



კულტურათაშორისი კომუნიკაციები  
**INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATIONS**  
**МЕЖКУЛЬТУРНЫЕ КОММУНИКАЦИИ**

**INTERCULTURAL RELATIONS SOCIETY**

---

**ISSN 1512-4363**

*საერთაშორისო სამეცნიერო-პერიოდული გამოცემა*  
*International scientific periodical edition*  
*Международное научно-периодическое издание*

**კულტურათაშორისი კომუნიკაციები**

**INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATIONS**

**МЕЖКУЛЬТУРНЫЕ КОММУНИКАЦИИ**



**№23**

**თბილისი – Tbilisi – Тбилиси**  
**2014**

UDC (უკ) 008 (100)

კ-897

**მთავარი რედაქტორი** ინდირა ძაგანია  
**Editor-in-chief** Indira Dzagania  
**Главный редактор** Индира Дзагания

**რედაქტორები**  
ლირა გაბუნია  
ოლღა პეტრიაშვილი  
მარინე ტურავა  
ირინე ჯობავა  
ირმა ზაკარაია

**Editors**  
Lira Gabunia  
Olga Petriashvili  
Marina Turava  
Irina Jobava  
Irma Zakaraia

**Редакторы**  
Ли́ра Габу́ния  
Ольга Пётриашви́ли  
Ма́рина Турава  
Ирина Джобава  
Ирма Закара́я

**კომპიუტერული რედაქტირება**  
რობერტ მესხი

**Computer Editing**  
Robert Meskhi

**Компьютерное редактирование**  
Роберт Месхи

**პასუხისმგებელი მდივანი**  
ლიანა გვასალია

**Executive Secretary**  
Liana Gvasalia

**Ответственный секретарь**  
Лиана Гвасалия

### სარედაქციო საბჭო

ჯონი აფაქიძე (საქართველო), დელვინ ჰარნიშჩი (აშშ), ბილალ დინდარი (თურქეთი), ქემალ აბდულა (აზერბაიჯანი), ენდრიუ ჰარისი (დიდი ბრიტანეთი), მარია კორნელია ბარლიბა (რუმინეთი), დორის ფოგელი (ავსტრია), სვეტლანა ტერ-მინასოვა (რუსეთი), პეტრე კონონენკო (უკრაინა), გიორგი პოპა (მოლდავეთი), ილონა მანელიდუ (საბერძნეთი), ილიას უსთუნერი (თურქეთი), ანა აგრანატი (ისრაელი), ლალა ანმედოვა (აზერბაიჯანი), აიტენ მუსტაფაევა (აზერბაიჯანი), დავით გოცირიძე (საქართველო), ლეონიდე ჯახაია (საქართველო), მიხეილ ბოგუცკი (პოლონეთი), ვილემ ჰენდრიკ დე ბოფორტი (ნიდერლანდების სამეფო), ვენტა კოცერე (ლატვია), ჟანა ტოლისბაევა (ყაზახეთი), ზაირინისო იუსუფი (ტაჯიკეთი), მერი მადარშახი (საფრანგეთი), რობერტო რიჩი (იტალია), რობერტო რიჩი (იტალია), იორდან ლიუცკანოვი (ბულგარეთი), ქემალ მაკილი-ალიევი (აზერბაიჯანი), ირინა ანდრიუშენკო (უკრაინა), მარია დიმასი (საბერძნეთი), რიტსუკო ინოუ (იაპონია), ალა საინენკო (მოლდავეთი), მანუელ ფილიპე დე კოსტა (პორტუგალია), რომან დიაკონი (ლატვია).

### Editorial Board

Joni Apakidze (Georgia), Delwyn Harnisch (USA), Billal Dindar (Turkey), Kamal Abdulla (Azerbaijan), Andrew Harris (Great Britain), Maria Cornelia Barliba (Romania), Doris Fögel (Austria), Svetlana Ter-Minasova (Russia), Peter Kononenko (Ukraine), Gheorghe Popa (Moldova), Iona Manelidu (Greece), Ilyas Ustunyer (Turkey), Ann Agranat (Israel), Lala Akhmedova (Azerbaijan), Ayten Mustafaeva (Azerbaijan), David Gotsiridze (Georgia), Leonid Jakhiaia (Georgia), Mikhael Bogutski (Poland), Willem Hendrik de Beaufort (the Netherlands), Venta Kotsere (Latvia), Jhana Tolisbaeva (Kazakhstan), Hairiniso Yusufi (Tajikistan), Mehri Madarshahi (France), Roberto Righi (Italy), Yordan Lyutskanov (Bulgarian), Kamal Makili-Aliyev (Azerbaijan), Irina Andriushenko (Ukraine), Maria Dimasi (Greece), Ritsuko Inoue (Japan), Ala Sainenco (Moldova), Manuel Filipe da Costa (Portugal), Roman Dyakon (Latvia).

### Редакционный совет

Джони Апакидзе (Грузия), Делвин Гарнишч (США), Билял Диндар (Турция), Кямал Абдулла (Азербайджан), Эндрю Харрис (Великобритания), Мария Корнелия Барлиба (Румыния), Дорис Фегель (Австрия), Светлана Тер-Минасова (Россия), Петр Кононенко (Украина), Георгий Попа (Молдова), Илона Манелиду (Греция), Ильяс Устуньер (Турция), Анна Агранат (Израиль), Лала Ахмедова (Азербайджан), Айтен Мустафаева (Азербайджан), Давид Гоциридзе (Грузия), Леонид Джахия (Грузия), Михаил Богущкий (Польша), Виллем Хендрик де Бофорт (Нидерланды), Вента Коцере (Латвия), Жанна Толысбаева (Казахстан), Хайринисо Юсуфи (Таджикистан), Мери Мадаршахи (Франция), Роберто Ричи (Италия), Йордан Люцканов (Болгария), Кямал Макили-Алиев (Азербайджан), Ирина Андриушченко (Украина), Мария Димаси (Греция), Ритсуко Иноуэ (Япония), Алла Сайненко (Молдова), Мануэль Филипе де Коста (Португалия), Роман Дьякон (Латвия).

