those of the other writers. Yet, dislocation, exile, and their role in identity formation are also felt profoundly by Alev Adil and these issues permeate her writing. In a literary essay called "Translating and Mutating Identities: Cypriots who Write in English", she says that, "Perhaps because I am a Cypriot, born on that tiny war

torn island in the Mediterranean, I'm especially aware of how constructed and contingent identity can be, how mutable and frail are the imagined communities we inhabit as certainties" (Adil "Translating and Mutating Identities: Cypriots Who Write in English" 1). Her discomfiture with the established categories of identity and of literary circulation is foregrounded in her work and forms an integral part of her obsession with split identities and of her overall distrust of any homely representations. Moreover, her work brings out the fragmentation of diaspora and the contestations that are always attendant to issues of identity in places marked by division and dislocation. This intricate web of pressures on the issue of identity is what compels Alev Adil to seek another form of politics in her writing. Her literary ethos is one that imbibes this unconventional view of politics and also what made her feel a sense of 'homecoming' in her literary friendship to Lysandros Pitharas, one of the other writers that this thesis discusses. I will discuss Lysandros Pitharas briefly, but before that, I would like to underline that for both Alev Adil and Lysandros Pitharas, the experience of London Cypriot diaspora has certainly been transformative. While Greeks and Turks of Cyprus were for years hermetically sealed from one another on the island, London Cypriots went to the same shops, drank coffee and played backgammon together. Evidently, the Cypriot diaspora of London was not utterly devoid of its own tensions and exemplified various kinds of uncritical attachments to the culture of the island that are generally prevalent in diaspora. Yet, it also afforded one the opportunity to question the rigid lines of ethnicity and the monophonic identities that nationalisms on both sides of the island were imposing.

Lysandros Pitharas was born in London to a Greek-Cypriot family and grew up in the British metropolis. He studied international politics at Sussex and went on to work as a journalist. He died prematurely at the age of 32. I would like to underline here the significance of the two writers' friendship in their overall literary engagement. The friendship of the two poets reveals something of a desire to overcome the rigid boundaries set up by the dominant discourses of nationalism and patriarchy but it is also marked by something else that is profoundly ethical and certainly acutely political. That something is philosophy; in other words, a friendship for values and ethical principles that led to a radical vision of community. Robert Young argues that if world literature is universal through the inclusion of the world's masterpieces, "postcolonial literature, though partial, achieves a certain universality through its relation to the ethical" ("World Literature and Postcolonialism" 218). The literary community that is emerging in Cyprus in the last fifteen years has something of this kind of friendship, since it is composed of people who

share a vision for another community, one that breaks away from the established models. The friendships within language between people such as Aydin Mehmet Ali, Alev Adil, Stephanos Stephanides, Andriana Ierodiaconou, but also across languages between the aforementioned writers and writers such as Gur Genc, Jenan Selchuk, and the late Niki Marangou are examples of this friendship that shares a vision for another community. Going back to the friendship between Alev Adil and Lysandros Pitharas, we are told by Alev Adil that she was enabled to feel 'at home' in writing and in sharing her writing with Lysandros Pitharas. As she puts it,

> I felt at home with Lysandros, I felt that for both of us the sense of belonging was a fragile and mutable thing, not easily defined or delineated. We tried to make it all *write*, to put it into words but really this sense of belonging, of complexity was a fragile thing, strung somewhere between the spoken and the written word, grandiose and humorous in turn, words dependent for their meaning on the writers [sic] tone of voice, bound to the passing moment, to new contingent conceptualisations of community and family. (Adil "Translating and Mutating Identities: Cypriots Who Write in English" 9-10)

The fragility of friendship and of belonging is one that poses defiantly against the misleadingly staunch nationalist promise of a community based on filiation and strong bonds of common heritage. Thus, home is not the cozy and snug abode that nationalist and patriarchal discourses propagate but a vulnerable point of contact that is created through the common struggle against the illusory and rigid conceptualisations of community that have proliferated and dominated in the island. Adil says that, "We shared many of the same or similar emotions and influences: an infatuation with cities, the sense of being haunted by the Island to which we both felt a strong sense of belonging and of distance too" ("Translating and Mutating Identities: Cypriots Who Write in English" 9). The two writers' works are indeed haunted by the island they felt a strange attachment too, and their friendship is one that became political through its common contestation of the dominant ways that community was envisioned on the island. In the same piece where she explores the complexities of being a Cypriot in English and the role of her literary friendship to Lysandros Pitharas, Adil warns us against any reductionist readings of this friendship as one between a Turkish-Cypriot and a Greek-Cypriot. She says: "This isn't a story of friendship despite the boundaries of Greek/Turkish, male/female, first generation/second

generation Cypriot identities but because of our shared sense of duty to negotiate those oppositions as playfully but as intensely, as ethically as we could" (Adil "Translating and Mutating Identities: Cypriots Who Write in English" 12).

Stephanos Stephanides also spent some of his childhood years in England but unlike the other writers discussed above, his movement away from the island was not the result of war but of his father's decision to take him to England away from his mother. Having been born in Trikomo, Cyprus, Stephanides spent his childhood years on the island before being taken to the UK by his father. Stephanides records the trauma of separation from his mother as well as from his language and village life in his memoir "a litany in my slumber". Stephanides' mother-tongue was the Greek dialect of Cyprus and when he found himself in Britain at a young age against his will, he was not sure why he had to learn English. His separation from his childhood, but also from his mother and tongue, was felt intensely as a form of exile. In his memoir he says,

> Was my exile to Manchester planned? The English had sent the revered Archbishop Makarios into exile in the Seychelles because he threatened to expel them and rule the island himself. But why did Demosthenes [his father] leave me in Manchester? I was not an archbishop and I was just a boy. All I did was to refuse to speak English. In Cyprus they wanted to ban English from schools. Why did I have to learn it and why did I have to stay here? And where was Katerina and when would I see her again? ("A Litany in My Slumber" 2)

His sojourn in the UK ended up being much longer than the young boy anticipated since he returned briefly to the island of his birth only after completing his studies at Cardiff University—at a time when the village of his birth was inaccessible to him due to the 1974 partition—only to re-embark on another detour to British Guyana, Brazil, and the United States, before returning once more to the island of his birth to assume an academic position at the University of Cyprus in 1992. Stephanides' sense of dislocation from home and language is one that permeates his work and informs his work's particular affinity to the fragmented, the inchoate, and the elusive nature of reality and representation. Moreover, despite his early resistance to English, Stephanides ended up adopting English as his literary and academic language since it became his strongest language due to his many years in Britain and his almost complete education in English. However, his adoption of English does not mean that other languages stopped speaking through him. Quite the

contrary, we read many tongues in his work that at times fight with English for space, reminding us that translation is almost always attendant in post-colonial settings. His extensive travelling and experiences have affected his writing both in terms of themes as well as language. In particular, his writing is pollinated by India and South America, two places that he visited and lived in for some time. His travels and engagement with such a variety of places and cultures have endowed his writing with a particularly diasporic perspective.

Miranda Hoplaros' personal itinerary also crosses diaspora. Born in Rhodesia to Greek-Cypriot parents, Miranda Hoplaros grew up speaking the Greek-Cypriot dialect at home, learned English at school and attended Greek classes (Hoplaros 9), as she tells us in her autobiographical fragments titled, *Mrs. Bones*. Her experiences from her tempestuous childhood in a war torn Rhodesia are recorded in small vignettes that do not follow any chronological sequence and which can be seen as a stylistic metonymy for her fragmented and dislocated upbringing. Her overall work is preoccupied with issues of dislocation, migration, exile, and motherly abandonment, but unlike the other writers, she does not place her stories in a Cypriot setting. Like a child playing hide and seek, Hoplaros' child narrator tries to seek answers to a profoundly emotional, yet strained relationship, to her m(other), brushing on issues such as abandonment, survival, desire etc., while hiding behind the inherent ambivalence of language, as well as her position at the crossroads of various cultures and languages, exemplifying a precarious position that we earlier called 'minor'. Having been almost exclusively educated in English, she also adopted English as her literary language. Nevertheless, her adoption of the language does not mean its uncritical emulation and adaptation. Conversely, Hoplaros' work takes the English language to unknown contours and as such foregrounds her sense of dislocation and her difference in English. An example will elucidate the point.

Through the constant insertion of ambivalence in her text, and hiding behind the naivety of the child narrator, the author reproduces the 'otherness' of the diasporic experience. Under the heading 'Desire', the text amusingly tells us that "Desire is like Pinocchio, an ellipsis. I was taught the word ellipsis at Greek school. It sounded important. Our Greek teacher, Mr Papadopoulos, told us that in Rhodesia there is a shortage of teachers from Greece, an ellipsis. I didn't mind that. I hoped no more would arrive" (Hoplaros 65). The remaining of the vignette uses the word 'ellipsis' at times to mean desire and at other times to mean lack of something, which is what it means in Greek. Apart from foregrounding the proximity of 'desire' and 'lack', the narrator's usage

of ‘ellipsis’ is in tension with both its monophonic Greek meaning, as well as its grammatical meaning in English as “1. a) the omission of a word or phrase necessary for a complete syntactical construction but not necessary for understanding, b) An example of such omission, **2.** a mark or series of marks (. . . or * * * , for example) used in writing or printing to indicate an omission, especially of letters or words” (Dictionary). While being in tension with both Greek and English, the text embellishes the two languages while inscribing its difference as a metonymic outcome of its diasporic position. As such, it reveals its inability to be ‘at home’ in either of the two languages, and the inevitability of inscribing its difference as a diasporic text. The fluidity of meaning that results from such word usage is one through which an(other) meaning of the word is brought to the fore. What is omitted is not a word or a phrase as the English meaning denotes, but the established meaning of the word itself, in order for it to create space for itself. While the conventional usage of ‘ellipsis’ does not affect understanding, the author’s twisting and distortion of the word, can be seen as an invitation to an(other) (mis)understanding. It is thus that ‘minor literature’ deterritorializes both the major language whence it springs, as well as Greek, the referential language of meaning according to Deleuze and Guattari. Its deterritorializing is a diasporic practice or a metonymy of the diasporic experience. Through her twisting and distortion of established meaning, the author succeeds in both seeking an(other) meaning, but also failing (deliberately?) to hide her anxiety about her ‘ellipsis’ of her m(other).

It is evident that the personal itineraries of these writers exemplify a diversity of reasons why they write in English but also a variety of precarious relationships to their language that are the result of war, exile, education not only as a result of colonialism but also as a result of personal choices, migration, or contingency. Indeed, their engagement with issues of migration, exile, dislocation, but also with gender is not unrelated to their lived experience. Important as this might be in the formation of the text, such views also need the careful study of their texts, since it is in the act of writing and reading that visions of communities are expressed. The narratives in English by the Cypriots I discuss in this part of the thesis share a nostalgia and a vision for a community beyond nationalist, racial, and gender strictures that have become hegemonic, and one where the self seeks home or a cultural arrival in a language that is already identified with, and implicated in, the above hegemonic strictures and thus in need for alteration. It is thus that this literature becomes ‘minor’: on the one hand, it resists the local paradigms, and, on the other, by changing the language, it defies the exoticizing and domesticating expectations of a metropolitan

audience.

Cypriot Anglophone Literature and its Homelessness in the Literary Market

Apart from the ontological fragmentation that characterizes all forms of writing and which creates a form of discomfiture in relation to home, there is another form of homelessness that seems to characterize certain kinds of writing or certain literatures whose particularities render them recalcitrant to established categories. Such is the position of Cypriot literature written in English. Being ignored or marginalized locally (in Cyprus) by the two dominant languages (Greek and Turkish) as well as remaining internationally unknown in such categories as postcolonial or commonwealth literatures, because of its small size and only recent chronological appearance, Cypriot English literature, has, indeed, no fixed home in established literary circuits. It is precisely this indeterminate position on the crossroads of different literary conduits that bestow it with proximity to the criteria that Deleuze and Guattari outline for 'minor literatures'. Moreover, its lack of a fixed dwelling has also enabled it to develop novel and more nuanced aesthetics of hospitality to the 'other' compared to the aesthetic of insularity and polarity that characterizes much of the dominant literary discourses of the island. The Cypriots who seek to make their home in English are in a position of discomfiture vis-à-vis their language since the latter's heritage on the island is intimately linked with a colonial rhetoric. Thus, they enter English with a feeling of unease and are not 'at home' in it. As Derrida and Dufourmentelle argued in another context—which by way of an epigraph opens this chapter—it is perhaps those that experienced 'homelessness' that are more likely to offer hospitality (56). This nuanced aesthetic of hospitality is encapsulated in Stephanides' observation that, "Boundaries become alive where something begins, not where something stops, when a horizon of expectation opens, a dynamic unfolding, the gift of hospitality we give or receive by letting go" (Stephanides "I Land Home in the Waft of Sibyls with Their Ruthful Smiles" 273). I would like to emphasize here that I am not claiming that literature in English by Cypriots is either by definition more conducive to more nuanced aesthetics towards the 'other' than literature in Greek or Turkish by Cypriots, or that all of this corpus in English manifests a uniform aesthetics. Rather, what I am arguing, is, that its very position at the crossroads of literary categories, and its discomfiture with the established literary categories, have enabled it to develop a more open and more critical aesthetic with regards to the politics of otherness. There are, of

course, many examples of Cypriot literature written in Greek and Turkish that resemble this critical perspective vis-à-vis politics of otherness, but they are also 'not at home' in the dominant ideology of the literary institutions and remain uncanonized, or when canonized, certain aspects of them are appropriated so that they fit the main ideology. However, these works are beyond the scope of this study.

Let us see briefly now where Cypriot literature written in English converges with the criteria that Deleuze and Guattari posit for 'minor literatures'. Before that it is necessary to make two clarifications: firstly, while the position of being 'minor' endows a writer or a literature with potentialities for contesting certain dominant discourses, it does not necessarily prevent and protect one from appropriation and co-optation; secondly, by foregrounding the proximity of Cypriot literature written in English with 'minor literatures' I am not drawing a parallel between this literature and the work of Kafka that Deleuze and Guattari use in their theorizing of 'minor literatures'. Rather, I am simply trying to locate the tensions that are prevalent in some of the works of Cypriot literature written in English because of their position in a poly-lingual setting that entails various complex territorializations, deterritorializations, and reterritorializations. Moreover, their work on 'minor literature' provides a useful model for approaching the works of writers that are not 'at home' in the language they use and are constantly striving to retain their 'minor' particularity in the major language they write in. It is my belief that the import of Deleuze's and Guattari's work on 'minor literature' lies precisely here.

Being 'Minor' in Literature

Let us see in more detail, what being 'minor' in literature exactly means. It is precisely because of their potentiality to subvert major languages from within that 'minor literatures' are found to be remarkable and empowering, and this potentiality of theirs derives from their dislocated and dislocating presence within a major language. In other words, a "minor literature doesn't come from a minor language; it is rather that which a minority constructs within a major language" (Deleuze and Guattari 16). Such a position has three main characteristics as Deleuze and Guattari list: "the deterritorialization of language, the connection of the individual to a political immediacy, and the collective assemblage of enunciation" (18). As I have argued elsewhere, Kafka's position, with its attendant multiple frictions, is somewhat similar to that of the Cypriots' who write in English (Vasiliou 84). Speaking specifically about Kafka's position in a nexus of various

languages, Deleuze and Guattari maintain, that as a Jew living in Prague writing in German, Kafka, is, in essence, a multiply deterritorialized subject. They argue that he is deterritorialized from his 'primitive Czech territoriality' (Deleuze and Guattari 16), cut off from the major German language by his position in Prague, but also in a problematic position in relation to the German language "as a 'paper language'" (Deleuze and Guattari 19). As they maintain, his deterritorialization is accentuated by his Jewishness, which renders him at the same time "part of this minority and excluded from it" (Deleuze and Guattari 17). In a similar fashion, Cypriot writers who write in English are caught in linguistic nexuses that entail deterritorializations, territorializations and reterritorializations: "they are cut off from the local Greek and Turkish speaking establishments that erect linguistic barriers to them, while concurrently being in an ambivalent position in relation to global English and its attendant colonial and imperial connotations" (Vasiliou 84). In relation to local literature written in Greek and Turkish, Cypriot English appears to be in a majority position by virtue of its proximity to a major language, yet, is, in essence, in a minority position, both at home—since it is ignored and excluded—but also internationally. Indeed, in relation to global Anglophone writing, Cypriot literature written in English is in a minority position because of its small size that has prevented it from eliciting the literary world's interest but also because even its own postcoloniality is obfuscated by the dominance of the local discourses to the extent that it remains outside the literary circuits of the larger categories such as 'post-colonial literature' and 'commonwealth literature' (Vasiliou 84).

Deleuze and Guattari borrow a tetralinguistic model from Henri Gobard in their study of the ways that languages function in such poly-lingual settings with their attendant tensions. This model maps the tensions between languages based on four proposed spatiotemporal categories: *vernacular* language that is 'here', *vehicular* language that is 'everywhere', *referential* language that is 'there', and *mythic* language that is 'beyond' (23). The first, the vernacular, is the territorial language which in the context of Cyprus would be the Cypriot dialects of Greek and Turkish that are spoken on the island by the people in both major communities; the second, the vehicular, is "a worldwide language, a language of business, commercial exchange, bureaucratic transmission and so on, a language of the first sort of deterritorialization" (Deleuze and Guattari 23), which in the context of Cyprus would be English (one could say that the model is becoming a bit blurred here because Turkish and Greek are also used in bureaucratic and commercial exchanges); the third, the referential language, is the language of sense and culture,

"entailing a cultural reterritorialization", which in the context of the island would be metropolitan Greek and Turkish; while the fourth, the mythic language, "on the horizon of cultures, caught up [in] a spiritual or religious reterritorialization" (Deleuze and Guattari 23), would be ancient Greek and Ottoman Turkish in the context of the island, two languages no longer used, but always present.

This model is not a system as Deleuze and Guattari emphasize (one should not be surprised considering their commitment against archetypes) but a "blur of languages" (24), where variations exist, and are common, both with regards to the distribution of the languages along the various groups, but also with regards to different epochs. The reaction of a group of Greek Cypriot scholars (representing the status quo) against any suggestion for the usage of the Greek Cypriot dialect in public schools is an example of one group fearing the loss of the function of Greek as a language of culture and meaning that constantly reterritorializes sense. Moreover, the proponents of the inclusion of the Cypriot Greek dialect in public schools manifest a desire to reterritorialize sense through a dialect, exemplifying a blur of borders that is significant. The linguistic history of the island abounds in examples that show the constant tensions between the various languages on the island, but what interests me here is the position of English as it is written by Cypriots, and its deterritorializing potential. It is true that in the literary space, English by Cypriots is both in tension and collaboration with the local languages as well as with the 'paper language' of English, the global language with its colonial connotations, from which it springs, but from which it also differs. It is herein that lies the usefulness of Deleuze and Guattari's model of 'minor literatures' since it outlines the contesting space between various shifting centres of power in multilingual communities. However, it should be indicated here that unlike Kafka's case where German, the 'paper language', is the official language in Prague when he writes, English is not the official language in Cyprus. This important point makes the importation of this model somewhat debatable. Why use it then, one may rightly ask? The answer is both direct and indirect. On the one hand, it is the writers themselves that seem to identify with such 'minor' positions, as it is evident in Alev Adil's words when she tries to convey the tensions that the Cypriot writers who write in English are confronted with:

> They must negotiate positions somewhere between the extremes of assimilation or marginalization in the mother country. In the context of their Cypriot identity their work exhibits the characteristics of minor literatures that Deleuzed and Guattari identify. ("Translating and Mutating

On the other, in my usage of this model, I am not aiming to reproduce it faithfully but to use it in such a way that it enables the manifestation of the tensions that are already present between English in Cyprus and global English as well as between Cypriot English and the local languages. These tensions have indeed led these writers to the creation of an aesthetics that problematizes their relationship to their language. As such, their aesthetic pollinates the English language with their difference and alters it. In other words, in seeking home in English, the Cypriot writers that I discuss need to change the major language that they use and make it 'minor' in order to divest it from its colonial baggage and render it conducive for expressing their affective relationship to the Cypriot 'topos'. By becoming 'minor' they bring home an(other) vision of community that is more open and critical (cosmopolitan?) than the dominant models of community that we find on the cultural sphere of the island. Below, I intend to provide a fruitful critique of this model that aims to temper somewhat the joyfulness that characterizes it. With regards to the criteria that are outlined for this literature I would briefly indicate that at times the tone of Deleuze and Guattari is somewhat idealistic, which perhaps has to do with the desire of the authors to rescue Kafka from an interpretative framework of negation and nihilism and recast him in a more joyful and positive interpretive framework. Furthermore, some of the criteria they set for 'minor literature' are somewhat vague and unconvincing at times. But, let us have a brief look at these criteria, for the sake of clarity.

The high degree of deterritorialization that is essential in 'minor literatures' is indeed significant and useful as a tool that helps us in our reading of literatures that spring from major languages, but whose spatial, ethnic, or racial particularities leave them in tension with the major language from where they spring. However, this is not in any way absolute. Indeed, Deleuze and Guattari themselves acknowledge that there is a fine line between deterritorialization and reterritorialization, as the third epigraph to this chapter testifies. Writing in a major language from a different location or from a different ethnicity to the dominant one, and being positioned in a nexus of various languages, is not *per se* enough to bestow a high degree of deterritorialization to one's writing. The example of a novel from Cypriot literature written in English, titled *The Cypriot,* will exemplify the point.

Moreover, the second characteristic is somewhat vague and problematic. As they argue, the second characteristic in minor literatures is that "everything in them is

political...its cramped space forces each individual intrigue to connect immediately to politics" (Deleuze and Guattari 17). And are other literatures not political? Can literature be, in other words, not political? What about the role of the interpretation, dissemination, and reception of literature? Are 'major literatures' independent of these acutely political processes? Similarly inexact about the role of 'minor' literature is the third characteristic, which argues that in minor literatures, "everything takes on a collective value...what each author says individually already constitutes a common action, and what he or she says or does is necessarily political, even if others aren't in agreement" (Deleuze and Guattari 17). Deleuze and Guattari add that "literature finds itself charged with the role and function of collective, and even revolutionary, enunciation" (17). I wholeheartedly agree with the authors that in literature there is "the possibility to express another possible community and to forge the means for another consciousness and another sensibility" (17). I also agree with the authors that "if the writer is in the margins or completely outside his or her fragile community, [this] allows the writer all the more the possibility" (17) to do the above, to express, in other words, another community and to forge another sensibility. However, it is important to remind ourselves that collectivities were also created by major literatures and they were acutely political and ideological. This is precisely the argument of Edward Said when talking about the role of English literature in *Orientalism*. Apart from the evident problem of appropriation of such marginal space, especially at times when their marketability is high, by voices that are profoundly complicit with the dominant discourses of the status quo, there is also another problem, namely, the risk of obfuscating the role of vernacular languages and major national literatures in the forging of nationalist, and anti-colonial sentiments. In other words, it is not only 'minor literatures' that have the ability, or the possibility, to express another community and forge another sensibility but also major languages, as the history of national struggles for independence shows. Expressing another community does not necessarily mean contesting the hegemony of the dominant discourses, but simply proposing an alternative one. What 'minor' literatures have, and major literatures do not, is the sense of discomfiture with the established categories and discourses, and thus the increased possibility of contesting the latter. The criticality of the imagined and imaginary community that is expressed out of such contestations depends on how nuanced the addressing of these issues in the writing is. Be that as it may, I still think that Deleuze and Guattari's outline of 'minor literature' is indeed a useful way of conceptualizing the tensions, collusions, and complicities between languages in poly-lingual settings. Moreover, it gives us a helpful and effective way of

conceptualizing the position of writers who spring from a major language but whose situation renders them also antagonistic to it. It also helps us explore the ways that they address and express the attendant tensions of such a precarious position.

