ORAL TRADITIONAL FORM IN THE KARAGIOZIS PERFORMANCE

Because the oral traditional performer does not maintain a conscious aesthetic, it is unlikely that, using player testimony as a starting point, one could arrive at a theory of genesis, composition, growth or change in an oral traditional form. Nevertheless, without considering the player's viewpoint on composition, it is not possible to know with certainty that any theory used to describe the form actually does so. This paper will deal in particular with one specific oral traditional form, the Karagiozis performance, a shadow puppet theatre form dating in Greece from at least 1799 and derived from a Turkish form, Karagöz, which very likely dates from as early as the fourteenth century in the Ottoman Empire (Fotiadis, Biris, And, Myrsiades, «Karagiozis»). The objective is to determine the process of composition in the Karagiozis performance by viewing the performance from the player's perspective, using only his testimony and the evidence of his performances as guides to understanding that process. Applications of theory to the Karagiozis performance will not be addressed, although some interesting and useful applications have been made. Primary among these are applications of the work of the Russian formalist Vladimir Propp (Sifakis and Danforth); of additional interest are those of the French structuralist Claude Lévi-Strauss (Danforth) and the American Slavicist Albert B. Lord (Kiourtsakis).

The underlying bias of this paper is that the compositional process as understood by the player is much simpler, freer, and more varied than has been suggested in theoretical and critical studies of the Karagiozis performance. The process of creating new texts is, as well, seen by players as open to more influence and as considerably more flexible than has previously been thought. Players view the overall framework, the basic scene divisions, and fundamental moves of the performance differently from those who study the performance. The balance they strike between stability and instability in composition and the creation of new texts is struck on the side of instability which they, in contrast to students of the form, represent as the driving force of the performance.

The actual process of composition is much more eclectic and un-self-conscious, less logical and more tightly bound to the exigencies of the performance environment when viewed from the player's perspective (Kiour-

tsakis, Joyner, Bauman, Becker, Myrsiades, «Performance»). Players are ultimately more concerned with achieving success with their audiences than with immutable laws of form and structure. They are preoccupied with the effect on their performances created by the differences between provincial and urban audiences and by the short-term stops in provincial touring as opposed to the long-term bookings at city theatres. Their issues are those of experience versus craft, tricks versus themes, spirit versus refinement, acrobatics versus language and the need to balance these opposing elements to achieve the ultimate complex of performance values —προσωπικότητα (individuality), δημιουργία (creativity), and τέχνη (art). It is the ability to be θρίαμβος (triumphant) with their audience, to be νοικοκυροσύνη (housekeeping) in their performance and καλοσύνη (good) within themselves in their personal lives that they claim to prize above the ability to maintain formal controls in performance composition.

When players discuss composition, it is almost always in relation to their own performances, almost as if the issues of themes, texts, and style could not be compared from one player to another. What is interesting here is that they generally treat the issue of composition —admittedly a critical and yet the least-discussed element of performance in player testimony— as a highly personal concern even though they consider the ability to compose in performance essential to αληθινός (true) or γνήσιος (authentic) Karagiozis, terms players reserve for truly superior performances.

Underlying the player's emphasis on the performance event and his troika of performance values — individuality, creativity, and art— there exists another, more formal, approach to composition, one which exhibits a sense of wholeness, completion, clear compositional elements consciously used in patterned combinations, and text creation that is coherent and developmental. This more formal approach is both touched on in player testimony and implicit in the player's performance. It is that to which the player refers as keeping his performances from devolving to the erratic or the haphazard. This formal process, what we shall call the player's aesthetic, has been chosen for examination in this study as a means of determining how the Karagiozis player under the pressure of the immediate on-going performance event maintains the consistency and continuity of his texts, how he protects the tradition both in transmitting its classic elements and in adapting those elements to change, and how he creates new texts to insure the continued viability of the performance.