EAN 9771512 43 6007

**თამარ ხიტერი**  
(საქართველო)

**კოლექტიური არაცნობიერის არქეტიპები ქართულ, ფრანგულ და  
რუსულ სიმბოლიზმში: კონსულტურული ანალიზი**

შეუძლებელია არქეტიპებზე საუბარი, თუ უარყოფთ კოლექტიური არაცნობიერის არსებობას. ეს ის საკითხია, რომელიც დღემდე მწვავე პოლემიკის საგნად რჩება, თუმცა კროსკულტურული ანალიზის დროს, ჩვენ, პრაქტიკულად, მივდივართ იმ დასკვნამდე, რომ ადამიანის გონებაში არსებობს რაღაც შრე, სადაც მისთვის გაუცნობიერებლად ინახება სახეები და სიუჟეტები, რომლებიც, საჭიროების შემთხვევაში, სიმბოლოების მეშვეობით ვლინდება ხელოვნებაში. არქეტიპების თემა ძალიან სათუთია, რადგან უმნიშვნელო გადახრის შემთხვევაშიც კი ჩვენ გადავდივართ ფილოსოფიურ პოლემიკაში, სადაც არ არსებობს მცდარი და მართალი, სადაც დისკუსიის აზრს არა იმდენად ჭეშმარიტების ძიება, არამედ თვით დისკუსიის პროცესი წარმოადგენს. ჩვენ, როგორც ემპირიკოსები, საკუთარ თავს ამის საშუალებას ვერ მივცემთ და არქეტიპებზე ვისაუბრებთ კონკრეტული თვალსაზრისიდან გამომდინარე.

არქეტიპის ცნება (ბერძ. ნიმუში, ფორმა) ანალიტიკურ ფსიქოლოგიაში 1919 წელს კარლ გუსტავ იუნგმა შემოიტანა. ეს ტერმინი გამოიყენებოდა როგორც ქრისტიანობის აპოლოგეტებთან – ირინეოსთან, ავგუსტინესთან, არეოპაგელთან, ასევე იუდეველებთანაც, მაგალითად, ფილონთან.

კარლ იუნგის განმარტებით, არქეტიპი არის „უნივერსალური პირველადი თანდაყოლილი ფსიქიკური სტრუქტურა, რომელიც კოლექტიური არაცნობიერის შინაარსს წარმოადგენს და ვლინდება სიზმრებში, მითებსა და ზღაპრებში“ (3, 281). იუნგი ეყრდნობოდა ნეტარი ავგუსტინეს გამონათქვამს და იმეორებდა, რომ „არქეტიპი არის ფსიქიკური შინაარსის კლასი, რომლებსაც არ აქვთ საკუთარი წყარო ცალკეულ ინდივიდში. ამ შინაარსის სპეციფიკა იმაში მდგომარეობს, რომ მათ აქვთ მთელი კაცობრიობის, როგორც ერთი მთლიანის, თვისებები“ (3, 291).

არქეტიპი, თავისი არსიდან გამომდინარე, არის არქაული ფენომენი, ამიტომაც ის ვლინდება ფოლკლორში, მითებსა და ლიტერატურაში. აუცილებელი პირობა არის ის, რომ არქეტიპს, რომელიც ცნობიერში ირეკლება, უნდა გააჩნდეს სიმბოლო, შეიძლება ერთზე მეტი. ზუსტად ეს არის ის შემთხვევა, რომელიც კვალად გასდევს XX საუკუნის ლიტერატურას. არქეტიპს, როგორც ამბივალენტურ სახეს, გააჩნია დადებითი და უარყოფითი თვისებები. ერთფეროვანი სახე, რომელსაც აქვს მხოლოდ დადებითი (ან მხოლოდ უარყოფითი) თვისება, არ შეიძლება ჩაითვალოს არქეტიპად.

არქეტიპების გამოყენება ყველა ეპოქაში ხდებოდა, თუმცა არასდროს ყოფილა ისეთი აქტუალური, როგორც XX საუკუნეში. სიმბოლისტები, ფუტურისტები, პოსტმოდერნისტები – ყველა მათგანი უარყოფდა მარადიულ ფასეულობებს და თავისი შემოქმედებით, პარადოქსულად, მხოლოდ ამტკიცებდა მათ არსებობას. ტიციან ტაბიქე, შარლ ბოდლერი, პაოლო იაშვილი, კონსტანტინე ბალმონტი, გალაკტიონ ტაბიქე – ყველა მათგანი სასოწარკვეთილი და იმედგაცრუებულია, ექსტერიორისგან ინტერიერში იმალება და შეველას მაინც მარადიულ ძალებს სთხოვს.