Minor Literatures and Politics of Otherness

But what is the relation of being 'minor' in literature to an aesthetics of 'otherness'? Becoming nomads, immigrants, gypsies in relation to their language, as Deleuze and Guattari tell us in the second epigraph, is the aim of 'minor' writers (19). But is not language, particularly the the m(other)'s language, the innermost of homes? (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 89)? And what does it mean to become nomadic, an immigrant, or a gypsy in relation to one's home? Does it mean rejecting 'home' altogether, or does it mean expanding its homeliness for others in such a way that it becomes no longer familiar? If Polan is right in saying that the deterritorializing processes of 'minor literatures' are easily appropriated (xxvi) what is, then, their import to our 21st century violence-ridden, and unprecedentedly hegemonic world? What is their import, in other words, for the politics of 'otherness' and for the ongoing struggle for the elimination of power asymmetries and increasing economic (and political) dependence of the 'periphery' on the imperial 'centre(s)'? The radical subversion of dominant discourses that 'minor literatures' are invested with opens up the question of the 'other' and therefore engages with visions of another community, ones where the 'other' is not sequestered in her/his alienating alterity and where the 'other' speaks if s/he can and is heard. But then of course, we need to ask the urgent question of how s/he is heard and in what language. And who has been invested with the authority to do the listening in the first place, how and why? All these questions are inextricably related with discussions of community, nationalism, and cosmopolitanism, but also with power, hegemony, and imperialism. Produced in a context of competing discourses such as nationalism, bi-communalism, multi-culturalism and cosmopolitanism, Cypriot literature written in English, is inevitably confronted with questions of otherness, and as I argued earlier, its position at the crossroads of literary circuits endows it with an acute sense of dislocation and deterritorialization with regards to established discourses and their hegemonic territorialization of sense. Historiography and literature have both contributed to the imagining of the nation-states and have colluded with nationalist ideology in the construction, entrenchment, and naturalization of monolithic national (Lambropoulos 12-13), as well as heternormal, sexual identities (Scott

8). In what follows I aim to exemplify the ways that Cypriot literature written in English comes to contest this monolithic depiction of the past as it appears in historiographic and canonized fictional narratives and to liberate it from such delimiting depictions. In doing that, the narratives discussed either exude a nostalgia for, or bring into presence, an(other) vision of community, that resonates with an aesthetics of cosmopolitanism that is unlike other versions of cosmopolitanism that appeared on the cultural terrain of the island. The cosmopolitan aesthetic that characterizes the narratives that I discuss finds proximity at times to ideas pertaining to utopia and other times to Foucault's heterotopias. But first, I will briefly address nationalism's intimacy with, and indispensability to, the institutions of historiography and literature.

Nationalism, Historiography, and Literature

The salience of historiography for nationalism rests in the former's identification with the 'real' of the past, and the latter's desire of a narrative that gives it immemorial coherence and continuity. Yet, despite nationalism's endeavor to construct narratives of itself that reveal its immemorial continuity and its unequivocal coherence, what these narratives reveal, in fact, is the impossibility of such undertakings. Homi Bhabha conveys this ambiguity of the nation and its narratives by describing it as a kind of haunting: "What I want to emphasize in that large and liminal image of the nation with which I began is a particular ambivalence that haunts the idea of the nation, the language of those who write of it and the lives of those who live it" ("Introduction: Narrating the Nation " 1). Yet, as he argues, those who write about the nation do not seem to admit to this ambivalence of the nation and its origins. Indeed, "despite the certainty with which historians speak of the 'origins' of nation as a sign of modernity of society, the cultural temporality of the nation inscribes a much more transitional social reality" (Bhabha "Introduction: Narrating the Nation " 1). This certainty that marks the historians' narratives is what Michel De Certeau calls "the institution of the real [which] … consists of the construction of representations into laws imposed by the states of things. Through this process ethical tasks are replaced by what is supposed to be the expression of reality" (200). Indeed, historiography reveals a persistence to "speak in the name of the real" (De Certeau 201) and concurrently to deny its own fictiveness by positing itself in contradistinction to fiction. Yet, the works of Hayden White and Michel De Certeau, among others, have grappled precisely with this "dogmatizing tendency" (De Certeau 200) of historiography towards the real. The

contestation of the borders of the nation as it unfolds in its narratives is an ethical task as De Certeau's quote above implies. The narratives that I read in these last two chapters engage in such ethical tasks, namely the transgressing of the nation's boundaries and of its cultural space. To put it simply, the narratives that I include in my discussion come to contest the dominant version of the history of the cultural space of the island, and, in doing so, to rewrite it, and express another vision of community that transgresses the dominant models of nationalist patriarchal community that permeate the cultural sphere of the island. Lisandros Pitharas' poem "Green Line" reveals precisely such an intention to transgress the boundaries of the national story. When the poem was written, crossing the Green Line was prohibited, and despite the waiver of the prohibition, nationalist discourses continue to view such crossings as acts of treason. Indeed, the nationalist discourses continue to 'police' the Green Line and to affirm its divisive symbolic nature through such policing. It is precisely because of this divisive symbolism of the green line that has permeated the cultural space of the nation that Pitharas' poem assumes both a transgressive character but also an ethical urgency through its playful contempt of such divisiveness. In doing so, the poem employs various textures:

I can't see this green line.
Textures are more useful,
like the crevice this finger traces around your masks
and the damp breath of those still alive
and the theatre of sighs,
as we post our condemnation to various presidents, the acrid envelope's lip

and sometimes our little towns are quiet
and only flags flutter as tributes to the silence,

and I poke my tongue
into the hole of my history
and wriggle my toes in the damp sand, beyond the cafeteria,
and observe that I can't see this green line, I just can't see it.

I can only see gold,
and the eyes of my people blacker than embers,
and the strong smell of their lovemaking,

and secrets which they say nestle in their breasts,
standing like monoliths looking toward the sea,
saying nothing
as if they are chanting. (Pitharas 9)

The textures that Pithara's narrator seeks in this poem are both bodily as well as discursive and it is precisely through the latter that he achieves the former. Alev Adil says that "There can be no war without words, and peace must forge its own poetry" ("Translating and Mutating Identities: Cypriots Who Write in English" 1), and peace is part of the ethical imperative that both writers have in their writing. The physicality of his tongue that pokes "into the hole of my history" (Pitharas 9) but still "can't see this green line" is a strong affirmation of the possibility of an(other) (text)ure that resists recognizing the physicality and inevitability of the green line and its divisive border mentality. Furthermore, the refusal, or inability, to see the green line could be understood as a gesture of resistance to accept the green line as it is foregrounded in nationalist narratives on both sides, namely, a de facto separation that serves as a constant reminder of violence and trauma. Instead, the physicality of the tongue points to a sensuality that aims at the nullification the border of the green line:

I can only see gold,
and the eyes of the people blacker than embers,
and the strong smell of their lovemaking,
and secrets which they say nestle in their breasts,
……,
saying nothing
as if they are chanting. (Pitharas 9)

The last lines reveal the poet's distrust of the textures of language too, since, apart from physical borders, the green line has been entrenched as a line of division and separation through the discursive borders of nationalism. Instead, the poem relishes the sensual aspect of the tongue while inscribing an(other) texture of the green line, one where its impermeability is lost and its absurdity exposed.

What is it that these texts that posit themselves antagonistically to the narratives of the nation aim to achieve? Being both inside and outside of the nation, or in spaces that Bhabha calls in-between, these narratives come to contest the boundaries of ethnicity, cultural identity, and sexuality that dominate in the nation's favored stories. Bhabha

affirms that such in-between locations "seek to affirm and extend Franz Fanon's revolutionary credo: 'National consciousness, which is not nationalism, is the only thing that will give us an international dimension'" ("Introduction: Narrating the Nation " 4). Importantly, though, instead of mobilizing a righteous dogmatism about their truthfulness (as historiography or canonized literature often does), they are 'at home' with their own fictiveness and often extend our sense of the real by subtly undermining its rationalistic garment. As such, the poem creates heterotopias of community that serve as pockets of resistance to the dominant model of nationalist and patriarchal community of the island. The ambivalent sexuality and anti-nationalist aesthetic that pervade the poem points to a community that resonates with a cosmopolitanism that comes to proximity to the international dimension that Fanon envisions in the quote above. Before continuing our discussion of 'minor' narratives that come to contest the dominant narratives of the nation, it is important to foreground the danger of appropriation of such 'minor' spaces by voices that are complicit to the dominant discourses but which still manage to benefit from the growing aura around such areas as the 'post-colonial', 'exile', or 'migrant' literatures.

The Danger of Appropriation of 'Minor Spaces'

The work I would like to briefly comment on as a way of a caveat of appropriation of 'minor' spaces by voices complicit to the dominant ideology is Koumi's novel *The Cypriot (2006),* whose author's self-initiated marketing attempts have created a comparatively wide reception of the work, which managed to benefit from the market aura that has been growing around postcolonial novels of dislocation. The narrative oscillates between London of the early 1970s and Cyprus under British colonialism in the 1950s. The chapter titles in this novel have one version in English that is followed by its translated equivalent in transliterated Cypriot dialect. These chapter titles are quite revealing of the trope of auto-exoticisation, a trope that is collusive with neo-colonial undercurrents in pleasing a metropolitan audience's thirst for exotic landscapes (Pratt 9). Indeed, in the generally dry and sterile narrative, traditional rituals and customs, such as christenings, coffee making, oral poetry, peasant costumes, etc., fixed in a curious past, seem to be parading for commercial metropolitan consumption. Let us have a very brief look at the plot for the sake of clarity. The love between Andonis, the Greek-Cypriot Christian protagonist, and Funda, a Turkish-Cypriot Muslim girl, and its rejection by both Christian and Muslims during the years of the struggle against British colonization is the central

theme of the story. The novel is split in two parts, one where a third person narrator tells the story of the 1950s Cyprus with its attendant violence between the EOKA fighters and the British colonial army as well as the love between Andonis and Funda, and one, where Andonis narrates his personal itinerary in London in the 1970s, years after his exile to the English capital. Alongside the two characters' love, the novel unfolds also the history of the 1950s and the rift between the Christians and the Muslims as it is played out in a small village. While Andonis and Funda persist in their love, despite its overwhelming rejection by their own communities (the only one in favour of it being a captain of the British army), their love comes to an abrupt end when Andonis has to be ushered out of the country after being involuntarily involved in the murder of a Turkish-Cypriot goatherd who happened to be in love with Funda— and who had assumed responsibility for the unexpected pregnancy of Funda by Andonis. Living in London and completely cut off from Cyprus for years—a rather unconvincing story since in a matter of a few days in the narrative he accidentally encounters almost everyone from his village who had moved to London—he decides to return to his village in the midst of the Turkish invasion of 1974 in order to rescue Funda and his mother. His unlikely undertaking is guaranteed success through the chaperoning of the British captain, whose retirement enabled him to continue the service to humanity by doing charity work for the Red Cross. The last few pages read more like an adventure story where the retired but omnipotent captain, with the help of a bottle of whisky that he gives to the thirsty Turkish soldiers, storms the village and reinstalls Andonis in it.

While evidently eager to project a postcolonial anti-nationalist perspective on the tumultuous events of the island's recent history (1950s until 1974) and defy nationalist historiography, the novel ends up complying with historiography's commemoration of monumental events that nationalism holds dear. Additionally, the overall narrative resonates with a sterile and uncritical politics of otherness, where the 'other' is benevolently reconstituted but is still fixed in his/her alterity. Indeed, the novel's twofold narration, although purporting to challenge the realist linear narration that characterizes most nationalist narratives, ends up reproducing it since the two parts unfold linearly and, more significantly, they are narrated in such a way that they erase any historical ambivalence and mnemonic ambiguity. Moreover, in trying to valorise the gallantry of the two lovers in the face of so much animosity, the novel ends up unintentionally reproducing the nationalist narratives of ossified communities in unrelenting hatred. The only hope for co-existence and rapprochement between the two communities comes at the end of the novel through the return of Andonis to the island and his reunion with Funda, all

engineered and adroitly carried out by the selfless interference of the retired captain of the British colonial army. This curious closure to the novel where the real hero is the retired English captain and not the two lovers culminates when Andonis prompts his beloved Funda to share his conviction that through their love "one day the troubles will go away forever" (Koumi 285). Evidently, such a conviction that ethnic and religious hatred will vanish through the love of two individuals from different communities is not only wishful thinking but also reminiscent of uncritical cosmopolitanism or multi-culturalism where cultural co-existence is celebrated as long as the power hierarchy is not questioned.

Indeed, the novel is not a stranger to such celebration of a British style multi-culturalism, which is implicitly used as a model to be followed by such societies as the Cypriot, lamentably still caught up in ethno-religious nationalism. The following passage where Andonis reflects on life in London is revealing of such facile multi-culturalism, where questions of power remain unasked in the name of a celebrated diversity. Andonis becomes

> conscious once more of sharing this huge city with countless others, all getting by. Many had origins in other parts of the world. People like me struggling to make a home amongst people like Ruth. And amongst each other. And all at once I was filled with hope. I glimpsed a future when all these different people had come together to share the best each had to offer. A future when this diversity and colour had merged, the whole much deeper and much richer than any of its parts. It was a future I knew I'd almost glimpsed once before. I wondered whether I'd ever live to see it for real. (Koumi 176-77)

I do not need to go into any detail about the problems that the neo-liberal discourse of multi-culturalism entails. The novel abounds in examples that extol multi-cultural London and castigate ethno-religious nationalism, without ever probing into their attendant socio-political complex contexts and problems. While setting out to open up the question of the 'other' and thus invite other narratives from the past to emerge and question the dominant nationalist narratives, the novel ends up reproducing a facile aesthetics of simplistic appropriation of the 'other'. For instance, when talking about the Turkish-Cypriots, which the novel wishes to rescue from the amnesia of the Greek-Cypriot nationalist narratives, the novel, unwittingly perhaps, ends up fully appropriating them. In a revealing passage where the narrator (Andonis) tries to draw a difference between Turks and Turkish-

Cypriots, in the context of the Turkish invasion, we can see this utter appropriation: "The soldiers were unshaven, and their eyes were glazed. With their Anatolian features, they looked different from *our own* Muslims, who after all *looked like* Cypriots" (Koumi 278 my emphasis). Are 'our own Muslims' not Cypriots? Do they only look like Cypriots?

But is this not what the novel sets out to do, namely, to remind the Greek-Cypriots, and the world—ironically while the novel castigates the parochialism of the Cypriots it reproduces such parochialism by placing Cyprus in the centre of world politics—that the Turkish-Cypriots or the Muslims of Cyprus are equally Cypriots as the rest of the Cypriots? Yet, here we see that the invitation to the 'other' voices of the past is one that does not recognize the complexity of the relationship of the self to the other and of the invitation itself. Reading the novel closely, one gets the feeling that by uncritically repudiating nationalism (without exploring its historicity and its emotional force) and by uncritically embracing diversity, the 'other' can be accepted into a London-style multi-cultural oasis of homeliness. While eager to inscribe the anxiety of the main characters about the destiny of their loved ones in the midst of violence and hatred, the novel is less eager to reveal its anxiety of inadequacy. Lamentably, its ongoing clichés reveal more about such anxiety than about questions of culture.

Why discuss this novel of such questionable quality, one is right to ask. Why this specific novel and not some other work of equally uncritical aesthetics? I think that this novel, precisely because of it overall context of production, dissemination, and reception, renders itself well as an example of the previous discussion of the danger of co-optation of deterritorializing practices by reterritoralizing ones, in the context of 'minor literatures'. In my use of 'deterritorialization', I refer to practices that contest and thus redraw the boundaries of concepts that are already territorialized because of their complicity with some dominant discourses. At times, practices that are collusive or complicit with the dominant order may come to be assumed as deterritorializing, de-scribing, or disaffiliating practices and be subsumed in the latter. As such, they benefit from the aura that the market has created around such deterritorializing practices (i.e. the post-colonial novel that aims at the contestation of certain dominant discourses) by being subsumed under established categories of literary circulation such as the post-colonial novel, minor literature, migrant literature, exile literature etc. While there are important differences between such categories, they are often appropriated by the market and used in loose ways and thus end up allowing space for works of poor aesthetics and dubious politics. The example I am drawing on is a case at hand. Produced and published in London, the novel is celebrated

by Robert Hastings, director of Dexter Haven Publishing, as a novel "making a valuable contribution to our understanding of Cyprus' history, culture, and the ongoing problem" (http://pages.globetrotter.net/gcradb/TheCypriot.html). Yet, the novel's depiction of Cypriot history and culture is highly problematic, and its dry narrative, auto-exotic depictions, and facile closure are saturated in neo-colonial politics. Comparing the attention elicited by this novel to the attention elicited by some of its contemporary novels written in English by Cypriots, such as Ierodiaconou's *Margarita's Husband* and *The Women's Coffee Shop*, Hoplaros' *Mrs. Bones*, or Nadjarian's *Ledra Street*, in a marketplace like Amazon, we find that *The Cypriot* has enjoyed far more attention than its counterparts, which are part of what this thesis maps as 'minor literature'. Indeed, casting a look at Amazon website (Amazon), for instance, we find that Koumi's novel has thirty-one reviews, most of which are praising indeed, whereas the other aforementioned Cypriot novels have between none and four. I am not pointing out the number of readers' comments as a means for evaluating the novels, but only as evidence of the volume of attention that the works have received in a particular marketplace. Moreover, the fact that the majority of these mostly praising comments come from London shows that the book has been much more widely read in London than its counterparts which are perhaps more widely known within the small and steadily emerging literary community of Anglophone literature of Cyprus. Some questions remain though: who is 'minor literature' writing for, and is it being read by this audience? Even if English theoretically allows access to the global stage, is literature written by Cypriots in English read outside Cyprus? I do not think that there are easy answers to these questions. In my reading of Cypriot literature written in English, I include works that were written both in Cyprus but also in diaspora (i.e. Ierodiaconou lives and writes in France, Pitharas wrote in London, Aydin Mehmet Ali and Alev Adil write both in London and in Cyprus). Most of these writers are known more in Cyprus than in the place where they live and write. Therefore, they remain either outside the literary feast or are newcomers to it both at home and internationally. However, Cypriot English literature, remaining rather small as a literary corpus, finds itself easily appropriated by voices such as the one we have seen, which exemplifies diametrically different aesthetics on such issues as identity, home, cosmopolitanism etc. Indeed, such paradigms as those afforded by Cypriot literature written in English tell us that we need to beware of using prescribed literary categories loosely.

Rewriting the Past through Fiction

I would like to move now to a more detailed discussion of Cypriot literature written in English and the ways in which it grapples with the history of the island, and, more specifically, the ways in which it tries to contest the dominant narratives of orthodox conceptions of ethnic and cultural identities. My discussion will draw on various works of this corpus and will focus on different kinds of displacement that are achieved by these narratives, such as temporal displacements, the contestation of the 'real', and the revival of ghosts of the past that come to haunt the narratives and claim their space. I will start with Ierodiaconou's novel *Margarita's Husband*. The novel engages with the past and constitutes an endeavour to re-insert into the past voices that have been completely ignored, erased, or marginalized from the dominant narratives of Cypriot literature and historiography. As such, it can be seen as an invitation to ghostly presences of the past to re-visit the space of unequivocal representations of the past, as the latter unfolds in the dominant narratives of fiction and historiography, and turn it into an unhomely space with their uncanny presence. The moments that the novel resuscitates and the persistence they are invested with as a concern of the present echo Benjamin's caveat: "every image of the past that is not recognized with the present as one of its own concerns threatens to disappear irretrievably" (255). Unlike *The Cypriot,* which appropriates these voices of the past and domesticates them through facile and clichéd forms of multi-culturalism and cosmopolitanism, Ierodiaconou's novel speaks another story, one where the 'other' reveals hers/his/its spectral presence and astonishes us (or the discourse itself) for a moment. As such, it makes a guest out of us, of the writer, and/or of the discourse, since we are all led to other unfamiliar contours. However, the author is aware of the inevitability of domestication of the 'other' once s/he is part of the narrative and thus provides multiple layers of astonishment in her text. Let us start by outlining *Margarita's Husband's* plot.

Ierodiaconou's *Margarita's Husband*

The novel provides neither a spatially nor a temporally clear context but through its unfolding we slowly surmise that it grapples with the events preceding the 1931 uprising against colonial rule in a village in Cyprus. The spatial and temporal vagueness that surrounds the text should not be taken for an indifference to history. Quite the contrary, the text is obsessed with history, but, in lieu of the master-narratives nationalism and their

temporal and spatial alleged lucidity and explicitness, it opts for the temporal and spatial inexactitude, if not opacity. Walter Benjamin tells us that the "concept of historical progress of mankind cannot be sundered from the concept of progression through a homogeneous, empty time. A critique of the concept of such a progression must be the basis of any criticism of the concept of progress itself" (261). Instead of a linear narration that unfolds over a "homogeneous, empty time", the novel employs a non-linear narration laden with snippets of life in rural and urban Cyprus, where we experience the tremendous changes that are taking place on the island during this time with the island's entry into modernity through political parties, national education, and urbanization. Alongside this entrance into modernity, we are also presented with village life and its attendant traditional customs. As the title indicates, the main character is Margarita's husband, Homer Kyroleon, whose self-chosen surname is a reflection of his status as a rich and powerful landowner. Kyroleon's wealth and power are the outcome of clever and deceitful manipulations of colonial policies which enable him to swindle his co-villagers' land, taking thus revenge for his father's prior loss of property through a natural disaster but also through his creditors' greed and lack of compassion. Kyroleon's wealth is accompanied by enormous prestige and power and he is, thus, the recipient of contrasting attitudes and feelings. As I suggested elsewhere, Kyroleon "is dreaded by his workers, hated by his son Adonis while adored by his daughter Polyxene, and pitied, loved, and feared at the same time by his wife" (Vasiliou 89). The sudden death of his daughter Polyxene plunges Kyroleon into mourning. Moreover, his son's return to the island from Paris, where instead of pursuing his studies in medicine he becomes intoxicated with surrealist poetry, exacerbates the already antagonistic relationship between the two men. The appearance of a refugee girl from Asia Minor brings the two men at loggerheads since, unbeknownst to each other, they both become enamoured with her. Margarita, Kyroleon's wife and Adonis' mother, is caught in the middle of the hostility between father and son and resorts to her numinous powers to find solace. In the background of this family saga, the island is on the cusp of momentous changes that the author patiently and subtly inscribes into the narrative. Through the inscription of these changes as well as the description of the family saga we become witnesses to a politics of otherness where the self and the 'other(s)' fuse, contesting thus the segregation of the two that characterizes most discourses of alterity, including most postcolonial discourses.