The reluctance of players to speak openly and fully about their performance composition constitutes the most significant barrier to study of the

player's aesthetic[1]. Suspicious of outside interviewers and jealous of fellow-performers, players prove unwilling witnesses in discussing their art, fearful that the spirit and life in their performance —the κέφι— will be bled or stolen away if they discuss the secrets of their art. This study has adopted, as a result, an eclectic approach to elicit evidence of performance composition. First, it used player testimony to elicit the player's approach to his art. That testimony was then used to set up tests to be applied to existing texts. The texts themselves suggested certain lines of inquiry which were then traced much as one would follow out a trail of clues. The limitations of such an approach are the limitations of the inductive method. The end results must, necessarily, be considered partial and incomplete, the process lacking an overall direction, and end results not easily generalizable. The advantages of the approach must also be attributed to the inductive process. What one learns is rooted not in supposition but in actual practice, and end results have a higher degree of accuracy and greater existential reality.

---

1. Admittedly there are problems in using player testimony as a point of departure for studying oral tradition. In the most significant application of player testimony to theory development —the singers interviewed by Milman Parry and Albert B. Lord— we find that, like the Karagiozis players, Slavic singers are not used to thinking of their art in a theoretical fashion (Parry and Lord 225-66). Indeed, both groups often appear confused when faced with questions that require more than specific, concrete answers. Players and singers are not explicit about their goals and center their testimony on what they consider is «good», «proper», and «successful». As Minna Skafte Jensen claims, referring to the testimony of Slavic singers, from the performance's view «what is important is the song, and you do not build up much theory about it. No such thing exists as an oral poetics, dictated by some bard» (Jensen 69).

Nevertheless, and like the Slavic singers, Karagiozis players do have ideals that they attempt to maintain, and they respect certain requirements necessary to maintaining those ideals. More articulate players —and this does not mean literate, sophisticated players— are capable of defining this area with clarity and some degree of detail. But even this testimony must be handled gingerly, for while the Karagiozis players cannot be accused of prevaricating, they are sometimes guilty of exaggeration and are often self-serving. Moreover, some testimony is difficult to correlate with the testimony on composition provided by the performances themselves.

This paper does not, however, take the position that the players claim to do one thing while they actually do another. The interviews do not generally suggest this to be the case and, in any event, where such conflicts do occur they can largely be explained by collating player testimony as a whole. The advantage of our material is the broad range of testimony it provides on tape as well as the extensive supplementary material available in print. When collating player testimony does not provide a resolution of the conflict, the testimony of the performances themselves is given priority. The latter circumstance occurs here sufficiently infrequently that it does not force a choice between believing either the player's testimony or the performances. Jensen feels this was apparently not the case with the Slavic singers studied by Parry and Lord (67-68).

The study has culled a wide range of player interviews (thirty-six players interviewed both in print and on tape), (Puchner, Myrsiades, «Bibliography») relying primarily, however, upon twenty-five oral autobiographies taped in 1969 (Mario Rinovolucri) and in 1971 (Ms. Braithwaite) for the Center for the Study of Oral Literature at Harvard University[2]. It has as well generated a broad text sample, covering the period from 1918 to 1984, of one hundred seventy-nine players texts by thirty-one players (see Appendix A), once again relying heavily on the holdings of the Center for the Study of Oral Literature (68 tapes in the Rinovolucri, Braithwaite, and Cedric Whitman Collections). (Myrsiades, «Bibliography»).