**Triantafyllos H. Kotopoulos**

(Greece)

## **THE FIRST HOMELAND BY GEORGE FARSAKIDES AND THE LITERARY REPRESENTATION OF ODESSA**

### **The relation between History and Literature – *In lieu of Introduction***

The alleged objectivity of the science of history, formerly taken for granted, has lately been questioned in a variety of manners. Historiography constitutes an act that intervenes between the historian and his sources, while, in any case, it is being construed as a narrative, becoming thus monitored by each historian's point of view. However, the particular political and social conditions into which a literary piece has been produced, together with the social status and ideology of the writer, continue to form principal research topics. Either consciously or unconsciously, the writer projects his/her own value systems on each piece of work, whilst analyzing, describing, forming a complete and authentic reflection of the experienced realities, but mainly a fragmental and rather interventional depiction. Nevertheless, the historian himself, as a receiver of the innate contradiction of the historical sources as well as the variability of the interpretations of past-time, comes into view through his own selections and, hence, as a co-creator. Historical knowledge has the attribute of textuality that is of the weaving of the historical events together with a process of their linguistic representation and notional construction. Being the primary raw material of historical science, sources themselves do not construe the past itself in its multifarious appearances. They rather constitute textual attestations reflecting contemporary social views on bygone affairs (12, 257). Narrative structures provide a chronicle sense and act as semblances of historicity. It has to be noted here that an annulment of the separation between Literature and History, claiming at a scientific verification, can be traced already in the last half of the previous century (5, 15). This split entitles one to connect the biography of the writer –that is his social and class origin, his ideological fixations, his literary standards and tendencies- with his work and enables relations among many of his works in the context of an intratextual approach (6, 14-15). Nevertheless, one should not neglect that the ways of conception and interpretation of a text can be traced into a social universe expanding along a timeline, and hence conditioned from their historical context. During the 1960s, historiography came into contact with disciplines such as semiotics, linguistics, theory of literature and became influenced by their theoretical and technical approaches. A consequence of such a contact was a "linguistic shift" in the science of History.

By "linguistic shift" we mean the application of a conceptual arsenal and methods of the science of linguistics to historical research. This trend was launched by the American historian Hayden White with the publication of the book *Meta-history: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* 1973 (9). According to White, history constitutes a form of knowledge relevant to that of novel-writing, while he records considerable similarities among historical parole with literary narration. Nevertheless, in his later texts he assures that the fictitious element of the narrative construction does not have an arbitrary character as it incorporates reality and that historical narrations do not construe, but imbue the past with a variability of meanings.

### **Methodological Approach**

A combination of methods of Historical science (control through the historical sources) and literary criticism (simple elements of the theory of narrative and the literary content analysis, when it goes beyond the classical literary reading -that remains simply in search of a thematic meaning

and the involved morals) forms the basic tool in the reading and approaching Farsakides' work titled "The First Homeland". These tools have been used here in an attempt to investigate the writer's ideology, prevailing in his work, but also to aid us reflect on the historical milieu into which the work is actually recorded.

### **George Farsakides (1926 - *fortunately still alive*)**

George Farsakides was born in 1926 in Odessa, USSR. His father, Anastasios Ilias Farsakides, a graduate from the Russian Business School of Istanbul and a deputy director of the Russian Post and Shipping Companies, developed an illegal activity by using Russian ships as a gateway for conscript Christians. Having thus been chased by the Turks, he immigrated to Odessa, where he married Elena Dmitrievna, a descendant of a wealthy family in the city.

The Farsakides family arrived in Greece in 1934, when the author was still eight (8) years old. The Second World War and the German occupation marked George's development. From an early age he joined the Resistance against German occupation, and was wounded in a battle against the Germans, becoming crippled in both his hands. He spent in total 16,5 years in concentration camps. During his exile (Macronisos, Ai Stratis, Yaros, Leros), he came in contact with a considerable number of Greek intellectuals and artists -perhaps the most remarkable ones at the time- and took part at numerous cultural activities (theatrical performances, prop-design, literature readings, philosophical discussions and many other). Having himself been a self-taught painter, he draws intensively and attempts the making of his first etchings drawing his themes from the lives of inmates and the struggles of the Greek people. During a period of many imprisonments and exiles, he worked as a cartoonist in "Avgi" (Dawn) newspaper, while, after the shutdown of the camps, he served as a correspondent in "Rizospastis" (The Radical One). After the Reconstitution of Democracy, he made a number of note-worthy exhibitions of painting and engraving, while having been a co-author in several books.

In 1964 the book *Macronisos* was printed and given for publication. Its multifarious content involved Farsakides' etchings made over pencil sketches that he managed to save from confiscation during his exile in the island of Macronisos. The book also involved his own texts as well as texts by known and unknown writers of that period (Ritsos, Loudemis). The publication was the first book containing visual and textual evidence denominating the tormentors and the crimes committed against the exiled. In spite of the positive reviews, a prosecution submitted by D. Ioannides (that was accepted by The Greek legal authorities) resulted to the book's immediate withdrawal and the arrest of the author. The fall of the military dictatorship, however, was followed by lots of successive reprints.

In 1981 *First Homeland* was published and awarded the "Menelaos Loudemis" prize by the "Society of Greek Writers". The book actually marks the beginning of Farsakidis' writing career.

So the books that follow are: *I never became twenty* (1983, Skitali), *Places of Exile* (Macronisos, Agios Stratis, Gyaros, Leros) (1992), *Medicinal Lies and "Profane» Approaches* (2004), *Eleven Days and Three Years of the Civil War* (2004, Nisides), the scrapbook *As you set out for Ithaca ...* (2006, Typoekdotiki), *Of Early Youth* (2007, Typoekdotiki), the scrapbook *Of Love and Loneliness* (2007, Typoekdotiki), *A Disgraceful Agreement and the Holocaust of Hortiatis* (2011), the scrapbook *Thessaloniki, rambling in old times and old neighborhoods* (2011), *Stoicism and the Need for New Gods* (2012) and so goes on....