Although never spelled out clearly, the attentive reader of the novel notices that its interest lies in bringing out the polyphony and heterogeneity of the past and the fluidity of

identity construction. Instead of monophonic and unequivocal narratives of the past, the novel re-inscribes the events by juxtaposing various antithetical discourses that were vying for space at the time, something that was effaced by the nationalist discourses that predominated later on. Kefala argues that the experience of peripheral countries with modernity inevitably passed through nationalism, which endeavoured to erase heterogeneity for the sake of homogeneity (24-25). As such, the novel provides an(other) reading of the past, bringing out nascent voices and discourses that the nationalist archive ignored or co-opted. Through them we witness the complexity of the political front at the time. Rather than giving into the temptation of presenting the political front as one where the two major communities were plunged in divisive nationalism or one where there was harmonious and brotherly love and coexistence, the novel provides a far more nuanced reading of the past and brings out the entanglement and precariousness of the political front. In a dialogue between Kyroleon and his friend, Vuralbey, a renowned lawyer of the Muslim community, where the two members of the Executive council are discussing the political ramifications, we get a feeling of the delicate and precarious political situation on the eve of the uprising. Kyroleon's belief that the Muslims will rebel together with the Christians against the colonial government, elicits a revealing response by Vuralbey:

> 'You mustn't mistake me. I have no love for these oppressors' ... 'But the Moslem community is safer with them, while those bearded goats hold the reins of the revolt ... If I see a Moslem plotting revolution with a Christian I will say to him, 'Beware, for your fellow revolutionary of today will stab you in the back over the spoils of the revolution tomorrow'. (Ierodiaconou *Margarita's Husband: A Fable of the Levant* 84)

Vuralbey's response conveys the intricate web of discourses that comprised the political front at the time and resists such simplistic readings of the past as one of sworn enmity or brotherly conviviality. Additionally, it conveys the slippery situation of the Turkish-Cypriot community, caught as it was between its fear of the Greek-Cypriot community and the latter's drive for Enosis, and its dislike of colonial power, in which it sought refuge for protection from their compatriots' ethnically monophonic discourses. The text, in other words, invites voices of the past that have been erased from dominant narratives to resurface and claim their space.

The novel's dislike of discourses of authenticity and purity that typify both nationalist and colonial discourses is also manifest through its subtle ridicule of such ideas.

Choosing Kyroleon—who is presented as the embodiment of manhood and widely recognized as a glorious representative of the race of the nation—the text, in passing, yet sardonically, plants some doubt about his racial origins. For, how else can the author explain Kyroleon's exceptional height of six feet which enabled him to stand well above most men in his district? Unable to do so, she cites the whispers that were present in "the recesses of village lore ... [in which] in fact survived a story about the rape of Kyroleon's great-great-grandmother in a seaside orange grove by a group of pirates, though whether they were Greeks or Arabs and what their height had been no one could say for certain" (Ierodiaconou *Margarita's Husband: A Fable of the Levant* 19). If the story about Kyroleon's progenitor's rape is true, then what is Kyroleon, Greek, Arab, or a hybrid, the text seems to be asking us? As I argued elsewhere, the "mixture that is indistinguishable in Kyroleon's nature, subtly undermines such orthodox conceptions of identity that typify nationalist and Orientalist discourses. It also suggests that cultural heterogeneity is characteristic of all societies" (Vasiliou 90). Using Kyroleon's ambivalent origins, the text tells us an(other) story of identity construction, one where fluidity and impurity make a laughing stock of purity and authenticity. Ironically though, Kyroleon's accidental death at the hands of the working-class insurgents, at the end of the novel, is presented by the bishop who embodies the cause of nationalism, as an act of sacrifice "before the twin altars of God and Freedom" (Ierodiaconou *Margarita's Husband: A Fable of the Levant* 162), two altars that meant nothing for Kyroleon. The nationalists do not miss the chance to appropriate the event of Kyroleon's death as an act of sacrifice for the glorification of the nation.

Let us now explore another form of otherness that the narrative invites to inhabit its space. On the cusp of transition between tradition and modernity, the novel gives space to the voices of such motley characters as the crone of the village and her uncanny powers to make things come true, Margarita's animals and birds, and various saints who smile cunningly and reassuringly at the characters. The weaving of these supernatural voices and elements comes to haunt the otherwise realist narration. Indeed, the insertion of the 'magical' elements in the narrative does not negate reality in the name of a 'supernatural' or 'magical' topos but, instead, extends the limits of the real. In this process, where the supernatural is invited to the discussion, the narrative is generally arrested by some form of astonishment before subtly subsuming 'magic' into the otherwise realist narration. It is this moment of astonishment as we saw earlier that Derrida and Dufourmantelle value. Dufourmantelle's astonishment "is the precise name for what Derrida's speaking calls

forth in us.... I would like to salute the audacity that leads a philosophical utterance to make us desert those dwellings of the mind where reason lives as master, when for an instant astonishment makes reason a guest (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 32-36). Let us see an example of this astonishment. When Adonis eagerly shares some of his surrealist poems with his mother, Margarita says that,

> 'some of my birds speak like that.' And Adonis who had heard stories of his paternal grandfather's literary exploits and always cherished the belief that he had inherited his poetic gift from the tight-fisted old shepherd, *suddenly saw his mother with new eyes*, recalling with *a shock* her conversations with animals which he had always assumed were make-believe displays put on mainly to amuse her children. (Ierodiaconou *Margarita's Husband: A Fable of the Levant* 88 my emphasis)

The shock of Adonis and of the readers is only momentary since the realist narration that follows domesticates the foreignness of Margarita's outlandish ability to communicate with birds. Through this momentary shock though, the realist narration comes to a standstill and the text expands its space for this 'other' knowledge to inhabit it, even momentarily, and is, thereby, altered. It becomes 'othered', in other words, in such a way that reality and 'magic' are fused, just like the self and the other. The novel provides various such examples and one feels constantly astonished by the insertion of these voices. These uncanny voices that the text invites point to a different kind of community, one that does not coalesce into an identity, but conversely remains open to new possibilities and new forms of astonishment. It is in this vein that I read the novel as an example of the utopian cosmopolitanism discussed in the introduction, one where the horizon of possibilities for envisioning community remains open and perhaps inoperative. As such the novel keeps bringing home visions of an(other) community that displace and dislocate our sense of the homely.

Pithara's Distrust of Truth and Adil's Alchemy of Myth

Similar to Ierodiaconou who contests the rationality of the 'real' by inserting 'magical' elements in her narrative, Pitharas and Alev Adil also seem preoccupied with dislocating the centrality of the 'real' in the depiction of the past and in any form of representation in general. Pitharas' "I have only one poem to write", among other

concerns, also performs a deterritorialization of the 'real'. The poem is a poignant attempt to negotiate between his desire to write and his awareness of death's imminence. The title of the poem reflects the latter and not his belief in the monophony of truth, since as he avows in the poem, "the Poem is no fortress of truth,/ the Poem has no metaphore, like light, or voice, or soul/the Poem is no solution" (Pitharas 30). In this poem which starts with, "I have only one poem to write, only one life to/ write it/ and do not tell me I am mad to aspire to these small/ victories/ for the Poem is not about being remembered, or acclaimed,/ or to be understood", Pitharas seems to dissolve and become the poem itself by the end: "the Poem is nothing more or less than myself,/ the cage of bone and dream in which we sing/ a song/ already written for us..." (Pitharas 30). The fatality of destiny that is echoed in the last words is somewhat contested by the previous lines which underline that the poem is "no fortress of truth," revealing thus a playfulness about truth and reality that is inherent in language. On the one hand, we are all spoken by language as we speak it, forming our sense of self and otherness in the process in such a way that we feel 'at home', and, on the other, we are constantly reminded by language of the division at the core of our being, or, of the impossibility of being 'at home' in a process that foregrounds the inseparability of self and other. While eager to underline the impossibility of truth, Pitharas establishes another truth, namely, that one cannot escape language in his/her endeavour to become a subject. What remains in a poem fraught with paradoxes, is that truth, like life, is paradoxical indeed. Such paradoxes come to fiercely contest the orthodoxy of truth and of the 'real' that typify nationalist narratives.

A similar playfulness is observed in Alev Adil's poetry. My choice of discussing the two poets' works together here is not a random one. Indeed, I would like to employ an(other) approach with these two writers and discuss their work through their dialogic and discursive friendship. My decision to do so stems from the sheer power and inspiration that characterizes their friendship. Further, it is my opinion that their struggle to be 'at home' in their multiple identities cannot be treated in isolation since it is in their shared commitment to writing as a political and ethical imperative that they found(ed) that elusive concept of home. In their poems and other writings, the concept of home emerges injured, scarred, and fragile by the appearance of various ghosts that come to haunt the conventional homeliness of pure and uncontested identities. Alev Adil conveys this fragility and elusiveness of home in a poignant piece where she tries to remember Lysandros, who died at a young age:

I felt at home with Lysandros, I felt that for both of us the sense of

> belonging was a fragile and mutable thing, not easily defined or delineated. We tried to make it *all write*, to put it into words but really this sense of belonging, of complexity was a fragile thing, strung somewhere between the spoken and the written word, grandiose and humorous in turn, words dependent for their meaning on the writers [sic] tone of voice, bound to the passing moment, to new contingent conceptualisations of community and family. (Adil "Translating and Mutating Identities: Cypriots Who Write in English" 9, my emphasis)

They were 'at home' in their friendship and in their writing, a writing that becomes political through its scorn and ridicule of conventional politics and the impermeable borders that the latter poses but also through the insertion of pleasure and playfulness.

Indeed, Alev Adil's poetry can be read as an incessant endeavor towards homecoming, one whose very repetition reflects the poet's awareness of the impossibility of homecoming. Home in her poetry is the actual journey, the process of homecoming, in other words, which is symptomatic of the experience of the disaporic subject. Her poetry distrusts any orthodox notion of identity, history, or language. Hers, is a split identity, whose parts have been irretrievably lost, as her poem "Forgotten Songs" avows: "I am not whole/ but parts of me have been/ torn up and left behind./ No, not my heart/ much more – my tongue" (Adil *Venus Infers* 60). Unlike nationalist narratives that rely on history for their re-membering of the past, her poems distrust such seemingly transparent promises: "It is all so much false history/ our remembering has no eyes/ or potato like grows them in the dark./ Forgotten songs suffuse us:/ mimosa bleeding scent into the night air./ We are not whole/ bits of us torn off/ and left behind./ Heartless, gutless/ soulless/ bastards all of us" (Adil *Venus Infers* 61). Aware of the impossibility of retrieving the bits that have been torn off, she opts for the elusory and equivocal nature of myth instead of the righteousness of history. Indeed, Alev Adil seems to be closest to home when her poetry revives ancient myths, only to transform them, in such transformations that operate as metaphors for the migrant experience. Meaning in her poetry refuses to settle in any one point, but, rather, displaces itself constantly. For instance, in her poem "Ariadne Unwinding (in the Regent Palace Hotel)", we read:

> I kept faith with the silence
> which was calm and whole
> and the moon, a luminous bowl of milk

with the sheen of poison
hung limpid over us.
The things I needed to tell you might be lies.
For years I have been petrified
stone-still listening
for the laboured bullish breaths of the minotaur
trapped in these long corridors. (Adil *Venus Infers* 84)

Her faith in the wholeness and calmness of silence, and the soothing ambience created by the milkness of the moon are abruptly disturbed by the "sheen of poison" that is hanging over. The mood changes suddenly, and instead of the calm and homely silence, we start listening to the minotaur's "labored bullish breaths". Home, wholeness, and meaning are displaced, and, instead, we get a feeling of the unhomely, the insecure, the feeling of being trapped. Home appears but then disappears as a fleeting illusion. The poem inscribes this uncertain and unhomely ambience in the heart of one of the most successful (initially) stories of homecoming. In the myth, Ariadne contributes to the demise of the Minotaur by providing Theseus with a sword and a ball of thread for retracing his steps back to the entrance of the labyrinth. But such rapturous and elated homecomings are suspect for our poet, whose rendition of the myth inserts an unhomely metamorphosis in it. Instead of the clarity of *lysis* to the problem of the labyrinth, Ariadne lingers on the opacity of *analysis*:

My story made history,
Rendered serene and strange
Through time.
I often get lost I admit,
Tangled in skeins and schemes
of my own weaving.
I don't want to blind you
To keep you here
In the loneliness of the labyrinth
I call home.
You cannot save me.
I should have warned you.
I let you call me Ariadne,
No lie nor harm in that.

But there is more my love
Much more
I am the maze
I am the minotaur. (Adil *Venus Infers* 85-86)

Home in the poem is the loneliness of the labyrinth, that sense of loss of meaning where the unhomeliness allows the most fruitful metamorphoses, where the self and other each recognize their inseparability, where Ariadne is the maze and the minotaur. These are often the tangible realities of diaspora; identities are acutely disputed by the living realities of everyday life. Alev Adil reminds us of this when she says that "Perhaps because I am a Cypriot, born on that tiny war torn island in the Mediterranean, I'm especially aware of how constructed and contingent identity can be, how mutable and frail are the imagined communities we inhabit as certainties, not a bedrock, more a rickety bricolage of politics, everyday life and literature" (Adil "Translating and Mutating Identities: Cypriots Who Write in English"). It is through this ongoing struggle to transform the illusion of homeliness into unhomeliness that Alev Adil's poetry succeeds in bringing another form of politics, one where meaning loses its stability and is constantly forced to negotiate for space. Her "Other,…evil twin" (Adil *Venus Infers* 21) who plays hide and seek with her, fusing and confusing her; her loss of a "thread/ of a dream/ a mapmaker offered [her]" (Adil *Venus Infers* 50); her invitations to the dead to come and haunt her poems; her displacements of Ariadne at the Regent Palace Hotel and Eurydice on the Jubilee Line at Rush Hour; are all various ways of contesting the transparent process of handing over tradition from one generation to the next, or of claiming tradition as the indisputable possession of anyone based on language, race, or nationality. It is thus that her poetry reaches a cosmopolitan dimension, one whose struggle for destabilization of meaning echoes of the utopian cosmopolitanism we discussed in the introduction. Her poetry instills alchemy in the purity of ancient myths, transforming them in the process in such ways that remind one of Wilson Harris' "unfinished genesis of the imagination" (Harris "New Preface to *Palace of the Peacock*" 56).

Stephanides' Amnesiac Detours into the Past

Ernest Renan tells us that, "Forgetting, I would even go so far as to say historical error, is a crucial factor in the creation of a nation, which is why progress in historical

studies often constitutes a danger for [the principle of] nationality" (Renan 11). Contrary to Renan's motto, the official slogan of the Cyprus Republic regarding its past was for a long time, "Δεν Ξεχνώ (I do not forget)", unfailingly printed on public school notebooks since the Turkish invasion of 1974. As a student, I remember asking one of my teachers once, what was that we were not supposed to forget, only to be reprimanded for my insolence. The question continues to haunt my mind, more forcefully and disquietingly than before. How is one supposed to negotiate between these two imperatives, the need to remember the past while eluding the official nationalist appropriation of memory? For, let us not forget—in a gesture in which we pretend to obey the nationalist motto—that by not forgetting (what?), by remembering everything, we risk emulating Funes, Jorge Luis Borges' unforgettable protagonist in his story, "Funes, his Memory". Fuenes' gift of a comprehensive and total memory, or his inability to forget, was also his curse since it meant that he could not think either (Borges 99).

It is this predicament between the need to remember and the need to forget, or between the incapacitating nature of memory and its fruitfulness, that marks Stephanides' poetry. His poem "Requiem to Trikomo", where he describes his return (both literal and anamnestic) to his parents' home in the village of Trikomo which lies in the occupied North reveals this anxiety of anamnesis: "Voices saying don't forget/ Let memory decompose/ Spread like a virus/ In the intent look of strangers" (Stephanides *Blue Moon in Rajasthan and Other Poems* 23). The poet is aware of the perfidiousness of memory, which can "spread like a virus" and thus instead of history and its monophony and monopoly of the past, he prefers to lay his "body out in the immensity of the earth/ Exposing it to oracles/ Looking for a special divination" (Stephanides *Blue Moon in Rajasthan and Other Poems* 23). The dedication at the beginning of the poem seems to be a guide for us readers to the voices of the oracles, which observe uncannily in their ghostly apparitions: "For deamons and creatures roaming Mesaoria especially between Trikomo and Salamis: those named and unnamed but who I know are watching" (Stephanides *Blue Moon in Rajasthan and Other Poems* 22). The unhomely presence of the dead seems to be a more promising route back to his past than the living records of history of the island. This seems to be the message of another poem, called "Sentience", where the poet tells us that "Everywhere the dead send their messengers/But many turn their heads away in dread" (Stephanides *Blue Moon in Rajasthan and Other Poems* 25). The poem reveals an anxious desire to invite the dead back into the story before it is too late since, "The dead will awaken only once/ Next spring will be too late/ Next month the fragrance of spring/

Will fade away into the summer drought/ Even the dead do not wait forever" (*Blue Moon in Rajasthan and Other Poems* 25). The anxiety of remembering the dead should not be confused with the nationalist necrophilia that pervades historiographical narratives. In contrast to the modes and modalities of historiography, which insists in ignoring its role as an interpretation of the past and poses itself as the conveyor of the reality of the past, fiction, in this case, becomes a form of metahistory. Hayden White argues that, "In order to write the history of any given scholarly discipline or even of a science, one must be prepared to ask questions about it of a sort that do not have to be asked in the practice of it" (81). It is this sort of questions about the past and the interpretation of the past that certain fictions ask, including the poem we are discussing. Specifically, in the poem, the dead are invited in the poem to disturb the monophony of the past that is unfailingly imparted to us by "our own" through education, nationalist symbols, and family stories. In the poem, this common trope is reversed and it is a stranger that relates the poet's story:

> Today you will send a stranger to tell me my story
> He will first give me fresh lemonade to quench my thirst
> and with a key open the door of the room
> Where I was born and where you dreamed your dreams
> As you stood on this green balcony
> With the sea-breeze in your hair
> Looking over rooftops, bell-towers, and minarets
> At the road with the acacias and eucalyptus trees
> And I will hear you speak in the movement of the wind
> Your voice traced by an absent hand
> Asik will kiss me on the cheeks
> To tell me he too saw the dead
> And with a touch of the hand
> I will know I have found the brother
> In milk and blood
> I had relentlessly forgotten. (Stephanides *Blue Moon in Rajasthan and Other Poems* 26)

The reversal here is ongoing. Apart from relying on a stranger to tell him his story, the poet conveys an(other) view of hospitality, one where the poet is made a foreigner in his own home, one where the poet is turned into a guest in his house, in such a reversal that

resonates with a radical stance on the politics of 'otherness'. Derrida tells us:

> the foreign is first of all foreign to the legal language in which the duty of hospitality is formulated, the right to asylum, its limits, norms, policing, etc. He has to ask for hospitality in a language which by definition is not his own, the one imposed on him by the master of the house, the host, the king, the lord, the authorities, the nation, the State, the father, etc. (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 15)

Similarly, the writer needs to become foreign (xenos) to himself, or to find that homely and familiar space and estrange it, in such a way that the s/he becomes foreign to her/his home, or to her/his language (that innermost of homes), so that hospitality begins to unfold and fuse the self and the other in an inseparable and inextricable relationship. It is thus that the poet enters his home through an(other), through the stranger who is a brother, relentlessly forgotten but constantly retrieved through the estrangement of the familiar contours of memory, always under the guidance of the uncanny apparitions of the dead.

The poem remembers the past in a way that differs from dominant discourses since instead of relying on the powers of memory, it resorts to sentience. Indeed, remembering the past can occur only through sentience, since consciousness is saturated with "relentless forgetting". Resorting to sentience, or what Wilson Harris would call "intuitive imagination" (Harris "Benito Cereno" 128), the poet is enabled to revisit the past and be led by the dead to his brother "in milk and blood" that he has been forced to "relentlessly forget" (Stephanides *Blue Moon in Rajasthan and Other Poems* 26). The dreamscape of sentience transgresses both physical and cultural borders and allows the poet to move freely without the need to "show our passport/To cross the gate they say" (Stephanides *Blue Moon in Rajasthan and Other Poems* 25). Moreover, the brother "in milk and blood" challenges established norms of identity, lineage, and roots, interrogating thereby the innermost foundations of nationalist discourse, namely that of a purported homogeneity.

Stephanides' quest to find meaning in the past is one that is aware of the constant detours that such return entails. Similar to Rushdie who claims that the "past is home, albeit a lost home" (9), Stephanides emulates such an ongoing detour in his memoir, "The Wind Under my Lips". Setting out to narrate his story, the writer seems again to be in need of guidance since instead of the certainty of other narratives, his tells us that "I can say with uncertainty that my journey began..." (Stephanides "The Wind under My Lips" 102). Every attempt at a beginning seems to fail since, as he attests, "sometimes there

seems to be something uncanny in my crossing of that threshold. I brought shadows with me, as if I had always been elsewhere. Or some place or no place or always here". Unable to continue, he forces a beginning, "for the sake of the story, I was ..." ("The Wind under My Lips" 102), underlining the constructive nature of any story where beginnings and ends are forced. Stories of the past are articulated memories, and, thus, every articulated memory in the shape of a story, the text suggests, is constructed. Distrustful of ready-made stories and histories, he opts "for the voices of sibyls, but their voices are enigmatic" (Stephanides "The Wind under My Lips" 103). The enigmas of these voices lead him to eschew the paths of clarity and linger instead on "crossroads for a while, not paths" ("The Wind under My Lips" 103). Similar to his poetry, his memoir is also haunted by the uncanny presence of the dead. The delightful promise of a retour is never fulfilled in the excerpt since every memory leads to another story, creating a labyrinth of detours that resembles the anarchic processes of recollection. Indeed, as I argued elsewhere,

> Wandering and floating are metaphors in this work for cultural transfer and exchange, and the role of imagination is paramount in mobilising this process of transfer. The diasporic wandering of the narrator is here not one of lament and sorrow but one of sober optimism about the liberating potentialities that literal or imaginary journeys are impregnated with. The story's refusal to be located in any other place or time than crossroads is significant in light of the fact that it challenges fixed notions of both time and space that typify nationalistic and colonial narratives. Temporal and spatial fixities are also negated both by the fragmented narration as well as by the constant physical or spectral dis-placement of characters and events. (Vasiliou 92)

And if at any moment we rush into conclusions about having mastered the past through these uncanny encounters, the poet reminds us in another poem, titled "Ars Poetica: Sacred or Demonic", that we should not believe him, "For different daemons speak within [him]/ All looking for their missing parts" (Stephanides *Blue Moon in Rajasthan and Other Poems* 15). The poem, thus, becomes 'minor' and endeavors to maintain its 'minor' potential by undermining itself. In other words, aware of the impossibility of placing and territorializing anew the boundaries of 'topos' through writing, the poem foregrounds the fluidity of these boundaries by eliciting attention to its own forked tongue.