Texts were classified by type (forty-one types have been identified) and organized in six larger overall groups to trace the process of text evolution across the tradition through theme and scene sharing and structural development[3]. Scenes occurring in the text sample were classified, counted for repetition, and analyzed for the way they were used. One particular text, *Ta επτά θηρία*, was chosen to focus discussion on compositional processes in the performance and is treated by comparison of ten different versions by nine players[4]. Selected additional individual texts are also referred to, particularly topical texts and one-act texts for the light they throw on text creation. Invariant texts (those which ultimately fall out of the tradition) are included for discussion with the understanding that the processes that initially brought them into the tradition would prove highly informative in our search for general compositional principles[5]. Two performances of the same text by the same player (performed at an interval of four years) are examined for the light that comparison sheds on compositional variations between versions. (We use here two versions of Charidimos' *Ta επτά θηρία*). Comparisons are drawn, as

2. D. Alexopoulos; A. Antonaros; S. Aspiotis; Avraam; S. Generalis; S. Gitsaris; G. Charidimos; Giannaros; S. Karambalis; K. Kareklàs; I. Katsanos; N. Lekkas; D. Manos; K. Manos; P. Michopoulos; Mitsakis; D. Mollas; A. Spiropoulos; D. Theodoropoulos; Vangos; V. Vasilaros. Myrsiades («Bibliography») incorrectly identifies 1971 Braithwaite player interviews as part of the Whitman Collection; it also left out Kareklàs in the list of players interviewed by Rinovolucri (Rin. 67).

3. Appendix A lists all the texts in our text sample by groups subdivided into text types. Dictations and taped performances are taken from the Rinovolucri, Braithwaite, and Whitman Collections of the Center for the Study of Oral Literature at Harvard University. See Myrsiades «Bibliography» for a complete listing of print and tape sources.

4. See Appendix A, Group D, Text Type 6 for titles and players.

5. The Hungarian folklorist G. Ortutay (190-2) holds that by study of that which is not accepted as typical, we learn more about the balance of continuity and change that defines tradition, more about the process of deterioration and creation that results, on the one hand, in losses due to transmission, and, on the other, to enrichment due to the emergence of new forms.

well, between different groups of texts to trace patterned variations that occur as the result of the demands of certain types of texts, for example the Riddle text or the Karagiozis Doctor text. Finally, selected performance parts, scenes and moves are examined to determine compositional principles or processes that exist at different structural levels or within different units.

This study is conducted in three parts: compositional units, compositional techniques, and text creation. The first part is treated in terms of the three-part overall framework of the performance, scenes that make up those parts, and the moves that constitute those scenes. The second part treats the compositional principles that account for the process of composition, particularly those of expansion, substitution, and order. Finally, the third part examines the creative process in terms of inspiration and organization, including the source of new texts, their shape, the developmental progression of new texts, and principles that guide growth in text creation across the tradition.

I. COMPOSITIONAL UNITS

The Karagiozis player sees his performance as made up of a few basic parts. Theodoropoulos sees his as the (A) preliminary Chatziavatis-Bey scenes; (B) the Chatziavatis-Karagiozis scene where the laughs begin[6]; and (C) that which is επίκαιρος (opportune). Mimis Mollas' and Giorgos Charidimos' divisions correspond to Theodoropoulos'. Charidimos cites the (A) Chatziavatis-Bey scene and the Chatziavatis-Karagiozis scene, which for him begin the action, (B) a σειρά (the repetitive introduction of a series of characters each performing a variation of a basic action) that constitutes the action, and (C) a close. Mimis Mollas' divisions are those of his father Antonis:

[Antonis] Mollas devoted the first act of his performances to sketching the psychology of character types. He stereotyped them. He did it this way, on the surface, because he couldn't give them more life than they could bear. His second act was devoted to conflict, and the third to dissolution[7]. As far as theatre was concerned, he worked correctly (Rinovolucri Tape 67)[8].

---

6. The Chatziavatis-Bey scene appears as the opening scene of the main performance. In this scene, the bey requests a service of Chatziavatis, a service which will ultimately involve Karagiozis in some capacity. The Chatziavatis-Karagiozis scene appears following the Chatziavatis-Bey scene; in it, Karagiozis is presented with some opportunity by Chatziavatis or convinces Chatziavatis to engage him for some activity.