### **The first homeland**

The reception of the book by the critics was excellent and the book won the "Menelaos Loudemis" prize by the Society of Greek Writers. The work can be considered as one of the first

multimodal texts in Greece -though the particular term was completely unknown to the author. Here Farsakides blends written text with visual material consisting of photographs, postcards, or artwork directly related to the time and the place of Odessa and to people, known or unknown, who act as the book's characters.

An arbitrary literary classification of the book seems difficult, since its content vacillates between two genres: namely, those of memoirs and fictional autobiography. The visit to his native land by the author after 30 years of absence, serves as an excuse for the writing of such a book.

The book refers to Farsakides' childhood in Odessa, and through retrospective narratives covers past personal events (the relocation of his father there, his mother's wealthy family's lifestyle) or events related to the city's own history, its social structure, its intellectual and cultural life, as well as the new economic data after the Bolshevik revolution of 1917. The area of the city constitutes a nostalgic eutopian creative scene that becomes contrasted with the dystopian space of exile camps which emerges through interceding projections to the future. It has to be noted here, that, in every case, a complete scenery is presented, since the actions of the characters together with their personality and general behaviour are affected by the space and the incidents of the particular time to which their description points at. On the other hand, the detailed references to the structured, natural, and historical-political milieu of the city construe a glorious, yet fictionalized, Odessa, with its neo-classic buildings, its Opera, its most well-known streets -"Derabasovskaya": the very central street of Odessa -and certainly one of the most well-known streets in whole Russia (9), the old mansions, the museums, the statue of Richelieu and the famous bust-monument/statue of Pushkin (15), and with its main avenue -*all presented to show up as* "a fragment of the ideal and the inaccessible" (15).

*The First Homeland* is Farsakides' first writing venture. And this is probably where the book's charming "shortcoming" lies upon, namely the lack of chapters. Little vignettes run across the text together with the images and the meaningful sequences among them. The whole project lies far from becoming considered as a product of mass culture -characterized by a plentiful of conventionalities, merely intending to fill up the reader's leisure time. The author goes beyond the established order; he does not consider his art neither a shelter, nor a refuge from reality, since this would ratify and perpetuate the essence of such reality. He reminisces, contemplates, and yet denounces ways of thinking that sink into the subjectivism and pseudo-individualism of the mass culture. In a pure, clear and uncompromising manner, the author incorporates into the internal structure of his work the fundamental contradictions of human society.

Farsakides uses an interchange between a homodiegetic first person narrator - that is the dominant character - and a heterodiegetic omniscient third person. In the first case, the literary qualities of the author either as the eight year old Yuri or as the 'Greco' father or as a Russian mother, are significantly highlighted, since the author manages to capture the unflagging interest of the reader through a suspenseful narration. He provides us with a high reading enjoyment, often assisted by a humorous tone. This can be easily recognised in the mother's narration where she points that she deliberately left the purchased packet of olives in the grocery, so that Anastasis would feel obliged to accompany her to the shop in order to get it back: "*So, we walk together, we have almost reached the house, but nothing yet; I say to myself: Virgin Mary please shed your holly light in his mind and make him bolder, make him touch my hand so that I'll pull it on me, as every decent girl should do [...] Nothing. He kept on talking, just talking! I was hardly listening to him. What do you want, I said to myself. You want me to make the first move? We were just outside the door when, at last, he reached my hand for a hand kissing. I was late in drawing it to me, but who cares? He wished me goodnight and left jaywalking with the packet in his hands. . . .*" (42). Farsakides makes an unique use of the binaries Greek father/compassion and humanism vs Russian mother/humour and stamina, while letting the characters themselves praise either each other or be

praised by secondary personae. In such a manner, he accomplishes their mythical nature, while integrating them as fictional heroes.

The omniscient narrator has the prestige of an authority that allows him have a historical bird's overview. He can compare political regimes and restore the historical truth through a linear narrative regarding the history of the revolution. In this case, however, a didactic disposition cannot be avoided. This seems present in the text and also waded with a mentality that compels the author to defend whatever positive or –and contempt whatever negative- happened after the Russian Revolution "*Fascism in Europe and the ghost of another war accelerate, in fact, the pace of socialist construction [...] The only way out is that the country's supplies to be taken over by the cooperative sector of production -namely the collective. The Soviet government is compelled to take strict administrative measures*"(144).

### **The Greek community of Odessa**

The history of the city of Odessa starts in 1792 with the signing of the Treaty of Iasion, which, among others, procured for Russia territories on the north coast of the Black Sea. Then the Empress Catherine decides on the creation of a new town in the territory of Hadji bey near the ruins of an ancient Greek colony. The city of Odessa is born with total solemnity two years later in 1794 (10; 17, 105; 18, 57-58). The presence of the Greek community in Odessa is detected at a very early age, a fact reasoned to a large extent on the sympathy that Catherine fostered for the enslaved Greeks but also on her dream for the revival of the Byzantine Empire. The Greeks had settled there even before the establishment of Odessa. Notably, at the inauguration of the city, they accommodated the Russian soldiers who had come for the festive ceremonies. Gradually, the presence of Greeks becomes even more pronounced, as they capitalize on the privileges granted to them by the empress. Odessa thus becomes a mosaic of ethnic communities within which the Greeks have a particularly privileged position. Characteristic is the fact that their strong commercial activity will highlight Odessa within a few years as the third richest city in Russia after Moscow and St Petersburg (10; 17, 105; 18, 57-58).