Nadjarian's Anxiety to Relate the Unimportant Events

Nadjarian's short stories reflect her disquiet with historiographical master-narratives that selectively filter through the past and assess moments and events according to their importance, leaving behind innumerable everyday moments and experiences that do not rate high in terms of importance so as to be included in historiography's privileged narratives. In her short story "Ledra Street", instead of a story about the street's former unity or its later division all coated in a narrative that is confident of its ability to speak on behalf of important issues, we are presented with 'other' narratives about the street, which are, as she avows, less important: "I would like to tell you about the kafenion, about the cat that lived there, and the cheese rinds I fed it. About the coffee-shop owner who was hit by a car, and the tray and glasses and the coffee which flew. These are the less important things" (Nadjarian *Ledra Street* 9). The narrator seems to be more concerned with the ways that one can negotiate the personal memories of place with the official ones or her own sense of guilt regarding the coffee-owner's death by a car with the actual division of the street. Her narrative shows this anxiety of negotiating between the two without allowing the official version of history and its self-righteous importance to subsume her personal memories. Refusing to refer specifically to the invasion of 1974 and thus privilege an event that is indelibly inscribed as important in the nation's official memory, the author says, "I read panic in my father's eyes one hot July day, the day I grew up. The day my memory was divided into important and less important things" (Nadjarian *Ledra Street* 9). Reading about the coffee-shop owner, Andreas Demetriou's death, the next day in the paper, the author's mother wonders "'And his wife? And his children? Don't they ever write about those that are left behind?" (Nadjarian *Ledra Street* 11). It is precisely those people and those moments that are left behind from history's privileged narratives that the author tries to salvage, only to realize that she too is left behind: "I am now the one left behind. Behind a wall, behind a checkpoint, looking for my father's shop, looking for my childhood, dismissing a man's death, mourning the division of a city. Counting the steps to the other side. Wondering where unimportance ends and where importance begins" (Nadjarian *Ledra Street* 11). In every attempt that the author makes to narrate a personal experience, she is confronted with the perplexing inextricability of the personal and the political. Reminiscing about her mother's wedding, she suddenly lapses into the political and social animosity:

> Behind her the church which now exists only in dreams which she now sees

> only in dreams, except that it still exists only a few meters away but she cannot reach it. 'It was Victoria street and we were happy. I was seventeen years old and I was happy because my life was changing, getting bigger. And there was love. Church bells rang and there was a love for God, the hodja sang in the minaret and there was love for God. And suddenly overnight everyone hated each other'. (Nadjarian *Ledra Street* 12)

What I am interested here is not whether the narrator is right in saying that hatred was a sudden thing but rather in her inability to disentangle the personal from the political. Such disentanglement is the role of historiography and its selection of important over unimportant things. Another story that scorns the processes of writing history is "Guided Tour". The narration transports us "Somewhere, [where] the street ends, and another part of it begins. Greek Side, Turkish side and in the middle a partition" (Nadjarian *Ledra Street* 15). Here, a group of British tourists are being informed about the capital's history. After Ledra Street, they are taken to Famagusta Gate, where in answer to someone's question, Frosso, the guide, responds that it was built in 1567. Frosso elaborates, saying that,

> the Gate is mentioned,... in descriptions of the siege of Nicosia by the Turks in 1570. It was the only way out for the besieged from within the wall, as fighting was taking place around the nearby bastions. Ah, says an elderly Englishman, whose knowledge of Cypriot history only goes back to the 1955-59 EOKA struggle.... Everything makes perfect sense. Of course, of course, history when it becomes history, when it can be read in history books, when it can be talked about by tourist guides, makes perfect sense, the only way out. (Nadjarian *Ledra Street* 17-18)

Before we have a moment to reflect on the last statement we are suddenly arrested by the irony behind history's confidence to offer such seemingly lucid renditions of the past:

> The only way out, Frosso also thinks, as soon as she has said the words. What a strange thing, a rare pain, to be trapped in your own country. The only way out now is what? Where? Do you understand? She wants to ask them. Do you really understand what it's like? She remembers a poem she once had to learn off by heart at school. The Walls, K. P. Kavafis. 'The city

> will follow you, and you will grow old in the same streets, in the same neighborhoods…' The city will follow you, and remind you every day that you are trapped in the south. That there is also a north, 'another side', beyond the checkpoints. That north and south don't necessarily mix and years change and some facts remain the same. History only changes drastically and beautifully from page to page in history books. (Nadjarian *Ledra Street* 18)

It is this confidence of historiography to relate the past unproblematically that the story challenges and together the nations' dependence in such seemingly transparent narratives. Instead of Renan's belief that for nations "it is good for everyone to know how to forget" (Renan 16) and that "historical error, is a crucial factor in the creation of a nation" (Renan 11), history seems to never lose confidence in its ability to re-member. In Cyprus, as Papadakis amusingly underlines by quoting the satirist George Mikes, this confidence is not only imparted on historians but on the everyday person who seems to deem it necessary to relate the island's 'true' history to the tourists and travellers. Away from the Cypriots in the safety of a swimming pool, Mikes says that,

> Here in the water they leave you alone. But you are well aware that outside there are six hundred thousand Cypriots—82% Greeks and 18% Turks—who are *all* eager and determined to explain the Cyprus problem to you. You close your eyes and shudder in the sunshine: you know there is no getting away from them. They *will* explain it to you. (qtd. in Papadakis 231 emphasis in the original)

The challenging of the historiographical favouring of the 'important events' through the insertion of the everyday can be read metaphorically as the creation of heterotopias of resistance to the established dominant order that foreground another way of envisioning community. In other words, the text does not aspire to the complete reversal of the established order but seeks, instead, pockets of resistance to the canonized ways of reading the past, and juxtaposes to the latter, other ways of reading the past and of envisioning community.

Aydin Mehmet Ali and her Retrieval of Lost Voices

One of the most urgent concerns of postcolonial theory has been, on the one hand, to expose the history of violence, oppression, and trauma that colonialism has brought about, and, on the other, to retrieve the voices of the oppressed and the colonized that have been left out of the narratives of western historiography. In doing so, it has disavowed universal history, in the name of particular histories and fragments of local histories that it reasserts as a way of contesting the master-narratives of historiography. This aim, of course, has resulted in a rather impassable predicament for postcolonial theory, namely the inability to resolve the question of how to forge postcolonial alliances in view of the lack of any universal thread that can unify the histories or fragments of trauma, violence and resistances (Vázquez-Arroyo 451-52).

What interests me in the work of Aydin Mehmet Ali is her genuine concern with the threat of disappearance of these forgotten pasts and fragments, not only because of colonialism but also because of the nationalism that has pervaded the island and continues to colonize discourses to the extent that stories of rapprochement and bi-communal or trans-cultural conviviality are obfuscated or left out of the renditions of history. In her short story, "şefika'ba", her narrator poignantly relates this concern: "And I am still, thirty years later, not allowed to find out the true history of my neighbourhood. Silent rules determine our conduct, our conversations. A mystery will always remain. I wonder if we will ever learn the truths of our lives and the people we shared them with" (Mehmet Ali and Gülfidan 56). The rules that determine conduct and conversations are thought in this case to be the reason why the narrator cannot and will not find out the truth about their lives. While evidently privileging the possibility of reaching the truth about the past in such a way that it mirrors the uncritical confidence of historiography about its own role, the quote relates a far more important truth, that is, the anxiety that is always present when one is not allowed to probe uninhibited for the truth. The narratives that transpire in this short story are ones of inter-communal and trans-cultural friendship and intra-communal violence, and through the narration the author is able to recover them and rescue them from the threat of oblivion.

Aydin Mehmet Ali launches a scathing critique of historiography when narrating in another story her harrowing experience of finding herself being scripted in the pages of history. While contemplating the contradiction between the elusiveness of identity and the resilience of identity-markers that fix a person into a divisive and oppositional position, she

is taken aback by something she reads:

> I am reading about identity. My eyes are suddenly caught by the words '... by July 1958 TMT were able to force out Greek Cypriots out of a Nicosia suburb.' Suddenly, I feel the pain of loss. My loss is mentioned in a book I read thirty years later. What I had suffered becomes history. History on pages. I, as a woman, using my intellect, have to abstract, remove my feelings, remove my childhood pain from it and present it as a piece of polemic for winning arguments and maybe struggles. Maro! How I loved you! How I missed you! One day you were my friend. You were there. Then you were not. The rules had changed. You disappeared one night ... The unshed pain of thirty years overwhelm [sic] me. (89)

The triumphant message conveyed by the history pages that she reads is one that jars with her sense of loss. The sense of loss, in places of ethnic division and violence, is generally associated to one's own people or along ethnic lines and not across them. The narrator though cannot identify with the euphoria of victory imprinted in the history pages. Rather, through her moving inscription of loss, she contests the righteousness of the nationalist narrative and performs an unstitching of the communal bond in the name of a cross-communal one. As such, she creates a cosmopolitan heterotopia of community that functions as a critique to the established order. Her story, as the title reveals, is a dedication to Maro, her childhood friend, her "other self" (90). Likewise, in the story itself, the poet-narrator, finds herself in London in a cross-cultural literary evening and dedicates "this evening of poetry, in our three languages, Turkish, Greek, and English, to my childhood friend, Maro. I don't know where she is. I don't know what happened to her.... She disappeared one night with her family. Her house was left empty" (90). In the neutrality afforded by London's distance from Cyprus the writer and the other participants can engage in acts of remembering that break away from such nationalist portrayals of history as the one the poet reads. As one of the poets in the story says, "'It is an evening we can't organize in our own country. We are no longer together; we are forced apart... divided, we live apart. It is a ... historical moment for us to be together'" (88). While such trans-national meetings between like-minded people who were forcefully divided could only take place in London—when the story was written the checkpoints were closed and the crossing was forbidden—"The sons and daughters of generals, officers, soldiers, unaware of the history they have created for me, sit around tables, sipping their drinks,

enjoying each other, their identities, their smugness on a lazy Sunday evening" (89). Since the author/poet/narrator cannot identify with those who share the same identity-marker with her or with any of the available options of "Cypriot...Cypriot... Turkish... Turkish... Turkish-Cypriot... Cypriot-Turkish..." (89), she has to invent one without a dash in between, since the former symbolizes a mark of division. So, she opts for Cypriotturkish. Similar to her emotional quest for an identity marker that would provide wholeness her quest for forgotten stories and narratives aims at such a reconstruction. Her quest derives its power and impetus from her "conviction and stubbornness of the poet who believes in the power of love and poetry" (91).

Indeed, Aydin Mehmet Ali's stories bring out emotive and recalcitrant voices that have been left out of the nationalist triumphs of division and hatred. While unable to break away from the privileged events of historiography in acts that unintentionally collude with the nationalist record, her poignant prose and poetry bring out voices of the past that resonate with inter-communal love and conviviality. The communities that emerge from her narratives are ones that imagine themselves across ethnic lines and against sexual heteronormativity, and operate as heterotopias or sites of resistance to the established order. Having been forcefully exiled from her island and been brought up in London, she endeavours in her work to contribute to the re-imagining of community across ethnic lines and not along them. Her work, although eager to contribute towards a reconciliation of the various ethnic communities and in the re-imagining of community, does not succumb to the facile discourse of a London-made multi-culturalism. Such multi-culturalism does not critically question the ways in which communities are formed but simply celebrates the peaceful coexistence of communities still fixed in their immovable ethnic lines and is, thus, suspect. Speaking on behalf of such cross-cultural attempts in London, in the name of multi-culturalism, Alev Adil warns that, "Promoting multiculturalism by eliding such difficulties often entrenched, rather than threatening chauvinism" (Adil "Translating and Mutating Identities: Cypriots Who Write in English" 7).

Such critique of uncritical multi-culturalism characterizes Aydin Mehmet Ali's story, "My London". In the story, she exemplifies an anxiety to rescue her own version of London from being erased. In this process, 'home' and 'abroad' are blurred since the narrative seems to be shifting between the two, interrogating them both in the process, and advocating at the same time an identity politics of becoming or rootlessness. The story traverses London both spatially and temporally, a journey that critically revisits orthodox notions of 'home', 'nation', 'community'. In the story we learn that, "While divisions and

nationalist discourse raged in Cyprus, Cypriot men quietly drank coffee and played backgammon and cards in the sanctity of mixed coffee houses, named after villages in the 'homelands….'" (Mehmet Ali 91). Tempting as it might be to depict London as a multi-cultural oasis from whose safety one can view home critically, the story resists and instead issues an admonition that "the wars in Iraq, Afghanistan and Palestine, and the inevitable Bombings in London have become the pretext to rob us of rights and freedoms as citizens of this City and take us back to the dark ages and leave race equality in shreds" (Mehmet Ali 93). The author's itinerary through time and space in London is one that exemplifies what Leela Gandhi has called "mutual transformations" (Gandhi *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction* 129-35), since as the author says, "London, I love. She created me as I created her. She would be something else if it were not for me, and others like me who came to stay"(Mehmet Ali 87).

Ierodiaconou's *The Women's Coffee Shop*

Unlike the first novel of the author that was published by Armida publications, *The Women's Coffee Shop* (2012) is self-published. The inability to find a publisher does not reflect the quality of the work though. Indeed, the novel is arresting in terms of aesthetics as well as daring in terms of content and ideas. Regrettably, though, the absence of a publisher is evident in the lack of proper editing that takes away somewhat from the overall quality of the book. Let us start with a brief summary of the plot and then proceed with a discussion of the novel's invitations to various ghosts of 'otherness', whose general exclusion from canonized narratives, makes their presence in the text, haunting, indeed. The author's willingness to deterritorialize dominant discourses is evident from the title of the novel. Coffee Shops (kafenia) in Cyprus are not only generally restricted to men but are also affiliated to a given political party and are, thus, always politically affiliated and overdetermined (Panayiotou 270). Therefore, a women's coffee shop that is politically unaffiliated is indeed a novelty. In this unconventional coffee-shop, women, gather, drink their coffee, and exchange the latest gossip of the village. Instead of hackneyed and clichéd discussions about politics that one unfailingly finds in men's coffee-shops, the women's coffee shop is a place that becomes 'political' through its sheer innovative existence that contests the patriarchal antinomy of male/public and female/private. Indeed, women in this coffee shop enter the male homosocial public space, and instead of

reproducing the conventional division of left-wing/right-wing politics, they become political through their engagement with social issues that concern the village and their community. Their entrance into the public space and their becoming 'political' culminates in their successful protest against the erection of a hotel complex in their village by Hadjimbey, the richest local landowner, and other developers.

The owner of the coffee-shop is Angelou, one of the main characters of the novel, whose appearance neither oozes femininity nor conforms to the patriarchal expectation of female propriety and conservatism. A description of Angelou tells us that, "She wore a man's khaki trousers and white shirt, sleeves rolled up and collar open at the throat; her feet, on the large side, were shod in the leather sandals favoured by the farmers and fishermen of the region in the hot months" (Ierodiaconou *The Women's Coffee Shop* 6). Angelou is indeed an unconventional character whose whole lifestyle contests the patriarchal roles afforded to women. However, Angelou is not the only character that appears recalcitrant to the established order since her best friend, and mainly platonic lover, Avraam Salih, is also the embodiment of unconventionality. As it is evident from his name, Avraam Salih is half Christian and half Moslem, the "offspring of sin" (Ierodiaconou *The Women's Coffee Shop* 104) as he is described by the preacher who was specifically dispatched by the bishop to address the flock of the Christian church after Salih's death, or murder. His mixed parentage, or his miscegenation—depending on how one looks at it in the novel—render him abominable in the eyes of the island's Christian and Moslem nationalists alike.

His death, or murder, is the catalytic event that unfolds the story and immerses us in the lives of some villagers in a village called Ayia, which is near the sea of an island in the Eastern Mediterranean, right after independence from colonial rule. Similar to Ierodiaconou's previous novel, *The Women's Coffee Shop* is enveloped in a mist regarding its spatio-temporal context, which is never clearly spelled out but only subtly and vaguely suggested. The narration is multiform and shifts from a third person omniscient narrator to a first person narrator in the shape of Avraam Salih, before it turns briefly into a second person narration. This narrative plurality, apart from contesting the dominant realist trope of third-person narrator, enables the author to inscribe the text with a series of ambivalences and envelop the past in a general ambiguity. Indeed, in the penultimate chapter Avraam Salih gives us various possible versions about his death or murder, and asks us to re-member the past events and to solve the puzzle of his death. Such a task imparted to the readers is significant since the reader assumes the role of the

detective/historian trying to re-member the past, only to find out that such a task is impossible. The novel is remarkable in the subtle ways that it challenges the genre of historiography and its purported truthfulness. Employing detective practices that resemble the role of the historian in unravelling the puzzles of the past the novel (mis)leads us not to a solution of the puzzle of Avraam Salih's death but to a variety of equally plausible possibilities of what happened to him, all narrated by him. As such, the novel resists the temptation of a clear answer and opts instead for various possibilities, keeping, thus, the future open. More importantly, through its resistance to a monophonic reading of the past, it inscribes ambivalence in the process of reading the past and contests, thus, the self-righteousness of the genre of historiography. This also allows the author to revive the dead Avraam Salih and invite him to haunt the text and tell various possible versions of what actually happened to him. The author, in other words, becomes foreign to her text, since she has to abandon her narrative omniscience and invite the dead Avraam Salih to tell his stories. Importantly, by inviting the dead to tell his stories, the text becomes 'othered' too, and it makes others of us as well since we are asked to abandon our fixation with closure and ready-made answers and follow the dead in these astonishing revelations. In essence, our sense of reality and truth is challenged by the ghostly presence of the dead narrator but also by the several versions of how Salih died. Most importantly, though, the ambiguity that envelops the process of remembering the past is one which calls for a different reading of the past, one which resists the dominant narratives' transparent reading of the past, and which points to a nostalgia for more critical ways of reading the past and of envisioning community. The "unburied – or, to be more exact, unburiable" (*The Women's Coffee Shop* 5) Avraam Salih is precisely an allegory for the corpus of 'minor literature' in the sense that as long as the corpse remains unburied, it remains outside the symbolic order and thus resistant to interment. Similarly, 'minor literature' aims to subvert the major language from within but at the same time to prevent its own co-optation and reterritorialization by the symbolic order. So, the unburiable corpse of Avraam Salih can be read metonymically as the utopian horizon of resistance to placing community within boundaries, a horizon that 'minor literature' aspires to.

Avraam Salih tells us that being dead means that he cannot transgress his dead status and convey to us exactly what happened to him. As he says, "for me to reveal the answer to a question of life and death would be to transgress the laws governing this boundary. Who doesn't know the tale of Orpheus and Eurydice? On the journey out of the underworld, Orpheus was banned from one thing: looking round to make certain, yes or

no, whether Eurydice was there" (Ierodiaconou *The Women's Coffee Shop* 203). But, is he not doing precisely that? Is he not uncannily transgressing his dead status and haunting the text while claiming not to be transgressing? Is he not, moreover, inviting us as readers to transgress our habitual reality of the living/dead binary and enter into his world of a marvellous reality where the dead awaken to tell us their story? And is not his invitation to us to become others than ourselves, or to yield into the "nocturnal side of speech" (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 2) that haunts the narrative one which makes us both hosts and hostages? Are we not hosting his marvellous and ghostly presence in our world while also being hostages to him for answers? While emphasizing the irrevocability of death by reference to Orpheus' legend, Avraam Salih also tells us that while the transgression of boundaries might be impossible it is only such impossibilities that keep the imagining of community in the future relentlessly open to possibilities. Hence, while not able to re-enter the world of the living, he can haunt it by his ghostly presence, making a fool of such orthodox discourses as that of historiography that claim clarity in reading the past.

Conclusion

In the present chapter I have tried to argue that the growing corpus of Cypriot literature that is written in English finds itself outside established categories of literary circulation and classification because of its linguistic particularities in a poly-lingual social milieu. This exclusion from established literary conduits has enabled it to develop an aesthetics that estranges it further from the dominant ideology as it is propagated in historiography and canonized fiction. Rather than reiterating the latter's aesthetics of authenticity of past origins and Manichean alteritist politics, the narratives I discussed convey a more nuanced depiction of the past and invite forgotten voices and stories to haunt their texts. The opening to other neglected or ignored voices is not a simple straightforward process, since it always entails the domestication of the foreignness of the 'other' through the 'other's' inclusion in the text. The authors become hosts by inviting the other voices and pasts to inhabit their narratives. It is only by becoming foreign (xenos) to one's narrative, one's community, and oneself that voices of the past can enter the space of discourse and astonish the readers. Such astonishment, which is accompanied by some form of anxiety as Derrida and Dufourmantelle tell us, is transient and elusive since it is always domesticated through the process of familiarization (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 26-28). How often and how well this astonishment is revived and retained in a narrative varies among the narratives I have discussed and is related to the degree of

nuance and criticality that their invitation to the 'other' entails. For, let us not forget that even the discussion on 'invitation' and 'hospitality' envelops both 'host' and 'guest', or 'self' and 'other' in a suspicious clarity. Perhaps this is where the most promising and fascinating prospects lie, namely, in the questioning of such seemingly assured terms and positions. The degree of questioning of the primacy of such terms as host/guest, present/past, self/other varies in the narratives I discuss above. While some works create heterotopias of cosmopolitanism that question the ethnic purity and sexual heteronormativity of the dominant discourses of the island, others point to a utopian cosmopolitanism where the community envisioned does not coalesce into a body but retains its relentless questioning of boundaries of the established order. What they all share, though, is a discomfiture with the established categories and their dominant ideology, and a willingness to become foreign to the latter in order to host forgotten and effaced voices and pasts. In trying to become foreign to themselves, they certainly reinforce their own minor position vis-a-vis the local dominant discourses. Cultural arrival for these recent Anglophone texts consists either in cross-cultural poetics or in an aesthetic of estrangement since homely structures are deemed with suspicion. Moreover, the disruption and dislocation in the material conditions of the lives of these writers as well as their discomfiture with the established categories means that their 'homecomings' are always in homes that are shifting, unstable, and open, and which mirror their 'minor' positions. In the next and final chapter we will see similar processes of estrangement with regards to gender in such ways that contest the heteronormativity of the dominant ideology.

Chapter 6: Cypriot Anglophone Literature: Displacing Gender by Becoming 'Xenos' at Home

> If gender is to be rethought, if new knowledge about sexual difference is to be produced (knowledge that calls into question even the primacy of the male/female opposition), then we must also be willing to rethink the history of politics and the politics of history. (Scott 11)

Introduction

Scholars who work within the contours of postcolonial, feminist, and literary theory sometimes share the realization that simply reinserting marginal voices in the pages of history does not suffice. Indeed, as Scott argues, it is only by questioning the politics of history that seemingly transparent or allegedly natural terms, that are often sites of prejudice against certain groups, come under scrutiny, and enable us to see "how hierarchies such as those of gender are constructed or legitimized" (Scott 4). Such an approach that is conscious of its own implication in the production of knowledge does away with the stability of meaning and origins and focuses instead on the variability, contradictions, and slippages of discourses and institutions that produce and ensure the perpetuation of meaning and sense at specific sites and through seemingly incontestable terms. Nationalist narratives, and particularly those of official historiography, are primary sites and processes that produce, impose, and entrench boundaries of appropriate national, sexual, and political identities, instead of reflections of objective identities that exist in society. In other words, it does not suffice to reinstate the voices of the past that have been left out of history's pages. Such an approach would simply confirm, and perhaps unwittingly justify, the biases against certain groups. What is needed, rather, is the exploration and investigation of how categories and binaries such as self/other, man/woman, home/abroad, or even host/guest that appear to be given, fixed, and natural have attained their meaning. Such an investigation cannot obviously shy away from exploring which discourses have endowed them with such meanings. So, while it is important to reinsert marginalized groups into the pages of history, it is equally important to lay bare the processes by which these groups came to inhabit the symbolic structures

that we have come to know them by.