In *First Homeland* the fictional constitution of the Greek community of Odessa is carried out by means of memory and the presentation of the author's childhood heroes. The Greek Charitable Community, the Church of the Holy Trinity, the Greek Rodokanakeion School for Girls and the Greek Labour School stand out. The Greek Charitable Community was established to financially support all the Greeks, who after the Crimea war experienced the strong economic decline that prevailed throughout Odessa, while at the same time trying to contend with the attempted assimilation and russification. The decline and the end of the Community will occur after 1917. The wealthiest Greeks will resort to countries in Western Europe, while in Odessa those who are inclined toward communism will remain (8).

The writer describes and names for the first time some of his father's close Greek friends of his father with his characteristic humour. The reference is to Mrs Froso and Mr. Dimitros, whose surname mother always finds it difficult to utter correctly and instead of Synothinos, she calls him "*Synody –nós, always stressing separately the last syllable of the name*" (99). The Greeks' large nose is their distinguishing feature which gives them entry to the Greek Charitable Community by the locals "*And how will I differentiate them from our own? The policeman asks his superior with legitimate ignorance. \_ When you see anyone with a large nose, let him pass, he answers. If you see someone smallnosed, he is ours, so grab him by the nape and out- understood?*"(99). Mrs Froso has finished the Greek School for Girls in Odessa and makes the author's mother wonder about her incongruous match with her husband "*Whatever you say, an educated woman shows it. Now, how she matched with her husband ... Who knows? The man may have hidden charms, she finishes with guile*" (100). Through a morning walk with his father, the Greek Church of the Holy Trinity is



described, founded with the empress's donations and completed with the contributions of expatriate Greeks "Those who decided on the rich internal decoration mustn't have felt sorry about the gold used ...[.] Fate and sovereign wanted it to become the symbol of a struggling nation, the patriarchate's head - which was always hostile to the very idea of a national revival. Which had always had urged into submission and had anathematised so many times the revolutionary people" (102-103). The historic value of the church of the Holy Trinity is unarguably great and the writer does not fail to point it out in a few lines. The temple had hosted for about 50 years the Patriarch Grigorios E' corpse, while there were also the tombs of great Greek benefactors of Odessa. However, it is a regrettable fact that the temple stopped celebrating for a period with the prevalence of Bolsheviks. It was ransacked, the silver iconostasis was stripped down, and while at the same time the tombs of Ypsilantis, Rodokanakis, Maximos and Maraslis were opened for the possibility that the dead corpses hid with them anything valuable (10; 17, 99-103).

There is also a reference to the Greek Labour School (it was constituted upon the re-organization of the Greek Rodokanakeion School for Girls after the USSR Revolution), the school which he attended as a student. It is a public school with a lot of free provisions (breakfast milk, books, tickets) to all those who wished to be trained on the Greek language. The ultimate scope was to strengthen the knowledge of Greek and hence the philhellenism throughout the Russia's territory (4).

The author also refers to the dramatic reduction of Greeks in Odessa after the final supremacy of "Revolution in Odessa", which he calculates as much fewer than the thirty thousand who the Greek community originally had. He even records a memorandum of the then President E. Pavlidis to the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the disastrous effect of the Greek military campaign in Ukraine (104-105).

### **The identity of Greeks in Odessa**

The **human geography** of Odessa is attributed through the descriptions of the writer's family's Greek friends. There are indicative references to Captain Manolis of Cretan origin -little George is puzzled of the fact that half Cretans are called Manolis and the other half is called captain even if they have no relation to the sea, uncle Lambros, guardian of Artel (a cooperative venture where Farsakides's father used to work) originating from an island in the Aegean Sea, but also to his father's Constantinople origin (101, 140). It is significant that the census for the inhabitants of Odessa in 1897 shows that the main mass of Greeks in Odessa comes from the islands of the Aegean in 40.6 per cent, while in a 12.8% is identified as Greeks coming from Istanbul and the surrounding areas (16)..

The Greeks are characterised by an intense **religious sentiment** and at the same time the soteriologic discovery of human assertion over ravages of time, **the reminiscence of the fatherland** is emphatically represented through the experience of memory. In Proust' *In search of lost time(Remembrance of Things Past)* , little Marcel is experiencing the exploration of mental space between the conscious and the unconscious, starting with the description of immense euphoria that the narrator felt by biting a small piece of madeleine. A few olives have the same mental function in Farsakides's work and confirm that the actual Art – not as a simple descriptive representation of life, but as an art that involves another dimension elusive to us when we live, that of time- is a record of the human internal, intellectual and mental adventure. The grocer Mr. Nontas always keeps a jar (of olives) hidden for his own consumption during the period of Sarakosti (40 days of Lent), which he does not want to sell even when the olives have finished, arguing that they are part of his soul and his home of "*Poor man I am, foreign, alone. Lent tomorrow, a little olive I have to eat to remember home. He come: give, give, give. Here! Take my soul to eat. Aman! to get rid of you*" (41). The religiousness of the Greeks is also reflected in another incident, when the

author's father requires from his future wife to take an oath that she has not got a child, as she told him publicly, when she was jealous of one of his old flirts *"Put your hand on the icons and swear to me"* (48).

It is worth mentioning that the **nostalgia** of Greeks cannot be eased by love at the new home. The guard at Artel (a cooperative venture where Farsakides's father had worked), uncle Lambros *"with his white big moustache on his rotund face"* originating from an island of the Aegean Sea, which is not specifically named, sits for a long time on the beach and reminisces his fatherland by saying to himself *"I have ties, I gave my best to this place, and yet how much would I like destiny to let me close my eyes on the island!"* (141).

Another element which confirms this longing of the members of the Greek community for their own country is the reference to the great artistic Attic's troupe (Kleonas Triantafyllou) and indirectly to the **cultural activity of the city**. The author's father describes the people who flocked to the theater to hear Attic's songs, but also the thrill caused in the room when they heard that song for the foreign land, describing a Greek's Christmas far away from home and his relatives (118-120).

**The relations between the Greeks** in Odessa were close as they attempted to maintain the traditions and customs of their homeland, but also to remain faithful to the values and ideals of their race. Family or friendly gatherings, the "tables" were common either in exceptional events – the formalization of a matrimony in this case- with the backing known songs in their homeland as the "Nerantzoula" (Little Sour Orange Tree)(48) or in major celebrations such as Christmas and Easter (178-188, 187). Their solidarity in order to overcome difficult situations is remarkable (99-101). Therefore it is not surprising that Mr. Synodinos has images and heroes of his homeland from the revolution of 1821 in his store, reminding and keeping alive the allure of the Greeks' liberation struggle (99). It should be noted that, in addition to the funny side of the pronunciation of his name by the author's mother, Dimitris Synodinos was a man with a strong personality and it is characteristic that even Kazantzakis says that he had met him in his shoe shop, which was then on the ground floor of the Company of Friends house (10; 17, 99-101).

The writer, through the his mother's stories on how she got to know her husband, contrasts the ethos and the integrity of his father's nature with the other Greeks' strong "**extroversion**" and "mediterranean temperament", who from the very first dance "tried to touch", something that was not that agreeable with local girls (42). Farsakides' Greek, Anastasi Ilic gradually gained everybody trust and sympathy, despite the fact that originally he had not been accepted by the author's mother's family of the mother being treated under the stereotypes of the foreigner. Through the walks of groom and father-in-law to the Greek cafes of road Gretseskaya, one of the most commercial streets in Odessa, and their humouristic narrations for the Turkish coffee (44), but also for the economic well-being of Greek traders (50-54) a notion emerges that simultaneously **the heart of the whole trade of the city was beating** there.

The particular personality of the author's father illuminates to a certain extent **the relationships that have developed in a number of cases between the two peoples**, which among others were related by the "same religion". Little Yuri is heavily influence by the personal relationship with his neighbour and friend Ivan Mercourievic or uncle Vanya, as he prefers to call him. For Vanya Anastasi Ilic become his closest companion *"I opened my soul to you to get this off my chest [ ...] I fell you closest even from my closest, because I know that you are touched by the foreigner's pain. I know that and I love you more for that"*(85). The Greek, the foreigner, is now his co-walker, his friend, his brother. The same love and friendship is depicted in the mother's instructions of mother to a mature Farsakides who will travel in 1965 as a tourist in Odessa to meet again with his favourite friends from the past. There is also a touching reference to his visiting the family friend- now an old lady- Maria Sergeievna *"I open the bags with gifts on the table trying to explain through groans and exclamations who I am and where I come from. Maria Sergeievna does*

not hear very well. With her left hand on her ear, the other making the sign of the cross and sweeping her eyes. - Ach! So many things ... my precious Yelena Dimitrievna, my little soul, you did not forget us. And Anastasi Ilic ... how sad was I! He hurried, he hurried very much to leave us... Let the soil that covers him be light" (19). The moment when Maria Sergeievna, who initially does not recognize Yuri (George Farsakides), passing with the Reds, becomes aware of her visitor's identity is very poignant "Aaaach! I should be killed for my stupidity. All this time and I... So you are yourself, our Liolia's Yurik!" (19).

The reference to Panagiotis Tomboulidis, mathematician and director of the 10-classes Greek school and party responsible for the Greek community highlights the role of Greeks in the **revolutionary upbringing** of Greek workers of Odessa "and the elimination of the antirevolutionary position that the wealthy leadership of most Greek communities of Russia was taking" (117). The writer describes characteristically, that Tomboulidis was the man who had major influence on his father but also on many other Greeks for the ideals of the Russian Revolution. He was particularly popular among the Community, an ideologue Bolshevik and he wanted to see justice applied to all classes and not just the elites. It should be noted that Panagiotis Tomboulidis was originally a bootblack in Odessa, where he struggled and was deprived of many things in order to earn his living (2, 117-122).

The author is particularly concerned about his family's possession of the house in Krasny Pereuluc street, number 18, where the members of the Company of Friends adjourned. The writer will refer for the first time to this particular building, which is located in the historical center of Odessa, near the Gretseskaya street, during his early narration (20) highlighting the significance it had for him and his family - especially his father. Intermediately on page 106 we read on the wall plate of the entry door "*Here The Company of Friends adjourned*". At the end (221) we will be informed that there the family will gather all its belongings, prior to their final departure from Odessa. It is noteworthy that the author uses quotation marks to designate it as "*our home*", while immediately it names it without any punctuation marks "*the small house of the Society of Friends*". Trying to trace the history of this house, we will see that the original owner was G. Maraslis, when the first meetings of the members of the Company of Friends start. Farsakides himself informs us through the mission of M. Karavia, that in 1923 the house's ownership passed to his father. He does not know how the title deeds got in his father's hands, but he is certain that he took it in order to maintain it for patriotic mainly reasons. According to some information given to us by Karavia, the ownership of the house after Maraslis's family ended up in the hands of the church which Farsakides's father was able to purchase it from. His anxiety is obvious about its possible demolition for the reconstruction of the surrounding area and he seeks to get assurances by colonel Popov, an official from the Kremlin who during the occupation period was head of the Soviet delegation in Greece, that the house will remain intact. He even mentions with bitterness, that no official from the Greek government has bothered about the fate and the history of this house (10; 17, 20).