My aim in this chapter is to discuss literary narratives that disrupt and transgress the categories of sexuality and gender that nationalist and patriarchal discourses propagate and explore how they directly or indirectly express 'other' ways of conceptualizing gender through such discursive gender performances. Moreover, in relation to the discussion on 'minor literature' in the previous chapter, I argue that the position of this literary corpus outside the literary and linguistic categories has enabled it to engage more freely with such gender disruptions and transgressions and to point to new "line[s] of escape" (Deleuze and Guattari 21) away from sexual heteronormativity. I am not arguing that gender transgressions and contestations of established borders of gender performance is the prerogative of 'minor literatures'. What I am arguing, rather, is that the position of this literary corpus at the crossroads of linguistic, national, and racial markers, has allowed it to engage in such discursive practices more freely or under less scrutiny from the nationalist institutions that continue to propagate zealously, as well as fiercely, nationalist and patriarchal identities.

Mary Layoun argues that "it is not only historical, political, or legal narratives that engage in this process. Literary narratives, too, can be read as attempts to negotiate dominant narratives of nationalism in which they participate and the boundaries which those dominant narratives draw and seek to maintain" (65). I concur with Mary Layoun but also think that in our theorizing, we need to question not only the boundaries of the concepts we seek to unravel and deconstruct but also of the epistemes that produce them and their attendant genres. History and literature are both engaged in cultural formations and are implicated in the construction of meaning. As such, they should both be subject to the same kind of analytical treatment. The reserve of scholars toward transgressing the disciplinary borders between the two in their analyses reflects more the legitimization of these fluid borders as fixed rather than some essential and inherent parameters that characterize them. In other words, history and fiction assume their specific epistemic realms only in contradistinction to each other in the name of a purported truth-value found in history and of a fictional quality found in literature. As Scott puts it,

> Oppositions between text and context, fiction and truth, art and life structure the self-representations of the disciplines of literature and history. Each discipline defines its expertise through a contrast with the other's object of inquiry and methods of interpretation. Each discipline also resolves the ambiguities of its own project by using the other as a foil. (8)

While not discarding completely the differences between the two disciplines, I find profoundly intriguing the questioning of their boundaries, since they are both implicated in the construction and maintaining of meaning at specific sites. A project like mine that aims to explore the transgression of boundaries in terms of racial, national, and sexual identities would come short of its objective if it was to pay too high a respect for such epistemic and disciplinary boundaries. Rather, I choose to draw on literary narratives in my analysis as the sources that come to question hegemonic terms, notions, and concepts as they appear in nationalist narratives, whether of history or of literature. I am not interested in the differences between the two but in their common implication in the production of meaning as discursive practices.

Gender, History and Home

Before delving into the literary narratives that I want to explore, I would like to briefly elaborate on the imbrications of gender, history, and home. If sexual identities were bequeathed to us through history as natural, gender, as an analytical category—despite the controversy around the term and its recent domestication—brings the naturalness of such sexual identities under scrutiny, since it implicates sexual difference with knowledge and power. While acknowledging the domestication of the term "through 'ordinary usage,' routinely offered as a synonym for women" (Scott xii), to the extent that it has lost some of the criticality it promised in the 1970s and 1980s (Scott xi), I use it as a tool that reveals the constructedness of terms and notions that otherwise appear natural. In this way, it enables the scrutiny of historical and literary texts that have colluded with dominant discourses in presenting sexual difference as natural. Moreover, it allows exploration of those discursive moments when such seemingly natural differences are disrobed and their boundaries are contested and transgressed. Rosemary Marangoly George correctly points out that "'home' immediately connotes the private sphere of patriarchal hierarchy, gendered self-identity, shelter, comfort, nurture, and protection" (1). While appearing resolutely fixed and unchanging, home, as "a desire that [is] fulfilled or denied in varying measure to the subject (both the fictional characters and the readers [and the writer I would add]) constructed by narrative" (George 2), is, in essence, aporetic in its paradoxical simultaneous fixity and mobility. Speaking about language and specifically about the mother-tongue, Derrida, teases out this aporia of home in relation to the mother-

tongue:

> What in fact does language name, the so-called mother tongue, the language you carry with you, the one that also carries us from birth to death? Doesn't it figure the home that never leaves us? The proper of property, at least the *fantasy* of property that, as close as could be to our bodies, and we always come back there, would give place to the most inalienable place, to a sort of mobile habitat, a garment or a tent? Wouldn't this mother tongue be a sort of second skin you wear on yourself, a mobile home? But also an immobile home since it moves about with us? (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 89)

If home as language is concurrently immobile and mobile, does it not follow that it is also both homely and unhomely, self and other, identity and difference? It is precisely this otherness of home that I will try to tease out of the narratives that I will be reading by paying attention to the ways in which the narratives insert other gender possibilities that contest both the boundaries of established sexual identities as well as certain symbolic structures that have operated as natural homes for these terms. To put it simply, the writers as well as the characters that feature in these narratives are not 'at home' in the fixity and naturalness of a certain legacy of sexual identities hidden behind dominant terms, and, thus, express other gender performances that contest the boundaries of these sexual identities. Such performances reveal also the inevitable presence of otherness at the heart of home, an otherness that is ghostly, uncanny, and disturbing to traditional connotations of home as a patriarchal space of safety and comfort. While the "'mother' tongue is already 'the other's language'" (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 89), as Derrida tells us, for Cypriots who write in English, as for other colonized people, the relationship to English as a mother-tongue has an added 'otherness' since it is already burdened with the colonial legacy. This almost unhomely relation to their language, when acknowledged, could perhaps endow them with enhanced motives for dislocating the centrality of certain terms.

Crossing Borders and contesting their Boundaries

Nationalist space is hence always gendered. Specifically, the literal or figurative encounter of the nation with its others is represented in gender metaphors that draw both the borderlines of the nation as well as of its people in such ways that they situate both people and attitudes in seemingly fixed categories: men/women, natives/foreigners, friends/enemies, normal/acceptable, abnormal/unacceptable, patriotic/treasonous. Yet, as

we have already discussed, nationalism defines itself through its narratives, or *as* narrative, and although through its rhetorical narration it aims to conceal the inherent slippages and gaps of its very act of narration through a purported coherence, self-righteousness, and closure, its aim remains unfailingly unfulfilled (Layoun 65). In mapping its territory, nationalist narration also draws the boundaries of sexual identities through its collusion with the strictures of patriarchy. Karayanni defines patriarchy "as an oppressive social imperative and as a system of hierarchical social organization where masculinity is hegemonic and determines relations within the family, social groups, work environments, and personal relationships" (231). This hegemonic system, though, is closely aligned to the ways in which national identity is articulated. Karayanni insists that "patriarchy has considerable control over the discursive topos of identity embodiment in contemporary Cyprus" (231). While nationalist literature is fraught with tropes that reiterate the binaries of native/foreigner, friend/enemy, victim/victimizer, they also exude and exalt a certain masculine attitude that favors rigidity, resoluteness, and inflexibility. Gender as a tool that exposes the contingency of such dichotomies as masculine/feminine is a fruitful way of negotiating such seemingly intransigent borders. As Karayanni points out,

> 'Borders' is a term that may evoke all kinds of nightmares for the Cypriot subject. Apart from the more obvious and contested geographical borders between the North and the South sides of the island (that we were forbidden to cross for twenty nine years, 1974-2003), I interpret 'borders' as the discursive limits of gender and I search for those moments in refugee literature, Cypriot and other, when gender borders appear permeable allowing a large range of expression that takes us away from narratives that are religiously observed by the nationalist imagination—narratives such as military parades, huge flowing flags on the roofs of buildings housing football teams, national anthems and national holidays where the 'glory of our past' is reiterated with persistence and urgency. (233)

Similarly, I am interested in this section to explore such gender border crossings that reconfigure the idea of community.

Stephanides' Contesting of Borders: A Case of Water and Translation

Stephanos Stephanides' "Ars Poetica: Water for Poetry" is a playful poetic attempt on the part of the poet at joining his voice with other voices in the island that contest the nationalist impermeability of borders. Dedicating the poem to Saraswati, the Hindu goddess of knowledge, music, art and science, the poet aims at conveying another view of knowledge, one associated with the goddess's intimacy with water, rather than the rigidity of nationalist knowledge about itself and its past. Indeed, water is a powerful agent in the poem, one that is capable of transgressing the impermeability of nationalist concreteness. The poem has as its epigraph a well-known poem by Gür Genç, that has become synonymous to a nostalgia for the permeability and fluidity of identity: "Too much poetry for such a small island/ please don't write anymore/ plant trees/ and water…" (qtd. in Stephanides *Blue Moon in Rajasthan and Other Poems* 16). Torn between his desire to be obedient to the call for water, and his acquiescence that there has been too much hard and rigid poetry that relives the binaries of official discourses instead of relieving us from them, Stephanides' poem, finds consummation in the guttural sounds of the sea, which also happen to be residing in the poet's name invoked in the epigraph: "I wait for poetry./ Or do I really wait for water?/ I close my eyes/ I recite the mantra -/ gür – gür – gür" (Stephanides *Blue Moon in Rajasthan and Other Poems* 17). The whole poem constitutes a playful refusal to accept fixed categories, notions, or even names, as they are coated in language: "I now know you are not genc – names lie" (Stephanides *Blue Moon in Rajasthan and Other Poems* 17). The poet, aware of water's fluidity that can infiltrate and percolate the seemingly impermeable borders, erected through the complicity of poetry with nationalist ideology, joins forces with it as he searches for that hidden watery sound that would alleviate the burden of language and allow him to articulate community in new and unpredictable ways. He says, "I add voice to the plosive/ Not knowing if it is bursting in or bursting out/ And liquid flows g r g r g r/ Air passes and I pout my lips/ And push my tongue to shape the breath/ To catch the vision hidden in the syllable/ Neither u not i/ Not front nor back" (Stephanides *Blue Moon in Rajasthan and Other Poems* 16). The inability to reproduce the sound 'ü' as it appears in the name 'gür', can be interpreted as a metaphor for the poet's inability to forge a language that would negotiate between his awareness of too much poetry and the need to find a watery language that would surpass the rigidity and dryness of official discourse. By the end of the poem, the poet finds that language in the guttural sounds of the sea: "I recite the mantra – gür – gür – gür" (Stephanides *Blue Moon*

in Rajasthan and Other Poems 17). As suggested by the ellipsis at the end of the poem by Gur Genc, that is used as an epigraph in Stephanides' poem, the struggle against the ostensible impermeability of borders is ongoing, and only through a self-questioning art can it be sustained. I think that 'Ars Poetica' is an endeavor in that direction, that playfully contests the dominant borders through a playfulness with the fluidity of water and language. As such, it joins forces not only with the poetic epigraph but also with all the poetry that challenges the rigidity of borders.

The transgression of boundaries and borders becomes more explicitly related to gender and perhaps more poignant in Stephanides' poem "Rhapsody on a Dragoman". The poem is divided in two parts, 'Part 1: Invisible in Daylight' and 'Part II: My Heart Takes on Any Form'. The two parts are connected through the figure of the dragoman, an interpreter not only moving between languages but also trespassing between them, being servant and interloper at the same time. The two parts reiterate this instability of identity of the dragoman through the trope of his profession, namely, interpreting, which is invested not only with a simple transfer from one language to the other but also with "skill and improvisation" (Stephanides "Rhapsody on a Dragoman" 86), reminding us that interpreting, like translation, is not a transparent transferring but a transfer that involves remaking, refashioning, and renewal, if not contestation, adulteration, and subversion. Indeed, the figure of the dragoman in the poems emerges as a profoundly subversive figure and serves as a metonymy for the act of translation of hard edges into fluid categories. I will discuss only the first part in this essay, since it relates more directly to the concerns of this chapter. The beginning reads:

> I am a dragoman
> courtesan of the word
> I pluck my eyes to hear
> with skill and improvisation
> wor-l-ds of hard edges,
> a treacherous and loyal
> exponent of obsessions
> not all men know my speech
> (Stephanides "Rhapsody on a Dragoman" 86)

Whilst trusted with the task of conveying the "wor-l-ds of hard edges", which I read as the intransigent identities and fixity of meaning that are expressed in the wor-l-ds that he is

trusted with, he destabilizes both the contract of trust as well as the content entrusted to him by telling us that not only is he both "treacherous and loyal" but also a "courtesan of the word" (Stephanides "Rhapsody on a Dragoman" 86). Moreover, his trespassing into illicit contours and boundaries is not easily perceived since "not all men know … [his] speech" (Stephanides "Rhapsody on a Dragoman" 86). The boundaries drawn by the masculine severity and formality associated with his profession are not only undermined but also adulterated by the insertion of the metaphor of 'courtesan of the word', swathing not only the dragoman but also his profession into an adulterous and ambivalent space of unpredictable and unceasing transfer that contests impermeable boundaries and rigid gender identities. The figure of the dragoman emerges, in other words, as a subversive trope. Indeed, while he needs his 'plucked eyes' to see, the dragoman and his act remain invisible, moving between linguistic, sexual, and national boundaries imperceptibly. Translation is inextricably bound with treason, since any translation will have to commit an act of betrayal to the original. Yet, this treason can also be fruitful, since as Stephanides underlines, "the space of untraslatability allows for a new space to emerge" (Stephanides "Imagining the Homeland in Translation: Cyprus between East and West, between Hellenism and Postcoloniality" 57). The instability of meaning and the meandering between the faithfulness implied in interpreting and the inevitable treason of meaning entailed in it are retained throughout the poem. In the second and third stanzas we read:

in the night I go under
in company of dervishes and learn
why cyclamens sprout in pavement cracks
and mutter promises, amidst the dust,
of the beautiful and the unseen
I ask meaning for
fore give fore go fore play
an island warbler
still with no quarrel
or a swallow
in the line of flight
meandering with finality
knowing that the road is lost
in floating debris
of fortuitous choices

precipitous moves

with impulsive sagacity
I swirl and sail away
vexed in my state of grace
daytime dragoman
nighttime dervish. (Stephanides "Rhapsody on a Dragoman" 86-87)

Metaphors such as “line of flight” (a term borrowed from Deleuze and Guattari), and images such as “cyclamens sprout[ing] in pavement cracks”, or “meandering with finality/ knowing that the road is lost”, all point towards unstable identities and dislocations of meaning. Moreover, they convey Stephanides’ belief that “translation may traverse tradition like diaspora” (Stephanides "Imagining the Homeland in Translation: Cyprus between East and West, between Hellenism and Postcoloniality" 54). I think that the closing lines of the poem express precisely this idea. Like a dancing dervish, the dragoman moves between seemingly fixed identities and transgresses their boundaries, being at the same time “a treacherous and loyal/ exponent of obsessions” and a “courtesan of the word”, a “daytime dragoman” and a “nighttime dervish” (Stephanides "Rhapsody on a Dragoman" 86-87). Such stealthy and treacherous movement dislocates stable categories, be they sexual, linguistic, or national. Further, it foregrounds the close proximity of translation and migrancy, as well as the potentialities for resistance that translation is impregnated with. It underlines, finally, that meaning resides more in the space of untranslatability than within the seemingly impermeable borders of sexual, linguistic, or national identities. Indeed, as Benjamin underlines in his essay “The Task of the Translator”, it is in the space of untranslatability that meaning resides. As he argues,

> if there is such a thing as a language of truth, the tensionless and silent depository of the ultimate truth which all thought strives for, then this language of truth is—the true language. And this very language, whose divination and description is the only perfection a philosopher can hope for, is concealed in concentrated fashion in translations. (Benjamin 77)

The pure language that is concentrated in translations for Benjamin is not the mechanical reproduction of meaning and content from one language to another but the sum of untranslatability that becomes visible through the slippages and dislocations of translation. I quote: “The traditional concepts in any discussion of translations are fidelity and license—the freedom of faithful reproduction and, in its service, fidelity to the word.

These ideas seem to be no longer serviceable to a theory that looks for other things in a translation than reproduction of meaning" (Benjamin 77-78). That is how I choose to read the treacherous nature of the dragoman in "Rhapsody of a Dragoman", that is, as a translator that looks for that space of untranslatability, betraying the original by being loyal to it. The dislocation of meaning and sense that is brought 'home' by this space of untranslatability is a 'minor' process. Moreover, it points to gestures of envisioning community that question the homeliness of sense and find themselves more 'at home' in the undecidability of suspension.

Pitharas' Sensual Playfulness and Illicit Desire

The contestation of borders through the insertion of playfulness is similarly revealed in Pithara's poem "Green Line". I discussed the poem in the last chapter in terms of its resistance to the dominant nationalist narratives and their territorialization of the green line as a space of division and violence, through a playful non-recognition of the boundaries that the green line poses. The poem, apart from its refusal to recognize the racial and ethnic divisiveness symbolized by the green line, also inscribes another refusal, namely to conform to the stern, grave, and severe tone of masculine attitude that the male national hero generally exudes, and the violence and victimization which characterize most dominant references to the green line. Rather, the tone of the poetic persona is playful, frolicsome, and flirtatious, yet, critical, at the same time. Through its denial and dislocation of the green line, it also dislocates dominant modes of masculinity, by inserting an unlikely sensuality and playfulness with a hue of mischievousness: "and I poke my tongue/ into the hole of my history/ and wriggle my toes in the damp sand, beyond the cafeteria,/ and observe that I can't see this green line, I just can't see it" (Pitharas 9). The presence of the green line he might not be able to see, but he does not fail to sense the presence of people swathed together through desire, pain, and aspiration: "I can only see gold,/ and the eyes of my people blacker than embers,/ and the strong smell of their lovemaking,/ and secrets which they say nestle in their breasts" (Pitharas 9). In the same way that what is physically there can be denied, what cannot be seen is also possibly present, as long as one imagines it, as the closing lines tell us: "saying nothing as if they are chanting" (Pitharas 9).

Pitharas' poem "Kavafis" is a more explicit example of expressing another form of sexuality and of contesting the dominant gender roles. The poem starts by subtly exposing

the agony that is always attendant in homosexual desire because of its attendant illicitness: "11 o' clock, he locks the door/ and into the Alexandrian Streets full of commotion, makes his way/ in these few hours his liberation must be complete/ Oh the torment!" (Pitharas 10). The illicitness of desire as it emerges in the poem becomes a subversive trope that unlocks the prison of acceptable and normal gender behavior where desire has been sequestered in by exposing the latter's naturalness and the former's constructiveness. Desire is laden with possibilities, particularly when it is kept alive by remaining unfulfilled. Similar to the subject's desire for completion through language, in an iterative process that always remains unfulfilled, yet is always laden with possibilities, the illicit aspect of homosexual desire, and its obstacles in finding consummation, renders the subject of desire open to unpredictable possibilities that are concealed in the imagination: "This ancient search,/ that with each step nearer to the morning begins the possibility/ of another night, another imagined kiss, leading nowhere" (Pitharas 10). The impasse of such imaginary escapades is not final and does not imply closure since desire is ongoing and leads the imagination to illicit contours where the policing of boundaries by dominant discourses does not have access to. The end of the poem reminds the persona (Kavafy), as well as us readers, of the vigilance of such discourses against illicit desire: "As he walks and the sun finally appears bidding the morning/ he unwrapping his coat more firmly around him/ and suddenly betrayed by light/ embarrassed by the pleasure of what might have been…" (Pitharas 10). Similar to the poetic persona's embarrassment by his imaginary nocturnal escapade, Pitharas reveals his own embarrassment caused by his desire for fulfillment and completion through the poetic act. The openness of the end of the poem through what might have been, inscribes another possibility of sexuality, one which one is safer in imagining than in performing. Whilst the poetic persona contents himself with imagining such illicit desire, the poem performs it by inscribing another form of sexuality, which comes, though, always swathed in illicitness. Such illicitness accentuates desire and resituates it in its open and infinite nature, liberating it from the prescribed categories that it has been made to serve.

Aydin Mehmet Ali and the Reterritorialization of Female Breasts

I would like to continue my discussion of literary narratives by discussing Aydin Mehmet Ali's short story "Breasts". The story, as its title indicates, is about breasts, and specifically, female breasts. Instead of a celebration of their lactating qualities and their

nurturing attributes, the story contests the monophony of such narratives about breasts since it views them with suspicion because of their collusion with patriarchy in the overall censoring of the female body as a site of pleasure. The narrative voice seems unable to maintain any structural unity to her narrative and keeps on shifting from one story to another without providing a closure to them. Such breathless narration reflects the anxiety felt by marginal sexualities who feel the vigilance of the dominant discourses that claim the female body as a site of reproduction and nurturing. Moreover, it reflects the narrator's urgent desire to re-invest her body and specifically her breasts with sensual pleasure. The story begins with the narrator's dogged refusal to let someone look at her breasts: "'[l]et me look at your breasts.' No you can't! No, no! You can't. How can I let you look at them when I can't look at my own breasts? How can I allow you to touch them? I can't take off my clothes and look at them in the mirror..." (Mehmet Ali and Gülfidan 131). As the story progresses, we find out why she exercises such strict policing over her breasts: "'Look at my breasts. Look at them... Grandma!' I look, I open my eyes and look at my breasts. 'Don't touch! Don't you dare touch them. It's a sin! It's shameful in the eyes of God. Don't you dare!'... 'and especially if there are any boys around'" (132). Her grandmother's menacing threats draw the limits of how she is to handle her breasts, or rather, how she is not to handle them. The guilt instilled by the evocation of the divine ensures a vigilance that is self-imposed, something similar to Foucault's panopticon, a modern disciplinary structure that ensures that the individual exercises such vigilance irrespective of the presence of authority since the individual is made to feel conscious of that authority's power (Michel Foucault *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of Prison* 201).