### **The Greek military corps and the decline of the Greek community**

The decline and the gradual weakening that the Greek community will experience the years after the revolution will be culminated with the huge wave of Greeks leaving from Odessa and the withdrawal of the Greek military corps, who had arrived in the area in 1919. This Greek military campaign would prove fatal not only for the Greeks in Odessa, but also for the entire Greek population of the Black Sea region. From this point then, a large part of Greek starts to be treated as enemies by the Russians, who until then considered the Greeks as the right hand of God (103-110). Venizelos, seeking to ensure a favorable response to the territorial claims of his country at the expense of Turkey and Bulgaria, put at the disposal of the forces of Entente two of the three

military divisions he had. A total of 23,351 soldiers who took part in the war against the Bolshevik admittedly became the most also effective part of the Allied forces. The largest proportion of the Greeks living in Odessa was awaiting the arrival of Greek military corps. They were convinced by the words of Venizelos, hoped to take back Constantinople, the lost lands and the argument that the path which leads to Thrace and Asia Minor passes first through Russia, had become a song: "From Russia there is/a wide street to Izmir" (13, 276; 14).

Farsakides selects his mother as the narrator of the day the Greeks in Odessa expected to greet their compatriots as heroes *"We had been listening for a long time They will come, they will come and they will immediately straighten the mess [ ...] One day the army arrived and we all went down to greet them like heroes[ ...] Joh my god, what was that! Tired, unshaven, mishappen [ ...] I am looking at Anastasi, the others awkwardly, as if to say: -these poor people will save us?"* (109-111). Conflicts and losses came quickly about. The Greek Community will take care with every formalization of the Greek soldiers' funerals. Here there is a characteristic description of Farsakidis's father to his son, whom he consistently showed to a small hillock on the road to the green beach of Arkadia, telling him that there our compatriots lie, those who will never return to Greece *"The dead of the Ukrainian military campaign"* (113).

Under the weight of these losses the military corps is forced to give in. But along with it a large part of the Greek community will also leave Odessa. Venizelos's decision for the Greek forces to participate along Entente is heavily criticised, because it had the effect of turning the Bolsheviks' anger and hatred against the biggest part of Greek diaspora in southern Russia (13, 277). However, at this point it should be noted the fact that the Bolsheviks' wrath according to Avgitides was carried out mainly to the bourgeoisie of the Greek communities, which assisted the occupying troops in every possible way. In contrast, the working classes who stayed away from the military corps and drafted with the Soviet authorities had a better treatment. For example, the verification of the above comes again through Farsakides's descriptions for his father, who was fascinated by the human ideal of the revolution and was awarded several times with awards and recognitions for his contribution (2; 17, 117-122). The author insists on the relationship developed between the Greeks of the working class and the Greeks of the military corps, who came to fight them. Despite the fact that they were rivals and fighting for different ideals, the continuous effort of the Greek working class to persuade their fellow countrymen to defect and turn back in Greece is prominent. It was finally accomplished after the Greek soldiers were convinced by the many losses they had suffered. We should emphasise that the military corps does not return home unprotected, as people by Odessa and the red army accompany them to Dniester (Nistru) (138-140). In these descriptions and the discussions between the author's father and his friend, Uncle Lambros a different view of the action of the members of the Greek community is highlighted. It is now clear that the majority of Greeks are people of the working class. The bourgeoisie and the authorities have left Odessa, soon after the hasty withdrawal of the Greek military corps as well as most of them have started to help and support in every way the foreign occupying troops that had come in order to suppress the revolution. This political act of course, as Avgitides notes, does not leave unaffected the authorities of workers and farmers in Ukraine, who inform the Greek authorities, that the Greek bourgeoisie in the region will suffer the consequences of the Greek's military corps' participation. This status of continuous violence and threats led thousands of bourgeois into going to Greece, leaving behind their livelihoods and fortunes. The decline of the Greek community of Odessa was inevitable (2; 17, 138-141).

### **Concluding remarks**

The new historicism determines the textuality of history either as an interweaving of language and historical fact, such as this is described in sources and historiographic projects, or as

an analysis of the historical time under terms of textual approach. This is an interpretative version which focuses on the textuality of history and at the same time the emergence of the historicity of texts and has as a starting point the idea that language creates and codifies reality (12, 292-293). Nevertheless, the issue of relations between History and Literature is not exhaustive and has not ceased to concern modern scholars of both fields. This modern concept for history, even though in its most radical expression leads to relativism which discredits the scientificity of the historic work by identifying it to the historical narrative, has offered new opportunities for the interpretation of the world as well as the deepening of history itself.

As history is doomed to always arrive at a relative truth, most modern historians commentate on the importance of observation of the everyday life of social groups to approach that "truth" in order to avoid the trap of static history (15, 199). In our efforts to highlight a historic period, the study of works of fiction "which are seated in the periphery of History" reveal to us the structure of sensing previous eras and contribute through the narrative to the transmission of lived experience (1, 125). The writers who represent historical periods in their fictions are up to a certain extent historians too who choose and retrace the events they present. And Farsakides belongs to this category. We should not forget though that in these works we "listen" to storytellers and protagonists talking through a system with meanings and codes and not the facts themselves. There is always a risk that the authors are less interested in the search for historical truth through personal interpretation of facts and more in the way in which the themes they present meet the readership's expectations.

Nonetheless, Farsakides's are not read texts today by the general public, without this being associated with its prose virtues or weaknesses. This particular left discourse articulates marks the history of his work's reception and gives to many an alibi for his marginalisation and to others a justification for trying to make him ideologically theirs.

#### *Literature:*

1. Apostolidou V. Secular memory and construction of feeling in fiction for the civil war: from the Iron Gates to Trespass, Scientific Symposium: Historic reality and Neohellenic fiction (1945-1995).
2. Avgitides K. Greek pontiacs and the young Soviet power, 1st scientific conference of the Club of Caucasians in Kalamaria, 11-12-13/05/2007
1. <http://www.users.sch.gr/aetow1963/pon4.htm> (προσβ. 14 Μαρτίου 2012).
2. Avgitides K. The Greeks in Odessa Region and the Revolution of 1821, Dodoni, Athens - Giannena 1994.
3. Avgitides K. The Greek schools in Odessa Region: 1816-1936, Dodoni, Athens - Giannena 2000.
4. Barthes R. *Historie et literature: à propos de Racine*», Annales ESC, III, 1960, Volume 15.
5. Bourdieu P. *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, greek transl. Efi Giannopoulou, Patakis Publications, Athes 2002.
6. Encyclopedia of Major Greek Expatiates, Odessa (Ukraine, Contemporary Years), Kardasis V. 2008, <http://www.ehw.gr/I.aspx?id=11097> (accessed in 3<sup>rd</sup> of April 2012).
7. Encyclopedia of Major Greek Expatiates, Greek Charitable Community of Odessa, Maris J. tsl. A.Aboutis, 2007, <http://www.ehw.gr/I.aspx?id=11528>, (accessed in 29<sup>th</sup> of March 2012).
8. Hayden W. H. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

9. Karavi M. Odessa, a forgotten Greek homeland (2<sup>nd</sup> part), <http://www.ert-archives.gr/V3/public/main/page-assetview.aspx?tid=0000008005&tsiz=0&autostart=0> (accessed in 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2012).
10. Karavia M. Odessa, a forgotten Greek homeland, (2<sup>nd</sup> part), <http://www.ert-archives.gr/V3/public/main/page-assetview.aspx?tid=0000006430&tsiz=0&autostart=0>, (accessed in 2<sup>nd</sup> of April 2012).
11. Kokkinos G. Form history to histories, pub. Ellinika Grammata, Atghens, 1998.
12. Koliopoulos I. History of Greece form 1800. The construction and employment of national policy. Vaniass, Thessaloniki, 2002
13. Benlisoy F. [Tribute to The Russian Revolution] From Russia there is/a wide street to Izmir, the greek participation to the campign of Entente against the new soviet state, trs. VeliziotisN., Vagdoutis N2011.
14. <http://rednotebook.gr/details.php?id=4077>, ( accessed in 26<sup>th</sup> March 2012).
15. Pauline Schmitt – Pantel, Collective Activities and the Political in the Greek City, The Greek City. From Homer to Alexander, Oswyn Murray and Simon Price (eds), Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1990.
16. Sifnaiou E. The Greek Community of Odessa in the late 19th c. Institute of Neohellenic Studies, National Institute of Research., <http://www.uadphilecon.gr/UA/files/186745598...-pdf>, (accessed in 14<sup>th</sup> March 2012).
17. Farsakides G. The first Homeland, ed. Typoekdotiki, Athens 1981.
18. Chasiotis I. Katsiarides-Hering O. Kardasis B. Charlaftis G. Georgitsogianni E. Greeks in Diaspora 15<sup>th</sup> -21<sup>st</sup> cen., ed. Chasiotis I., Katsiaridis-Hering, O., Abatzi A. pub. Greek Parliament, Athens, 2006. [http://www.hellenicparliament.gr/UserFiles/f3c70a23-7696-49db-9148-f24dce6a27c8/CD\\_1-115.pdf](http://www.hellenicparliament.gr/UserFiles/f3c70a23-7696-49db-9148-f24dce6a27c8/CD_1-115.pdf) , (accessed in 17th March 2012).

**ტრიანტაფილუს კოტოპოულუსი  
გიორგი ფარსაკიდესის „პირველი სამშობლო“ და ოდესის  
ლიტერატურული წარმოდგენა  
რეზიუმე**

სტატიაში საუბარია თანამედროვე უკრაინაში ოდესის ბერძნული დიასპორის ლიტერატურულ წარმოდგენაზე, რომელიც აღწერილია გიორგი ფარსაკიდესის რომანში „პირველი სამშობლო“. ბერძნული მართლმადიდებლური ეკლესიის მიერ შექმნილი ბერძენთა დასახლებები, სკოლებისა და საგანმანათლებლო დაწესებულებების ჩამოყალიბება, „მეგობართა საზოგადოების“ კონსტიტუცია, ბერძენი სამხედროების მონაწილეობა ბოლშევიკთა წინააღმდეგ წარმოაჩენს ბერძენთა მნიშვნელოვან როლს ამ ტერიტორიაზე და ფართოიდეოლოგიური კონტექსტის ფორმირებაში, რომელიც ეკუთვნის მთელ ეპოქას და ღირებულებების გაბატონებულ სისტემას.