Such self-censorship over the female body as an illicit site of desire and sensual pleasure, apart from the frenetic guilt that it brings about, also leads to fatal consequences as evidenced by the end of the story. Having discovered lumps in her breasts, the narrator cannot touch them or speak to anyone about them in the closed society of her village:

> Did you see my lump doctor? You must have. I have felt it. I felt it as it began to grow on my left breast by my arm. I didn't feel it at first... but one day it brushed against my arm and I felt it [....] And there it was. It grew and I noticed other small lumps. But I couldn't talk to anyone, I couldn't say. I can't go around talking about a lump on my breast in the village. (136)

Her reluctance and delay to visit the doctor has fatal results since, as the doctor reveals, the

cancer has spread to other organs and she cannot be saved. The story ends with the doctor saying, "If only she could have come to us earlier. When she first touched her breast and felt the tiniest of lumps... we could have done something for her. We could have saved her life. I am so, so sorry!" (137). But how could she have come earlier, the story suggests, if all her life she was made to think that touching her breasts was a sin. If, all her life, her breasts were exclusively territorialized as the site of lactation and nurture? Despite the somewhat predictable ending to the story, the story succeeds in inscribing forcefully such questions which remain unanswered and resonate violently in the ears of patriarchal discourses that draw and maintain intransigent borders of proper sexual and national identities on the site of the female body. The story further questions such strict vigilance over the female body also through the insertion of guilt associated with illicit desire. The inscription of the latter reveals that hegemonic discourses might be able to normalize and police gender performance but cannot extend such policing to desire. Desire then emerges as a powerful means of contesting such gender strictures and their alliance with hegemonic norms: "'He hasn't seen my breasts. He gropes for them in the night, in the dark[....] I push his hand away. He hasn't seen them [....] I wash them without looking. I pass the loofah over them quickly... so quickly... sometimes roughly, trying to eliminate any hint of sensual pleasure" (131-32). The self-censorship exercised by the narrator might point to her compliance and conformity with the patriarchal strictures that contain the female breasts within maternal needs but also divulges the promise and threat of pleasure. While the former evokes the female body as the natural site of reproduction and nurture and resonates of the national(ist) representations of female purity as a metaphor for the purity of the motherland, the latter inscribes the contradictions and the inadequacy of such representations, allowing another narrative about the female body to emerge.

Nadjarian's 'Coffee Cup': A Case of Rebellion

Nadjarian's "Coffee Cup" is paradigmatic of the overall collection's interest (*Ledra Street*) in issues relating to gender, migration, and history. Migrancy can indeed be seen as a trope for conceptualising and conveying the tensions attendant to the 'minor' position of some of the works of Cypriot English. Similar to the deterritorialisation of dominant tropes that are performed by some of the narratives written in English, the protagonist in the story needs to deterritorialize the category of 'woman'—as it has been outlined in Cypriot society and as it is maintained, often through the complicity of women like her

mother with patriarchy—in order to find happiness and be 'at home'. The story is swathed in a general feeling of urgency: urgency to dare and challenge the prescribed role of 'woman' that society affords for the protagonist, urgency to act before it is too late since she seems to be terminally ill, urgency to defy her mother. While adamant about her lack of belief in the clairvoyant powers of the coffee-cup, the protagonist seems to be more 'at home' in the portentous readings of the cup by an old crone, rather than at her mother's home. The story opens with the reading of the protagonist's coffee cup, a reading that prophesizes that "there is a man in the boat sailing to you. Hurry up and see him. Meet him, hurry up—or else it will be winter" (Nadjarian *Ledra Street* 108). Harrying to meet a man involves some form of agency, some form of taking control of one's life, an agency that is usually denied in women who find themselves restricted by patriarchy in 'feminine' roles that do not involve chasing a man but instead waiting for that precious proposal that would make 'honest women' out of them. Her mother's reaction to the reading of the cup is indicative of women's collusion, if not outright complicity, with patriarchy in propagating dominant sexual identities:

> 'You should never have gone near her,' she said boiling with indignation, for she thought she knew my future better than anyone. 'She's a witch, that's what....' She talked about it for weeks. Non-stop. She cleaned the house and talked about it; cooked and lit candles in church and talked about it.... When my coffee cup was forgotten, and her anger subsided, she reverted to her daily habit of filling reminiscences of her own wasted youth with words. I knew the sequence well: 'at your age, I was married. At your age, I had you'. (Nadjarian *Ledra Street* 109)

Her mother's words, reinforced by her actions and her own life as a woman who married early and had children, outline the proper conduct for women in the society described. Yet, the protagonist questions the boundaries of such prescribed roles, saying "Years later I proved the truth told by the coffee cup. Perhaps I did it to spite my mother. I went to the old port deliberately looking for a man" (Nadjarian *Ledra Street* 109).

The fulfilment of the prophetic reading of the coffee cup comes in the shape of Ramez, a man from a boat, with whom the narrator shares fleeting moments of bliss, embitters her mother and the others who "nudged each other, peered out of their windows when I passed" (Nadjarian *Ledra Street* 112). Thus, "It didn't take long for Ramez to appear on the early evening news...Trying to make sense of the commentary, snatching, at

the words ‘arrested’, ‘illegal’, ‘foreigners’” (Nadjarian *Ledra Street* 113). The figure of the other, conventionally identified in the body of the ‘foreigner’, of the ‘illegal’, and of the ‘immigrant’ is disembodied here and re-inscribed in the body of her mother and of her community. Such transfers of meaning are transgressive in the same way that her nocturnal escapades with a man transgress the boundaries of appropriate conduct for her as a woman in a patriarchal society. After othering her mother and her community who symbolise everything that is static, fearful, and conformist, and who police the boundaries of women’s conduct, the narrator opts instead for the figure of ‘migrancy’ and for the fluidity of struggle, exemplified in her journey on a boat in search of Ramez. Through her brave decision to embark on a journey in the dark, she performs other gender figurations that contest the sexual identity that she has been bequeathed. In the last lines, the reader is told that, “Beneath the pink sky of dawn, coffee-coloured ripples carried me along. When I looked back, no land was visible. And for the first time in my life I was happy” (Nadjarian *Ledra Street* 113). The protagonist is ‘at home’ in the unknown, yet fluid, expanse of the sea. Finding home in the sea can be read as a metaphor for poetics of migrancy and of fluidity of meaning, in such ways that contest dominant symbolic structures. Indeed, the happiness that the narrator envisions and pursues is fleeting and is embodied in the struggle against patriarchy. The lines before the end reveal the fear and danger of such struggles and resist easy romanticizations of the struggle: “I found the boat, but the sea seemed so rough without Ramez. The stark sky so cold” (Nadjarian *Ledra Street* 113).

One could object that a woman pursuing a man as foretold in her coffee cup is hardly a gender disruption. Yet, in view of the afforded roles for women in given societies, where they are expected to observe strict codes of propriety that deny them any agency in pursuing their own way to happiness, I strongly believe that the story contests such codified sexual identities and inscribes, instead, agency in the actions of the protagonist. Moreover, in the process of doing so, it exposes the women’s own collusion with patriarchy in the perpetuation of their own subordination, through the figure of the mother. Such sexual strictures are frenetic, indeed, as the outburst of the protagonist shows after finding out about Ramez’s arrest and deportation: “It was the first time my mother heard me scream. It was also the last. Coffee cups and plates crashed like cymbals, becoming one with the salad” (Nadjarian *Ledra Street* 113). The rebellion of the protagonist is not only against her mother but is a wider one. It is one against the conventional role of women that she has been bequeathed. The protagonist moves across

the boundary lines prescribed by patriarchy through the expression of desire as well as through her pursuit of happiness. The female body that in nationalist narratives and in the dominant identity afforded to women finds its utmost significance in reproduction as part of accepted marriage, is here endowed with subversive agency and is swathed in sexual desire that does not seek consummation in reproduction, but simply in sexual, sensual, and emotional gratification. Moreover, the insertion of desire in the story is not only significant in terms of the agency of the subject that desires, but also through the object of desire, namely an 'illegal' migrant. As such, the story performs a double challenge of patriarchy and its collusion with the national narratives in the policing of gender roles. Indeed, the protagonist's encounter with the illegal immigrant and her lusting over him revisits and performs a recasting of the boundaries of the nation's encounter with its 'others' and particularly with those 'illegal' others. The official dominant narratives draw specific boundaries with regards to national, sexual, and racial identities that hold sacred ideas of racial purity and of sexual propriety. The protagonist's sexual consummation with the illegal immigrant is one that crosses such racial and sexual boundaries that are held obstinately by the nationalist discourses. Considering the obsession of nationalist discourses with female rape and bodily violation as a metaphor for the national violation and penetration, the story deterritorializes the female body from such delimiting contours and recasts it in a subversive desire that exposes the historically constructed roles that sexual identities are swathed in through the collusion of patriarchy with nationalism.

Indeed, in the narrative, the figure of the 'migrant' is reappropriated both from its conventionally negative connotations in right-wing conservative discourses, as well as from the intellectual generosity of neo-liberalism that expends itself in building asylums to contain him, reinforcing in the process the alteritist barriers that have rendered him a migrant in the first place. Instead, the figure of migrancy emerges as a subversive trope that foregrounds the cultural transference that is at play in such encounters. To state it at its most naked, the figure of the migrant as it emerges in this story makes a parody of a world that, despite its profound creolisation, insists on cultural authenticity and ethnic identities. The investment of the narrative in the idiom of migrancy as an interpretive tool renders it oppositional to discourses of cultural fixity and purity that refuse to see beyond their fear of cultural ignorance. Most importantly, migrancy, in the story, operates as a metaphor of fluidity, and it is set against impermeable boundaries, be it of racial, national, or sexual nature. The cost of migrancy is high indeed, as the innumerable loss and unprecedented agony of migration reminds us. Water, the story suggests, is not only an

avenue and a metaphor of freedom and fluidity, but also a literal unhomely substance, the tomb of millions who dare to challenge those impermeable boundaries that migrants find wherever they turn. Resisting the establishment of a home can be read as an endeavour to resist the closure and delimitation of the future or of the imagining of community along sealed and assured lines and identities.

Ierodiaconou's *The Women's Coffee Shop* and Gender Upheaval

Ierodiaconou's novel *The Women's Coffee Shop* was briefly discussed in the previous chapter in terms of its resistance to the dominant nationalist paradigms and their monolithic appropriation of the past. In this chapter, I would like to draw on it regarding its politics of gender. The novel contests the collusion of patriarchy with dominant nationalist paradigms in presenting monolithic versions of the past where the privileged subject in the shape of the nationalist male hero draws the lines of acceptable and appropriate masculinity. While not averse to providing a temporal frame to the plot in saying, "Three years into a fragile independence granted only reluctantly and with great malice by the country's colonial masters" (Ierodiaconou *The Women's Coffee Shop* 10), the novel refuses to consecrate this event by concentrating on it. Thus, while colluding with historiography in remembering this event and its violent aftermath, its concurrent marginalization in the overall plot comes to undermine this collusion. While tricking us at the beginning that this is one of those novels about the sanguine aftermath of the independence and the gradual rift between the Christians and the Muslims, the novel actually sidelines this rift, and focuses instead on the voices of women and expresses possibilities for women entering public spaces without being subsumed to the masculine discourse of nationalism. In the nationalist archive of historiography and nationalist literature the latter are generally treated as auxiliary, subservient, and supporting figures in the struggle of their men. As Vassiliadou argues, with regards to women's roles in nationalist struggles, "they are the background 'heroines', the hidden 'warriors', but also the worst victims of war: they are killed, captured and raped; they are abused and threatened; they are left refugees, stigmatized, widows" (459). Whilst obviously implicated in the nationalist struggles in such ways that they bear the greatest burden of the war and are given the least recognition for it, women also generally have to put aside their own agenda against patriarchal oppression since the nation's other priorities take precedence (Vassiliadou 460). Simply put, women's courage is exemplified not through

their own actions but rather through their passive acquiescence to men's actions and their fortitude in bravely bearing the loss of their men. In *The Women's Coffee Shop*, this stereotype is reversed. Indeed, while Angelou believes in action, Avraam Salih, the male protagonist, believes in the revolutionary potentialities of his art, the shadow theatre. As such, they both pose defiantly against the norm of their gender identities. Indeed, both Angelou and Avraam Salih transgress the rigid gender identities that patriarchal nationalism prescribes for them.

Angelou is notorious for her actions and for her daring. In the pages of the novel, she is an agent both of her body as well as of her mind. Like a modern Antigoni, she defies both the Church and the hodja who are not willing to bury the "unburiable" corpse of Avraam Salih since "a baptismal certificate pertaining to the dead man could not be found, yet neither had he ever been seen at Friday prayers" (Ierodiaconou *The Women's Coffee Shop* 5). In the name of a higher justice she works towards the correction of the laws of her polis in such a way that she provides hospitality to a form of radical otherness, to the dead. Angelou's action of hospitality and defiance of state laws in the name of a higher justice resonates with that utopian cosmopolitanism that was discussed in the introduction to this thesis. Indeed, while Angelou's acutely political action is negated by the subsequent mysterious unburying of Avraam Salih, the author's invitation to him to come and tell his stories at the end of the novel can be seen as an act of retribution. In effect, the spirit of the unburiable Salih comes to haunt the text and shake the seeming confidence of dominant discourses and their attendant ideas of orthodoxy of identity.

Angelou's atypical agency is not only seen through her leading role in the protest against the erection of the hotel in the village but also through her successful businesses. In contrast to Angelou, we have Avraam Salih, who is not a man of action but a man who prefers to stage his revolutions quietly and privately through his art. The novel hence contests the patriarchal clichéd antinomy of women/private and men/public. Moreover, instead of a masculine pose of sober and boisterous action favoured by patriarchal nationalism, Avraam Salih, embodies a firm, yet subtle, critique towards prefabricated identities. Angelou, on the other hand, is indeed a woman of action, the indefatigable organizer of the protest: "But more than any other figure, it was Angelou who seized the viewer's imagination – a woman become a rock, or a century-old tree, so immutably fixed did she seem on the first morning at the head of the protesters" (Ierodiaconou *The Women's Coffee Shop* 167). What Avraam tried to do through his shadow theatre—whose history in the literary culture of the island is also inscribed in the course of the novel—and did not

manage due to his premature death, or murder, Angelou succeeds through a protest that amasses all the women of the village. As the narrator tells us,

> At the start, the mass she led numbered six or seven hundred, and included every able-bodied female in the village. Old crones, buxom brides, who had hung up their wedding wreaths over the marriage bed just days before, harassed mothers of ten, little gap-toothed girls in pigtails – Angelou had succeeded in drafting them all. (Ierodiaconou *The Women's Coffee Shop* 167)

Instead of the rebellion of men against colonial rule or of the animosity and violence perpetrated against one another by the nationalists on both sides that are usually consecrated in historiography or in historical novels as the monumental events of the 1950s and 1960s, the novel sidelines these events and focuses, instead, on a women's protest against the building of a hotel that would have changed their village irrevocably. The protest's success in thwarting the plans for the village's touristic development is not celebrated as a victory against modernity and touristic development. Rather, showing sobriety, the text through Angelou, admits that this is just a temporary victory:

> the village of Ayia, for the moment, had been wrenched from the grasp of those who would destroy it in the name of helping it grow. Participants and spectators were celebrating the outcome as a victory, and so it was – for a day. The more clairvoyant – was Angelou one of them? – dared not think of tomorrow, when the men and machines and the money would simply shift elsewhere, to begin gnawing at the bone of another village. (Ierodiaconou *The Women's Coffee Shop* 180)

Through this protest, where women win the day, the author invites the female voices of the past in her text and provides, thus, another reading of the past, one where the actual heroes are the everyday characters and not the fighters of the nation.

The end of the novel and the women's discussion about Xenia's daughter's name exemplifies precisely this point. Xenia, one of the regulars, comes in the coffee shop with her newborn wrapped up and her entrance immediately elicits the attention of all the women who come and cluck over the baby. The clucking sounds are interrupted by Katerina's question about the baby's name:

> Before Xenia could answer, Elenara said, with a gold-toothed grin, -'After

> whichever one of the mothers-in-law wins! Eh, Xenia?' All the women laughed anew; Xenia looked discomfited. Blushing, she said, -'Yes, I mean – my husband says it should be his mother, you know, Maria. But – ' She hesitated, as if unsure how her audience would take what she was about to say next. Then, looking round, she saw Angelou's eyes fixed on her. As though the fact gave her courage, she said, addressing the coffee shop keeper alone, -'But I think it should have a heroine's name. I mean, men get named after heroes, don't they? Achilles, things like that? Why not women?.... Call her Constantia. (Ierodiaconou *The Women's Coffee Shop* 233)

Constantia was Avraam Salih's mother who rejected her dowry, defied her omnipotent father, and married her Turkish-Cypriot lover, Mehmet, and led a life of isolation from the rest of the village. She was one of those minor characters, even in the space of the novel, whose heroism rested in defying patriarchy and nationalism. Her quiet revolution does not decorate the pages of any grand narratives. Yet, the honouring of Constantia through the naming of the baby comes to contest the conventional christening of heroes. The hero is not a man who fought for the nation but a woman who defied, at once, her father, the Church, and the nation. Moreover, Xenia's daughter is not named by her father's mother's name as tradition would warrant, but by Angelou, the coffee shop owner who designates that heroism lies in the minor actions of resistance to the established norms. The latter are generally not remembered and are always threatened with extinction; in contrast, the major events are entrenched in our memories through their repetition and consecration in the pages of historiography and canonized nationalist fiction. Thus, their remembering is a matter of life and death, since as Benjamin reminds us, "The past can be seized only as an image which flashes up at the instant when it can be recognized and is never seen again" (Benjamin 255). By inserting these minor events of the past into her narrative the author resists the dominant narratives of historiography but also performs gender disruptions that are rather significant. Unlike the dominant reiteration of these gender roles as they appear in canonized narratives, where masculinity and femininity are trapped in essentialist formulations, the novel offers alternative ways of gender performativity that are fresh and daring for the Cypriot cultural context. As Karayanni argues, "Cyprus' national crisis (perhaps inevitably) resulted in a crisis in terms of gender embodiment and expression, and what are considered respectable modes of being a Cypriot man or woman" (232). It is

precisely these established modes of gender embodiment that the novel interrogates and brings in crisis. We have already discussed Angelou's unconventional nature; being an unmarried woman approaching forty and financially independent, she is simply uncommon and aberrant in a society that naturalized the category of women through their motherhood. Moreover, Angelou's homosexuality and Erminoni's bisexuality insert into the narrative alternative ways of performing sexuality and expressing desire that transgress the strictures of gender roles imposed by nationalist and patriarchal narratives. In these daring ways the text expresses its desire for another community where gender *is* not, but instead *becomes*, revealing, thus, the performativity of gender, rather than its essence. In effect, the novel exemplifies a nostalgia for another community, one where women enter public space without being subsumed within patriarchal structures and strictures, and one where gender is performed as opposed to being a natural embodiment of one's sexuality. Such performativity is a metonymy of the permeability and porousness of borders and boundaries that in nationalist narratives appear to be fixed and impermeable. Instead of fighting the men's struggle, the women show agency by choosing their own struggles to fight against the incursion of tourism in their village, against patriarchy and its codified norms of acceptable desire, and against the nation-state. As such, the text becomes 'minor' through its contesting of dominant modes and models.

The novel invites forgotten voices, alternative possibilities, and a community that failed to become and hosts them, allowing them to tell their story. It is through the actual telling of these stories that various homecomings are achieved. The relationship with the 'other' is evidently a complex and iterative process, since as we have already discussed, the 'other' is always and already *with(in)* the self. The danger of simplistic appropriation of the 'other' in the gesture of rescuing the other from his/her obscurity is always lurking. Post-colonial discourse has struggled with this predicament, since it often entrenches the self and the other in renewed oppositions through the binary of colonized/coloniser. The text seems to be aware of this danger and endeavours to overcome it by blurring various borders and boundaries. Yet, we should always remember that the invitation to the other is always extended by someone who is in a position to do so. The astonishment that forms of otherness bring into the text is one way to render the homeliness of the text unhomely. Yet, as we have already seen, the astonishment is transient, fugacious, and always threatened with domestication of the uncanny and the unhomely. The novel does indeed blend the real and the magical and offers various layers of astonishment that reconfigure our boundaries and established logic and provide glimpses of another community where

power is more critically challenged. The novel offers indeed both heterotopias of cosmopolitanism as well as moments of a utopian cosmopolitanism. When the community coalesces into a body, it serves as a metonymy of heterotopias that challenges the established order. However, there are a few moments when the novel elides the placing of community along any lines and keeps it open to future possibilities of ongoing deterritorializations, a process that we referred to with regards to the unburiable Avraam Salih, and which I will pick up again in the conclusion.

Alev Adil's and the Women's Amnesiac Dance

Perhaps the most powerful questioning of the category of woman and its symbolic capital comes through Alev Adil's poem "Nicosia Girl". The poem uses the performative nature of dance as the trope that, on the one hand, imprisons the woman (or the girl) in a role as the object of male sexual desire, but, on the other, exposes the constructive nature of such roles. Performativity then becomes the trope of both enslavement and liberation. I quote the poem in its entirety since it is concise:

> It's performance time Nicosia girl,
> the traces and erasures of your footprints,
> the vestige of your gestures,
> your ghost on the balcony,
> are dancing for me.
> Memory, a secret agent of war,
> sets the scene:
> a bridge, a labyrinth, a graveyard.
> Dance your inherited amnesia,
> a heritage in an undeciphered script,
> your political dread, your amour projection,
> your sentimental terrorism,
> double-shadow, violent architect,
> my assassin. (Adil "Nicosia Girl" 100)

Nicosia as well as other cities of the island are fraught with cabarets where girls dance for male spectators and are generally expected (and often forced) to prostitute themselves. The dancing part of their duties, although necessary, is generally a foil for the latter part of

their duties. Most women perform their dancing unceremoniously and rudimentarily. Yet, they are generally referred to as 'dancing girls', despite the fact that they are brought to the island for prostitution and they are forced to perform it. The poem re-appropriates the performativity of dancing that such girls engage in and invests it with a subversive potential for the category of woman in general since the performance implies a cultural representation and not a natural essence. The girl in the poem does not dance for a male spectator as it is generally the case in these dancing halls; rather, it is her movement outside the hall that constitutes her dancing. The poet seems to recall the girl's movement in her memory, remembering "the traces and erasures of your footprints,/ the vestige of your gestures,/ your ghost on the balcony" (Adil "Nicosia Girl" 100). The next lines tell us that "Memory is a secret agent of war", since remembering would reveal the slippages, gaps, and holes of history, a history that constructed the gender roles that we have inherited. The poet encourages the girl to continue the dance: "dance your inherited amnesia,/ a heritage in an undeciphered script" ("Nicosia Girl" 100). I read the 'inherited amnesia' as the patriarchal gender categories that have been passed on to us in such a way that they appear natural. Yet, this heritage comes in a script that, despite its "undeciphered" character, continues to read woman as a category inextricably entangled with "political dread" "amour projection" and "sentimental terrorism" ("Nicosia Girl" 100), all of which operate ceaselessly as the 'assassins' for those other visions of sexuality and gender. The terms "double-shadow" and "violent architect" both underline the performativity of identity, and particularly, of gender identity. Indeed, such performativity becomes a metaphor for refusing to accept the "inherited amnesia", and, for choosing instead, the violence of memory which retains the possibility of resistance to such amnesia. As such, the poem performs a poetic dance that re-appropriates the subversive potentialities of dance as a mode of performance and, thus, exposes the constructive aspect of our inherited categories.

Hoplaros' Playful 'Hide and Seek'

Hoplaros' autobiographical memoir, *Mrs Bones*, is an exercise in disguise; hiding behind the voice of the child, she stretches, twists, and distorts the meaning of words so that she can convey the multiple layers of her identity. As she puts it, she explores "what it meant to be a Cypriot girl living in a small township north of Rhodesia – learning English at school, attending Greek lessons and speaking the Cypriot dialect at home" (Hoplaros 8).

Her exploration takes her, and us as readers, to unknown contours; more importantly, though, it takes the English language to surprising and enriching pathways. Like a child playing hide and seek, Hoplaros' child narrator tries to seek answers to a profoundly emotional, yet strained relationship, to her m(other), brushing on issues such as abandonment, survival, desire, femininity, etc., while hiding behind the inherent ambivalence of language as well as her position at the crossroads of various cultures and languages and exemplifies, thus, a precarious position that we earlier called 'minor'. I will discuss the text in more detail in my conclusion, but I would like to refer to it briefly here in terms of its playful negotiations of gender. In the short vignette called "Femininity", she starts by referring to a game she plays with the other girls at school, which is supposed to show what man one would marry: "*Tinker, Tailor, Soldier, Sailor, Rich man, Poor man, Thief*" (Hoplaros 95). She then tells us that

> I only know one type of woman and that is a housewife. I haven't heard anyone talking about their mom in another way. Housewives are married to their house. I think it's a silly game.... Mom says I'm going to get married when I grow up. That is what people do. That's why my mom had girls, so they could grow up and get married and she would be happy that she did her job well. And this makes me not want to grow up, to stay as little as I am. (Hoplaros 95-96)

The childish simplicity and naivety of the narration is both disarming and alarmingly revelatory. Moreover, it 'naturalizes' the societal expectations for the category of woman in such a way that it reveals the process in which normativity becomes normal. The narrator's reluctance to grow up becomes intensified in the closing lines: "But then mom shouldn't have let me become independent – to kick off my shoes and pierce my feet on thorns and acorns. I shouldn't have passed my time in relay races, out-sprinting my flapping white shorts. I shouldn't have been sent away to become smart. Now I have to hide how smart I really am, because she won't like it" (Hoplaros 96). The narrator needs to hide indeed if she is to continue to perform such unfeminine tasks. Like her 19th-century female counterparts who hid behind the picturesque aesthetic in their comments about socio-political issues, Hoplaros is aware of the boundaries afforded to her gender. Unlike her British counterparts, though, she is not as anxious in her hide-and-seek games since she knows that such hiding comes at a high cost, and, often, unwittingly colludes with the dominant discourses. She thus chooses to reveal herself and concurrently divulge the

attendant guilt that such hiding inevitably produces.

In another vignette called "Guilt", she precisely reveals the guilt that accompanies the heritage that the category of woman carries within. She starts by saying that "Guilt is invisible but hangs like a stone around my neck dragging me to the ground. The gravity between my body and the earth is magnetic. It is a bad feeling – makes you feel bad" (Hoplaros 155). Although invisible, guilt seems to be the omnipresent *patri*mony of women, a patrimony that cannot be erased, annulled, or ignored. That is why our narrator is fascinated by snakes' ease of metamorphosis: "I envy snakes shedding their old skin. I find their dried, light skins floating among the wild grass. They leave their shapes and patterns behind them and slither away their new identity. I wish I could do that with guilt but it clings tightly onto my body, seeps through the blood stream and settles on my bones" (Hoplaros 155). Her fascination with snakes turns into a fear of them in the following lines, since, apart from shedding their identity, snakes have also knowing eyes. Knowledge, it appears, is not to be trusted but feared:

> It's their knowing eyes that scare me. I wonder what type of snake tricked Eve. Knowledge and truth tied her to the earth, to Adam, to periods, to having babies and to death. She was guilty and passed it on to other women through generations of Chinese whispers – whispering in our ears so no-one could hear, dismantling and distorting the first words. (Hoplaros 115-16)

Knowledge, like truth, is not liberatory, but rather imprisoning, constricting, and untrustworthy. Indeed, if the category of woman is to be rethought, the knowledge that envelops the legacy of the category needs to be questioned too, together with its so-called natural truths. The text revisits the primordial figure of Eve and divests her of her womanhood in order to recast it in eternal doubt and dubiety. Moreover, it foregrounds the impossibility of any concept or notion to remain natural since the process of transferring resembles Chinese whispers. As such, it contests any form of authentic knowledge or identity that has been passed over through generations. Indeed, as Scott reminds us, "If gender is to be rethought, if new knowledge about sexual difference is to be produced (knowledge that calls into question even the primacy of the male/female opposition), then we must also be willing to rethink the history of politics and the politics of history" (11). Miranda Hoplaros' references to femininity, gender, and the knowledge surrounding them is precisely an effort in this direction, namely to rethink gender in such a way that it swathes both the history of politics and the politics of history in a productive ambivalence.

Conclusion

Discussing post-1974 Greek Cypriot fiction and its implications in the construction of sexual and gender categories, and specifically, its obsession with the theme of female rape and its attendant literal and figurative re(productive) potentialities, Mary Layoun reaches the following conclusion:

> Narrating the female body as the site of purity and nation violated, as the site of an international maternal (re)production, is certainly a dubious gesture. It conjures figures of eternally fecund and nurturing woman, of the reproductive site of 'natural' conciliation. Yet, simultaneously the narration of the (violation of the) female body in these texts also conjures the contradictions, the violatory representations, of the female body as national site. Those conflicting images mark —as threat and promise—many post-1974 Cypriot narratives, as they do a social and cultural discourse around them. But if that narration is a dubious gesture, it is also an indication of a different story beyond national boundaries that is yet to be told. For now, however, it can only be 'paralogic' narrated in the dark silence of Eutuxia's midnight border movements. (Layoun 74)

Layoun's analysis in the article is both incisive and insightful. She is certainly right in pointing to the contradictions, slippages, and gaps that the narration of the female body as national site always entails. Moreover, she is right in pointing out that such narrative acts, apart from revealing the broader cultural and social attitudes towards sexuality and gender, also reveal the promise for disruption of such attitudes and categories. While for canonized narratives such narrative acts can only be 'paralogic', uncanonized narratives, such as those discussed in this chapter, find their 'home' in the dark, and in those contours where reason is made both guest and host to the narrative, and what becomes 'paralogic' is not the traversing of the borders but reason itself. While canonized fiction needs to hide in the darkness of midnight movement, in such a way that the binary of reason and darkness remains intact, 'minor' literature obsesses with the darkness, that "nocturnal side of speech" (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 2) and finds its home in its unhomely contours. The gender disruptions that we saw in this chapter vary in terms of their concerns, expression, and intention. Moreover, while all are successful in questioning the boundaries of

established categories of sexuality and gender through the insertion of 'other' possible sexualities, not all go as far as challenging even the primacy of what appears to be natural in such a way as to bring the politics of history and the history of politics in crisis. Nevertheless, it is my conviction that the gender disruptions that are endeavoured and expressed in the corpus of Anglophone literature that appears in the postcolonial period, and more specifically in the last twenty years, are not unrelated to its 'minor position'. Indeed, becoming 'minor' in literature is synonymous with seeking 'homecoming' in 'lines of flight' from the established order and the hegemony of certain discourses. While writing entails some form of reterritorialization, the recasting of terms in new boundaries of meaning can be read as attempts at new ways of conceptualizing community, or of what this thesis calls with regards to the narratives discussed, heterotopias of cosmopolitanism. There are works, though, that not only recast the boundaries of meaning and sense, but engage in such contestations that suspend homecoming or meaning altogether and refuse to shape and place new boundaries, and point thus to utopian imaginings of community.

Conclusion: The Inconclusiveness of 'Minor' Literature

The Unburiable Corpse of Avraam Salih and 'Minor Literature'

As a way of conclusion I would like to re-invite into my narrative the dead Avraam Salih (from Ierodiaconou's *The Women's Coffee Shop*) to haunt this thesis with his ghostly presence and remind us that conclusions are antithetical to 'minor processes'. Ierodiaconou's novel starts by describing the condition of the dead Avraam Salih, a condition that describes, to a large extent, also, the shifting location of 'minor literatures'. I quote:

> Everything about Avraam Salih was humble: from his name, which revealed that he was the offspring of a mixed marriage between a Christian and a Moslem and therefore an outsider among Moslems and Christians alike; to the ill-cut suit of a too-bright blue which clothed him; to his condition, which was dead. And not only dead, but unburied – or, to be more exact, unburiable, since a baptismal certificate pertaining to the dead man could not be found, yet neither had he even been seen at Friday prayers. (*The Women's Coffee Shop* 5)

Avraam Salih's unburiable corpse can be read metonymically as the elusive, evasive, and shifting corpus of 'minor literatures'. The burying of Avraam Salih's corpse through a proper burial becomes coterminous with a recognition of his identity as a dead man by one of the dominant institutions, either the Christian or the Muslim, and, thus, his readmission in the symbolic order. Being unburiable, though, Avraam Salih, escapes placement, engraving, interment, and identification. More importantly, he escapes becoming the property of any dominant order. In other words, his 'unburiable condition' becomes a metonymy for resisting placement, interment, and territorialization. Similarly, 'minor literatures' are implicated in acts of resistance to the established symbolic order through their acts of deterritorialization. However, Deleuze and Guattari acknowledge that these acts of deterritorialization that 'minor' processes engage in entail also some form of reterritorialization. Specifically, they argue that, "Ordinarily, in fact, language compensates for its deterritorialization by a reterritorialization in sense" (20). However, as long as Avraam Salih's corpse remains 'unburiable', it eludes identification with the symbolic order and becomes identified solely as a corpse resisting placement, both literal and discursive. Buried, the corpse would have reached its final homecoming. Unburied,

or unburiable as it remains, the corpse continues to seek home by haunting the text and the latter's desire for a conclusion. Aware of this, the novel does not reach a conclusion. Instead, it provides multiple possibilities, all narrated by the ghostly apparition of Avraam Salih. In this process, the text rends asunder the possibility for reading the past conclusively, or for foreclosing the future in prescribed models and formulas. As such, it imbibes a nostalgia for a community that refuses to coalesce into an identity but which remains open to various possibilities. Such community which is inoperative and anti-communitarian (Gandhi *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction* 32), resonates with the utopian cosmopolitanism that we referred to in our introduction and in the last two chapters.

Becoming 'minor' in literature entails similar tasks: unburying the past and resisting the closure of the future. Yet, writing is a form of placement, or of emplacement. It is precisely here that there lies the crux of becoming 'minor': in searching possibilities of estranging the language, of rendering unhomely the homeliness of sense, territory, and place, or of displacing and dislocating sense and language. Speaking specifically about Kafka, Deleuze and Guattari write: "To hate all languages of masters…. What interests him even more is the possibility of making of his own language—assuming that it is unique, that it is a major language or has been—a minor utilization. To be a sort of stranger *within* his own language" (26). The Cypriots who write in English and whose works are discussed in this thesis are implicated in similar projects. On the one hand, they seek to establish their home in English, while, on the other, they resist the domesticating and exoticizing expectations of a metropolitan audience, and, thus, their easy incorporation into the category of English literature. Thus, while seeking home in English, they endeavor to retain their difference by estranging English through 'minor' utilizations. Moreover, through English, albeit of a 'minor' nature, these writers outline an(other) community beyond the strictures of nationalism and patriarchy that have become hegemonic on the island. Most of these works envision communities that function as sites of resistance to the dominant patriarchal models of community along ethnic lines by questioning both the sexual heteronormativity of these models as well as its ethnic homogeneity. In these heterotopias that are created by the Anglophone works by Cypriots discussed in my thesis, communities are imagined along ethnic lines and the rigid boundaries of heteronormal sexuality are transgressed and confused. As such, these works imagine heterotopias of cosmopolitan communities that operate as sites of resistance to the established hegemonic models of the island that uphold ethnic segregation and male

hegemony. Nevertheless, even 'minor' literatures entail writing and as such they are involved in processes of placement, of definition, and of boundary-setting. In other words, 'minor' literatures too are unable to eschew the symbolic order, but are in a position to constantly contest it and redraw its boundaries. It is in view of this predicament that I argue that contemporary narratives in English by Cypriots become 'xenos' at home. In estranging their linguistic medium, they seek to make a home within it. In trying to resist the inevitable placement of boundaries which is part of the writing process, these narratives point to the fluidity of boundaries and often undermine their own discourse.

Discussions of literature generally maintain and entrench the political and ideological borders of the nation. As such, they often, unwittingly, acknowledge as integral and unequivocal entities whose boundaries are contested and disputed. Such discussions are particularly heated in places like Cyprus where the political situation remains unresolved and potentially explosive. The current pathos that pervades the nationalist discourse in both communities pushes to the margins of the cultural front any discourses that question the nationalist nostalgia for ethnic purity and sexual heteronormativity. The literature that is written by Cypriots in English comes into this heated cultural front as a 'minor discourse' that endeavors to re-imagine communities along ethnic lines and across heteronormal sexual boundaries. These communities, as I argue, exude something of the cosmopolitan, either of the utopian or the heterotopian. However, Greek and Turkish were cosmopolitan languages themselves at some other point in history, the first being the language of the Byzantine empire, and the second of the Ottoman empire. Their translocation in Cyprus and their frontal confrontation brought about their vernacularization, a process that is still prevalent and living. The advent of English in 1878 as a colonial language on the island, finds the two vernacularized languages at the beginning stages of writing the Cypriot 'topos' with their voice. As the years pass and literary modernity develops on the island, the two vernaculars come steadily at loggerheads with each other. English comes to mediate between these languages and engages in various deterritorializations and reterritorializations, bringing with it a cosmopolitan fabric of voices. Yet, this cosmopolitan legacy that English leaves on the island is swathed in a colonial rhetoric, and is, thus, too problematic for the postcolonial Cypriot to inherit as it is. Therefore, some of the postcolonial Cypriots who come to seek their home in English do so with a sense of unease, and have to rework the language to make it conducive to their 'minor' projects. Indeed, as the thesis demonstrates, colonial, anti-colonial, and recent postcolonial Anglophone texts portray significant differences in

their writing of the Cypriot 'topos'. As such, 'homecoming' or cultural arrival, and cosmopolitanism are invested with different meanings in these texts from the island's different literary periods. While all three periods write the island and inscribe it with a polyphony of identities which reflect their ideological intentions, they also exemplify significant differences regarding the meanings invested on the above themes. In other words, reaching a 'homecoming' or finding a cultural arrival in the Anglophone narratives that write Cyprus often traverses cosmopolitanism, but the latter means different things at different historical periods in the literary history of the island. While the first colonial narratives are characterized by domesticating and vilifying depictions of the island to the extent that only the first ones portray some form of 'homecoming' to the island, anti-colonial texts uniformly envisage 'home' along nationalist parameters and exude a sense of homecoming in their glorification of the nation and in their nostalgia for ethnic purity. In contrast to both, recent postcolonial texts in English envisage 'home' across ethnic lines and imbibe an idiom of cosmopolitanism of the utopian and heterotopian kinds that is unlike any former cosmopolitan visions that have been observed before in the island's literary topographies. Cultural arrival for these recent Anglophone texts consists either in a cross-cultural poetics or in an aesthetic of estrangement of the homely structures that notions such as 'home' and 'community' have been enveloped in. Moreover, the disruption and dislocation in the daily realities of the lives of these writers as well as their discomfiture with the established literary categories means that their 'homecomings' are always in homes that are shifting, unstable, and open, and which reflect their 'minor' positions.

Further Research

The journey of English in Cyprus continues as I am writing these pages. Indeed, the contemporary Cypriot Anglophone literature that is the focus of this thesis appeared roughly fifteen to twenty years ago to such an extent as to warrant attention as a corpus and has developed remarkably since, both in volume as well in generic variety (poetry, novel, short-story, literary essay etc.). In essence, it is both a new and living process. Exploring such a living process means that it is necessary to resist the tendency of conclusive and definitive remarks both with regards the aesthetics as well as its future directions. In fact, since the beginning of this study four years ago, a lot of new works came out both by the discussed writers as well as by new writers. The pages of the literary journals that provide

hospitality to these works like *Cadences*, *Cyprus Dossier*, and *Arteri*, are inscribed by new voices continuously. Future studies could perhaps explore these new emergent voices and examine their connections with the generation of the writers I discuss here. Moreover, the reasons that explain why these new writers write in English need to be explored since the socio-political reality on the island changed dramatically since the violent and tumultuous years of the 1960s and 1970s and could perhaps have led to new reasons why some people write in English. Are the new writers, in other words, also the uncomfortable heirs of a hegemonic tradition or are they simply choosing English as the vehicle to a broader audience and thus express a cosmopolitan desire for the marketability of English? Be that as it may, what are the aesthetic, ideological, and political orientations of this constantly evolving field of new Anglophone Cypriot writers?

The literary sphere of the island is complemented also by Anglophone voices that are not Cypriot, and by some non-Cypriot literary voices that engage with the Cypriot literary scene through English as a language of translation. Indeed, the journals that I refer to throughout this thesis, as the hosts of these new literary and cultural communities that engage in imagining communities against the grain of the established status-quo, like *Cadences*, *Cyprus Dossier*, *Arteri,* etc. include in their pages, apart from Cypriot voices of all languages of the island, also Anglophone voices of non-Cypriots who live on the island permanently, or even of writers who visit the island and want to engage in some way with the literary circles of the island and use either English or other languages that are translated in English. Some of these writers who live on the island permanently have been active participants in the development of these new literary circles that imagine communities across ethnic lines and against the dominant sexual heteronormativity. Indeed, writers such as the British Paul Stewart, the Palestinian-American Lisa Suhair Majaj, and the Ecuadorian Mateo Jarrin, all of who write in English, and the Lithuanian Dalia Staponkutė who is involved in the Cypriot literary circles through translation, all have been involved to various degrees with issues of identity, and the latter's shaping by such phenomena as exile, migration, dislocation etc. These non-Cypriot Anglophone writers write the Cypriot 'topos' with voices and fresh perspectives from other worlds. New research is needed to locate more of these writers as well as their works' orientations and dialectical relationship to those of local Anglophone writers. My research focuses only on the 'Cypriot' Anglophone writers of the postcolonial era. In doing that, it becomes somewhat complicit with the discourses of the nation-state and grants legitimacy to the nation-state's structures. Yet, even the Cypriot state does not impose and cultivate a Cypriot identity, but instead

still seeks place in the trans-historical idiom of Greekness. With regards to literature, Cypriot literature is seen as a branch of the larger Greek literature and includes only Greek-speaking writers, as it has been already mentioned. Thus, my complicity with the national structures of literary categorization brings concurrently a deterritorialization of the 'Cypriot' and opens it to include those who write in Turkish and English too.

In terms of complicities and collusions, another word is due. The last part of my thesis brings together several voices under the name of contemporary Anglophone Cypriot Literature and makes a case for this literary corpus as one that is 'minor'. In bringing these voices together which imbibe a nostalgia for a community beyond nationalist and gender strictures, my project is also inevitably involved in processes of bringing home an(other) view of community. As such, it becomes inevitably complicit with this nostalgia for another community in making a case for these narratives as 'minor' processes. Yet, by placing them into a corpus, I am aware that in some way I am entrenching their position and perhaps compromising some of their 'minor' potentialities.

I would like to suggest two more directions for further study. Firstly, there is room for more archival research that can shed more light perhaps on the incipient stages of British colonialism on the island. My research looked at the newspaper archives and more specifically at the literary works that were published in the press during the first years of colonialism. Due to the scattered nature of the archival material which is found in parts in various libraries and archival centers, it is still unclear how many newspapers in English existed and whether there are archives of all of them. A study that focuses solely on the first years of literary modernity on the island can perhaps uncover more archival material that could shed more light on the presence of English on the island as a literary language during these first years of colonialism. Secondly, there is ample ground for further research on the processes of dialogue and translation between the various languages of the island, with a focus perhaps on English as a mediating language between Greek and Turkish, especially after the opening of the checkpoints in 2003. Indeed, the opening of the checkpoints in 2003 has been instrumental in the shaping of these new literary communities since before that momentous event most writers had no access to the literary scene of the other community. Elli Peonidou records these difficulties in her "Illicit Lovers: Poetry Crossing Borders", together with the ways in which London functioned as the neutral ground where these writers at times met and read each other's works (23-30). English has always been important as the mediating language in these processes. This enhanced role of English as a mediating language of translation between Greek and

Turkish after 2003 must have affected poetics in the two languages. The question is how and to what extent.

The ghostly presence of the unburiable corpse of Avraam Salih will continue to roam the cultural sphere of the island. Unburiable, as it remains, it continuously outlines the horizon for the (mis)understanding of the 'minor'. For, let us not forget that, "Thought is in essence a force of mastery. It is continually bringing the unknown back to the known, breaking up its mystery to possess it, she light on it. Name it" (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 28). While the corpse of Avraam Salih continues to roam, transgress, and haunt the cultural boundaries of the island, the corpus of Cypriot Anglophone literature needs to continue to provide 'philoxenia' to it, befriending, in other words, its foreignness, without ever allowing it to become too homely since that would mean the end of its 'xenos' part or its utter domestication and territorialization. Simply put, it would mean its burying.

Bibliography

The Owl 20 September 1890. Print.

The Owl: A Weekly Newpaper and Review September 20, 1890. Print.

"Cyprus as a Field for English Enterprise." *The Times of Cyprus* 5 September 1887. Print.

Cyprus Blue Book Reports. 1889-1890. Print.

"Reaping the Whirlwind." *The Times of Cyprus* 14 July 1893. Print.

"A Song of Cyprus." *The Times of Cyprus* 9 April 1892. Print.

A.H.B. "A Romance of Ramsgate Sands." *The Times of Cyprus* 24 January 1894. Print.

Adil, Alev. "Nicosia Girl." *Kunapipi* XXXIII.1-2 (2011): 100. Print.

---. "Translating and Mutating Identities: Cypriots Who Write in English."

---. *Venus Infers*. London: NE Publications, 2004. Print.

Adorno, Theodor W., and Max Horkheimer. *Dialectic of Enlightnement*. Trans. Cumming, John. London, New York: Verso, 1997. Print.

Agamben, Giorgio. *Home Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Trans. Heller-Roazen, Daniel. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998. Print.

Amazon. http://www.amazon.co.uk/product-reviews/1903660017/ref=cm_cr_pr_top_link_1?ie=UTF8&showViewpoints=0.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised ed. London and New York: Verso, 1991. Print.

Atia, Nadia, and Jeremy Davies. "Nostalgia and the Shapes of History." *Memory Studies* 3.3 (2010): 181-86. Print.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *The Dialogic Imagination*. University of Texas Press Slavic Series, No.1. Ed. Michael, Holquist. Texas: Univesity of Texas Press, 1981. Print.

Bassnett, Susan. "Travel Writing and Gender." *Travel Writing*. Ed. Hulme, Peter. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 225-41. Print.

Baybars, Taner. *Plucked in a Far-Off Land*. 1970. Lefkosia: Mufflon Publications Ltd., 2005. Print.

Beaton, Roderick. *George Seferis: Waiting for the Angel, a Biography*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003. Print.

Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations*. Trans. Zohn, Harry. New York: Schocken Books, 1968. Print.

Bensmaïa, Réda. "Foreword: The Kafka Effect." Trans. Cochran, Terry. *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*. 1986. Print.

Bermingham, Ann. "The Picturesque and Ready-to-Wear Femininity." *The Politics of the Picturesque: Literature, Landscape and Aesthetics since 1770*. Eds. Copley, Stephen and Peter Garside. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1994. 81-119. Print.

Bhabha, Homi K. "Introduction: Narrating the Nation " *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Bhabha, Homi. New York: Routledge, 1990. 1-7. Print.

---. "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse." *October* Vol. 28, Discipleship: A Special Issue on Psychoanalysis (Spring, 1984): 125-33. Print.

---. "Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree Outside Delhi, May 1817." *Critical Inquiry* Vol. 12.No. 1, "Race," Writing, and Difference (Autumn, 1985): 144-65. Print.

---. "Unsatisfied: Notes on Vernacular Cosmopolitanism." *Postcolonial Discourses: An Anthology*. Ed. Castle, Gregory. Oxford and Massachusetts Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 2001. 39-52. Print.

Blake, Susan L. "A Woman's Trek." *Western Women and Imperialism: Complicity and Resistance*. Eds. Chaudhuri, Nupur and Margaret Strobel. Bloomington and

Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1992. 19-34. Print.
Blanchot, Maurice. *The Unvavowable Community*. Trans. Joris, Pierre. Barrytown, New York: Station Hill Press, 1988. Print.
Borges, Jorge Luis. *Fictions*. Trans. Hurley, Andrew. New York: Penguin Books, 1998. Print.
Boym, Svetlana. *The Future of Nostalgia*. New York: Basic Books, 2001. Print.
Brassey, Mrs. *Sunshine and Storm in the East or Cruises to Cyprus and Constantinople*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1880. Print.
Brennan, Timothy. *At Home in the World: Cosmopolitanism Now*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: Harvard University Press, 1997. Print.
Bridges, Roy. "Exploration and Travel Outside Europe." *Travel Writing*. Ed. Hulme, Peter. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 53-69. Print.
Bryant, Rebecca. *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*. London, New York: I. B. Tauris & Co Ltd, 2004. Print.
---. "On the Condition of Postcoloniality in Cyprus." *Divided Cyprus: Modernity, History and an Island in Conflict*. Eds. Papadakis, Yiannis, Nicos Peristianis and Gizela Welz. Bloomington Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2006. 47-63. Print.
Burton, Antoinnete M. "The White Woman's Burden: British Feminists and the 'Indian Woman,' 1865-1915 " *Western Women and Imperialism: Complicity and Resistance*. Eds. Chaudhuri, Nupur and Margaret Strobel. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1992. 137-57. Print.
Buzard, James. "The Grand Tour and after (1660-1840)." *Travel Writing*. Eds. Hulme, Peter and Tim Young. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 37-52. Print.
---. "Victorian Women and the Implications of Empire." *Victorian Studies* 36.4 (Summer 1993): 443-53. Print.
Calotychos, Vangelis. "Interdisciplinary Perspectives: Difference at the Heart of Cypriot Identity and Its Study." *Cyprus and Its People: Nation, Identity, and Experience in an Unimaginable Community, 1955-1997*. Ed. Calotychos, Vangelis. Colorado and Oxford: Westview Press, 1998. 1-32. Print.
---. "'Lawrence Durrell, the Bitterest Lemon?': Cyps and Brits Loving Each Other to Death in Cyprus, 1953-57." *Lawrence Durrell and the Greek World*. Ed. Lillios, Anna. Selinsogrove and London: Susquehanna University Press, 2004. 169-87. Print.
---. "(Pre)Occupied Space: Hyphens, Apostrophes and over-Sites in the Literary Imagining of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey." *Step-Mothertongue: From Nationalism to Multi-Culturalism - Literatures of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey* Ed. Yashin, Mehmet. London: Middlesex University Press, 2000. 49-69. Print.
Carr, Helen. "Modernism and Travel." *Travel Writing*. Ed. Hulme, Peter. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 70-85. Print.
Ciakalli, George. *Cyprus under British Rule*. Nicosia: Nea Phoni tis Kyprou, 1902. Print.
Cobham, Claude D. *Excerpta Cypria*. Nicosia: The Library, 1969. Print.
Cook, Lady. "Who Should Propose." *The Times of Cyprus* 17 October 1894 1894. Print.
Copley, Stephen, and Peter Garside. "Introduction." *The Politics of the Picturesque: Literature, Landscape and Aesthetics since 1770*. Eds. Copley, Stephen and Peter Garside. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1994. 1-12. Print.
Costello, B. Karin, ed. *Cypriot Identities*. Nicosia: Intercollege Press, 2005. Print.
Critchley, Simon, and Richard Kearney. "Preface." Trans. Dooley, Mark and Michael Hughes. *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. Eds. Critchley, Simon and Richard Kearney. London and New Yourk Routledge, 2001. Print.
Dames, Nicholas. "Nostalgia and Its Disciplines: A Response." *Memory Studies* 3.3 (2010): 269-75. Print.

De Certeau, Michel *Heterologies: Discourse on the Other*. Trans. Massumi, Brian. Theory and History of Literature, Vol. 17. Minneapolis & London: University of Minnesota, 1986. Print.
Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guattari. *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*. Trans. Polan, Dana. Theory and History of Literature, Volume 30. Minessota and London: University of Minessota Press, 1986. Print.
Derrida, Jacques. *Dissemination*. Trans. Johnson, Barbara. London, New York: Continuum, 1981. Print.
---. *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. Trans. Dooley, Mark and Michael Hughes. London and New York: Routledge 2001. Print.
---. *Politics of Friendship*. Trans. Collins, George. London and New York: Verso, 1997. Print.
Derrida, Jacques, and Anne Dufourmantelle. *Of Hospitality (Cultural Memory in the Present)*. Trans. Bowlby, Rachel. Standford, California: Stanford University Press, 2000. Print.
Dictionary, The Free Online. "The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language." Houghton Mifflin Company 2009 2000.
Dixon, Hepworth. *British Cyprus*. London: Chapman & Hall, 1879. Print.
Douzinas, Costas. *Human Rights and Empire: The Political Philosophy of Cosmopolitanism*. New York: Routledge-Cavendish, 2007. Print.
Durrell, Lawrence. *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus*. London: Faber and Faber, 1957. Print.
Euripides. *Bacchae*. Trans. Gilbert, Murray: London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., New York: Longmans, Green &Co., 1920. Print.
Fanon, Franz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Trans. Farrington, Constance. New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1963. Print.
Forster, E.M. *Two Cheers for Democracy*. 1951. Print.
Foucault, Michel. "Des Espaces Autres." *Architecture/Mouvement/Continuité* October 1984 (1967). Print.
---. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of Prison*. Trans. Sheridan, Alan. London: Penguin, 1977. Print.
Foucault, Michel "Discourse and Truth: The Problematization of Parrhesia." (1983). Web.
Freud, Sigmund. "The Uncanny." Trans. Strachey, James and Anna Freud. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Vol. XVII. London: The Hogarth Press, 1955. 217-52. Print.
Gandhi, Leela. *Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-De-Siecle Radicalism, and the Politics of Friendship*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2006. Print.
---. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998. Print.
George, Rosemary Marangoly. *The Politics of Home*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 1999. Print.
Gourgouris, Stathis. *Dream Nation: Enlightenment, Colonization and the Institution of Modern Greece*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1996. Print.
Gregoriou, Zelia. "De-Scribing Hybridity in 'Unspoiled Cyprus': Postcolonial Tasks for the Theory of Education." *Comparative Education* Vol. 40.No. 2 (2004): 241-66. Print.
Harris, Wilson. "Benito Cereno." *Selected Essays of Wilson Harris: The Unfinished Genesis of the Imagination*. Ed. Bundy, Andrew. London and New York: Routledge, 1999. 123-33. Print.
---. "New Preface to *Palace of the Peacock*." *Selected Essays of Wilson Harris: The Unfinished Genesis of the Imagination*. Ed. Bundy, Andrew. London and New

York: Routledge, 1999. 53-57. Print.
Hastings, Robert. "Greek-Canadian Reportage." http://pages.globetrotter.net/gcradb/TheCypriot.html 11 May 2006.
Hoplaros, Miranda. *Mrs. Bones*. 2008. Print.
Hulme, Peter. "Introduction." *Travel Writing*. Ed. Hulme, Peter. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 1-13. Print.
Ierodiaconou, Andriana. *Margarita's Husband: A Fable of the Levant*. Nicosia: Armida Publications, 2007. Print.
---. *The Women's Coffee Shop*. 2012. Print.
Jenkins, Ruth Y. "The Gaze of the Victorian Woman Traveler." *Gender, Genre, & Identity in Women's Travel Writing*. Ed. Siegel, Kristi. New york: Peter Lang Inc., 2004. 16-30. Print.
Kahraman, Hasan Bülent "'Je Suis an Autre': Turkish Literature in Transition between National and Global Self." *Step-Mother Tongue: From Nationalism to Multi-Culturalism: Literatures of Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey*. Ed. Yashin, Mehmet. London: Middlesex University Press, 2000. Print.
Karayanni, Stavros. "Towards an Epistemology of Longing: Gender Disruptions and Resistance in Cyprus Narratives of Displacements." *Kunapipi* XXXIII.1-2 (2011): 230-43. Print.
Karoulla-Vrikki, Dimitra "Language and Ethnicity in Cyprus under the British." *Britain in Cyprus: Colonialism and Post-Colonialism 1878-2006*. Eds. Faustmann, Hubert and Nicos Peristianis. Mannheim and Mohnesse: Bibliopolis, 2006. 343-58. Print.
Keeley, Edmund. *Inventing Paradise: The Greek Journey*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1999. Print.
Kefala, Eleni. *Peripheral (Post)Modernity: The Syncretist Aesthetics of Borges, Piglia, Kalokyris and Kyriakidis*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc. , 2007. Print.
Kizilyurek, Niyazi. "The Turkish Cypriots: From an Ottoman-Muslim Community to a National Community." *Britain in Cyprus: Colonialism and Post-Colonialism 1878-2006*. Eds. Faustmann, Hubert and Nicos Peristianis. Mannheim and Mohnesee: Bibliopolis, 2006. 315-25. Print.
Knowles, Sam. "Macrocosm-Opolitanism? Gilroy, Appiah, and Bhabha: The Unsettling Generality of Cosmopolitan Ideas." *Postcolonial Text* 3.4 (2007): 1-11. Print.
Koumi, Andreas. *The Cypriot*. London: Dexter Haven Publishing Ltd., 2006. Print.
Lambropoulos, Vassilis. *Literature as National Institution: Studies in the Politics of Modern Greek Criticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988. Print.
Laouyene, Atef "Review of *Immigrant Narratives: Orientalism and Cultural Translation in Arab*
American and Arab British Literature." *Postcolonial Text* 7.4 (2012): 1-5. Print.
Layoun, Mary. "The Female Body and 'Transnational' Reproduction; or, Rape by Any Other Name?" *Scattered Hegemonies: Postmodernity and Transnational Feminist Practices*. Eds. Grewal, Inderpal and Caren Kaplan. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press, 1994. 63-75. Print.
Leontis, Artemis. *Topographies of Hellenism: Mapping the Homeland*. Ithaka and London: Cornell University Press, 1995. Print.
Lillios, Anna. "Introduction." *Lawrence Durrell and the Greek World*. Ed. Lillios, Anna. Selinsgrove and London: Susquehanna University Press, 2004. 13-29. Print.
MacNiven, Ian S. *Lawrence Durrell: A Biography*. London: faber and faber, 1998. Print.
Malpas, Jeff. "Philosophy's Nostalgia." *Philosophy's Moods: The Affective Grounds of Thinking*. Eds. Kenaan, Hagi and Ilit Ferber. Dordrecht Heidelberg London New York: Springer, 2001. Print.
McClure, John. *Late Imperial Romance*. London and New York: Verso, 1994. Print.

Mehmet Ali, Aydin. "My London." *Cadences: A Journal of the Literature and the Arts in Cyprus* 2.1&2 (June 2006). Print.
Mehmet Ali, Aydin, and Erhürman Gülfidan. *Pink Butterflies*. London: Fatal Publications, 2005. Print.
Mignolo, Walter. "The Many Faces of Cosmo-Polis: Border Thinking and Critical Cosmopolitanism." *Public Culture* 12.3 (2000): 721-48. Print.
Mills, Sara. *Discourses of Difference*. London and New York: Routledge, 1991. Print.
Mitsi, Efterpi. "Myth, Travel, and Empire in 'British' Cyprus." *Beyond the Floating Islands: Issue 7 of Cotepra Reader. Subproject*. Eds. Stephanides, Stephanos and Susan Bassnett: Cotepra, 2002. 115-27. Print.
Montis, Costas. *Closed Doors: An Answer to Bitter Lemons by Lawrence Durrell*. Trans. Roessel, David and Soterios G. Stavrou. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Nostos, 2004. Print.
Morgan, Tabitha. *Sweet and Bitter Island: A History of the British in Cyprus*. London, New York: I.B Tauris & Co Ltd., 2010. Print.
Nadjarian, Nora. *Cleft in Twain*. Nicosia 2003. Print.
---. *Ledra Street*. Nicosia: Armida Publications, 2006. Print.
Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Inoperative Community*. Trans. Conor, Peter, et al. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press, 1991. Print.
P.P.H. "Cyprus." *The Cyprus Herald* 12 July 1884. Print.
Panayiotou, Andreas. "Lenin in the Coffee-Shop: The Communist Alternative and Forms of Non-Western Modernity." *Post-Colonial Studies* 9.3 (2006): 267-80. Print.
Panteli, Stavros. *A New History of Cyprus*. London and The Hague: East-West Publications Ltd., 1984. Print.
Papadakis, Yiannis. "Introduction." *Postcolonial Studies* 9.3 (2006): 231-35. Print.
Peonidou, Elli. "Illicit Lovers: Poetry Crossing Borders." Trans. Eleni, Fourtouni. *Cultures of Memory/Memories of Culture*. Ed. Stephanides, Stephanos. Nicosia: University of Nicosia Press, 2007. Print.
Persianis, Panayiotis. "The British Colonial Education `Lending' Policy in Cyprus (1878-1960): An Intriguing Example of an Elusive `Adapted Education' Policy." *Comparative Education* 32.1 (1996): 45-68. Print.
Pickering, Michael, and Emily Keightley. "The Modalities of Nostalgia." *Current Sociology* 54.6 (2006): 919-41. Print.
Pitharas, Lysandros. *I Am the Twentieth Century*. Nicosia: Kochlias Publications, 1999. Print.
Polan, Dana. "Translator's Introduction." *Kafka: Toward Minor Literature*. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press, 1986. Print.
Pollock, Sheldon. "Cosmopolitan and Vernacular in History." *Cosmopolitanism*. Eds. Pollock, Sheldon, et al. Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2002. 14-53. Print.
Pollock, Sheldon, et al. "Cosmopolitanisms." *Cosmopolitanism*. Eds. Pollock, Sheldon, et al. Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2002. 1-14. Print.
Porter, J. Roger. "Durrell and the Dilemmas of Travel Writing." *Deus Loci: The Lawrence Durrell Journal* NS3: 51-59. Print.
Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge, 2008. Print.
Radstone, Susannah. "Nostalgia: Home-Comings and Departures." *Memory Studies* 3.3 (2010): 187-91. Print.
Raizis, Marios Byron. "Lawrence Durrell and the Greek Poets." *Lawrence Durrell and the Greek World*. Ed. Lillios, Anna. Selinsgrove and London: Susquehanna University Press, 2004. 241-54. Print.

Renan, Ernest. "What Is a Nation?" Trans. Thom, Martin. *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Bhabha, Homi. London and New York: Routledge, 1990. Print.
Roessel, David. "'Something to Stand the Government in Good Stead': Lawrence Durrell and the Cyprus Review." *Deus Loci: The Lawrence Durrell Journal* NS3 (1994): 37-50. Print.
Roessel, David "Letters of Lawrence Durrell to Austen Harrison." *Deus Loci: The Lawrence Durrell Journal* NS 3 (1994): 3-34. Print.
---. "Rodis Roufos on Bitter Lemons: A Suppressed Section of *the Age of Bronze*." *Deus Loci: The Lawrence Durrell Journal* NS3 (1994): 129-33. Print.
Roessel, David. "Introduction." Trans. Roessel, David and Soterios G. Stavrou. *Closed Doors: An Answer to Bitter Lemons by Lawrence Durrell*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Nostos, 2004. Print.
Roufos, Rodis. *The Age of Bronze*. London Melbourne Toronto: Heinmann, 1960. Print.
Rushdie, Salman. *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism 1981-1991*. London: Granta Books, 1991. Print.
Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books Ltd., 2003. Print.
---. *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. Print.
Scott-Stevenson, Mrs. *Our Home in Cyprus*. London: Chapman and Hall, 1880. Print.
Scott, Wallach Joan. *Gender and the Politics of History*. Revised Edition ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999. Print.
Seferis, George. *George Seferis, Collected Poems: 1924-1955*. Trans. Keeley, Edmund and Philip Sherard. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967. Print.
Showalter, Elaine. *Sexual Anarchy*. London: Virago Press, 1992. Print.
Siegel, Kristi. "Intersections: Women's Travel and Theory." *Gender, Genre, & Identity in Women's Travel Writing*. Ed. Siegel, Kristi. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 2004. 1-11. Print.
---. "Women's Travel and the Rhetoric of Peril: It Is Suicide to Be Abroad." *Gender, Genre, & Identity in Women's Travel Writing*. Ed. Siegel, Kristi. New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc., 2004. 55-72. Print.
Smith, Agnes. *Through Cyprus*. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1887. Print.
Stephanides, Stephanos. *Blue Moon in Rajasthan and Other Poems*. Nicosia: Kochlias Publications, 2005. Print.
---. "I Land Home in the Waft of Sibyls with Their Ruthful Smiles." *The New Symposium: Poets and Writers on What We Hold in Common*. Eds. Ďurovičovà, Nataŝa and Christopher Merrill. Iowa City: Autumn Hill Books & 91st Meridian Books, 2012. 271-77. Print.
---. "Imagining the Homeland in Translation: Cyprus between East and West, between Hellenism and Postcoloniality." *Beyond the Western Tradition* Ed. Rose, Marilyn Gaddis. Vol. XI. Binghampton: SUNY, 2000. 53-65. Print.
---. "An Island in Translation." *Kunapipi* XXXIII.1-2 (2011): 42-53. Print.
---. "A Litany in My Slumber." *CounterText*, No. 1.'Postcolonial Springs' Special Issue (Autumn 2014 (forthcoming)). Print.
---. "Rhapsody on a Dragoman." *Cadences: A Journal of Literature and the Arts in Cyprus* 8 (Fall 2012). Print.
---. "Transculturating for Worldiness." *Journal of Global Cultural Studies* 1 (2006): 20-22. Print.
---. "The Wind under My Lips." *Cadences: A Journal of the Literature and the Arts in Cyprus* 5 (2009): 102-10. Print.
Stephanides, Stephanos, and Andis P. Hadjiodysseos. "Translation (Cyprus)." *Encyclopedia of Post-Colonial Literatures in English*. Eds. Benson, Eugene and

L.W. Conolly. Second ed. Vol. 3. London and New York: Routledge, 2005. 1568-69. Print.
Suleri, Sara. *The Rhetoric of English India*. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press, 1992. Print.
Times, The Cyprus. *The Cyprus Times* 21 August 1880. Print.
Tournay-Theodotou, Petra. "The Empire Writes Back: Anti-Colonial Nationalism in Costas Montis' *Closed Doors* and Rodis Roufos' *the Age of Bronze*." Eds. Faustmann, Hubert and Nicos Peristianis. Mannheim und Möhnesee: Bibliopolis, 2006. Print.
Tournay-Theodotou, Petra "Colonial Encounters: Lawrence Durrell's *Bitter Lemons of Cyprus*." *Lawrence Durrell and the Greek World*. Ed. Lillios, Anna. Selinsgrove and London: Susquehanna University Press, 2004. 158-68. Print.
Vasiliou, Marios. "Cypriot English Literature: A Stranger at the Feast Locally and Globally." *Kunapipi* XXXIII.1-2 (2011): 83-93. Print.
Vassiliadou, Myria. "Questioning Nationalism: The Patriarchal and National Struggles of Cypriot Women within a European Context." *European Journal of Women's Studies* 9.4 (2002): 459-82. Print.
Vázquez-Arroyo, Antonio Y. "Universal History Disavowed: On Critical Theory and Postcolonialism." *Postcolonial Studies* 11.4 (2009): 451-73. Print.
Viswanathan, Gauri *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1989. Print.
Walder, Dennis. "Introduction: The Persistence of Nostalgia." *Postcolonial Nostalgias: Writing, Representation, and Memory*. Ed. Walder, Dennis. New York and London: Routledge, 2011. 1-23. Print.
White, Hayden. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1978. Print.
Williams, Raymond. *The Country and the City*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973. Print.
Yashin, Mehmet. "Introduction." *Step-Mothertongue: From Nationalism to Multi-Culturalism: Literature of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey*. Ed. Yashin, Mehmet. London: Middlesex University Press, 2000. Print.
---. "Three Generations, Three Identities, Three 'Patriae' within Twentieth-Century Cypriot Poetry." *Cyprus and Its People: Nation, Identity, and Experience in an Unimaginable Community, 1955-1997*. Ed. Calotychos, Vangelis. Colorado and Oxford: Westview Press, 1998. 223-33. Print.
Young, Robert J.C. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995. Print.
---. "World Literature and Postcolonialism." *The Routledge Companion to World Literature*. Eds. Theo D'Haen, David Damrosch and Djelal Kadir. New York: Routledge, 2012. 213-22. Print.
Παπαλεοντίου, Λευτέρης. *Κυπριακά Λογοτεχνικά Περιοδικά Στα Χρόνια Της Αγγλοκρατίας*. Δημοσιεύματα Του Κέντρου Επιστημωνικών Ερευνών Xxxv. Λευκωσία: Στ. Λειβαδιώτη Λτδ., 2001. Print.
---. *Τα Πρώτα Βήματα Της Κυπριακής Λογοτεχνικής Κριτικής*. Λευκωσία: Πολιτιστικές Υπηρεσίες Υπουργείου Παιδείας και Πολιτισμού: Σειρά Διδακτορικών Διατριβών Αρ. 1, 1997. Print.
Σεφέρης. *Ο Σεφέρης Στον Θεοτόκα*. Γιώργος Θεοτόκας Και Γιώργος Σεφέρης: Αλληλογραφία (1930-1966). Ed. (Επιμέλεια), Γ.Π. Σαββίδης. Αθήνα 1975. Print.
Σοφοκλέους, Κλ. Ανδρέας. "Εισαγωγή Στην Ιστορία Του Κυπριακού Τύπου." *Τα Μέσα Μαζικής Ενημέρωσης Στην Κύπρο*. Λευκωσία: Γραφείο Τύπου και Πληροφοριών της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας, 1993. 10-31. Print.

---. *Συμβολή Στην Ιστορία Του Κυπριακού Τύπου*. Β' ed. Vol. Α. Λευκωσία: Εκδοτικός Οίκος Νικοκλής, 2008. Print.
Τενέδιος, Ιάκωβος. "Ανασκόπηση Του Τουρκοκυπριακού Τύπου." *Κυπριακά 1878-1955*. Ed. Ιωαννίδης Κ., Γεώργιος. Λευκωσία: Δήμος Λευκωσίας, 1986. 77-89. Print.