7. Players traditionally use the term «dissolution» rather than «resolution» —the latter a more properly theatrical term— to suggest the way the shadows disappear from the screen in shadow puppet theatre at the end of a performance. In comic theory, dissolution is also supported as it suggests the way in which comic difficulties are not so much dealt with or resolved in the conclusion of performances as they merely disappear or are dissolved.

8. For ease of access, quotes from players are taken exclusively from the Rinovolucri

The whole text in performance, according to player testimony, is essentially a three-part construction of initital, middle, and concluding phases variously described, as we have seen, as either «preliminaries, laughs begin, opportunity», «initiation of action, action, close -of action», and «types sketched, conflict, dissolution». In performance, two performance pauses or intermissions can occur: one just after a prologue which precedes and is separate from the whole text in performance; and one just after the main action and before the resolution in the comedies, or after the complication and before the battle in the mountains in the histories. (The Karagiozis performance is made up of comic and history texts, the latter added later in the tradition).

Giorgos Charidimos' performance of *Ta επτά θηρία (The Seven Beasts)*, 1969, (see, on this text, Myrsiades, «Legend», Sifakis, Manousakas, Romaios, and Veloudis) exhibits the three performance divisions noted by players: (A) a pre-action set of scenes, dominated in the *Ta επτά θηρία* text by an announcement scene complex (Myrsiades, «Oral» 116-18); (B) a sequence of repeated actions; and (C) a post-action set of scenes. The scenes preceding the main action include the following:

(A1) the Bey assigns an announcement to Chatziavatis

(A2) the announcement scene complex

The main action scenes are made up of a parade of candidates to slay the beast. Each attempts to slay the beast and is chased off or eaten; this series of actions closes the first half of the performance which is followed by an intermission. The parade includes:

(B1) Karagiozis, a low-class Athenian

(B2) an old man, from the old quarter of Athens

(B3) Dionysios, the effete Greek from Zante

(B4) the Jew, an obsequious commercial figure from Thessaloniki

(B5) Stavrakas, the harbor bully from Piraeus

(B6) Omorfoniòs, the vain grotesque from Corfù

(B7) Barba Giorgos, the mountain rustic from Rumeli

The post-action scenes introduce a transition figure, Alexander the Great, who

---

and Braithwaite interviews on tape at the Center for the Study of Oral Literature, Harvard University. Quotes are identified (Rin.) or (Bra) in the text. Quotes were translated into English directly from the Greek on the tapes without preparing an intermediary written Greek text. This process was chosen as the most accurate means of achieving an English equivalent for the spoken Greek which relied in many cases on vocalisms and psychological nuances rather than the literal word for its meaning. By moving from the tape itself to English, oral delivery could be more directly translated (see Myrsiades and Myrsiades, «Texts and Contexts»). For biographies of players quoted, see Appendix C.

both completes the main action and initiates a new action line by succeeding in slaying the beast. This group of scenes begins after the performance intermission:

(C1) Alexander greets Karagiozis
      a Alexander recalls he saved Karagiozis from jail
      b Karagiozis parodies Alexander's armor
      c Karagiozis parodies Alexander's name
(C2) Karagiozis is offered an opportunity to slay the beast first
(C3) Karagiozis aids Alexander in freeing himself from the beast
(C4) Karagiozis pretends to be dead
(C5) Alexander slays the beast
(C6) Karagiozis pretends to Chatziavatis to be the slayer
(C7) Karagiozis and Chatziavatis carry off the beast

Within the three-part framework described above[9], players use three different kinds of scenes as demonstrated in our text sample. The first group, what we shall call (I) stock scenes, are attached to the performance either before or after the main action; these scenes are not specific to a particular text but float freely between different text types, repeating frequently, largely within the comic text group. A stock scene such as Karagiozis eating like a pig may appear strongly associated with one particular text group —in this instance with the Karagiozis Servant group— (see Appendix B) but has expanded in use beyond that text, probably because of its popularity, and has emigrated freely to other texts in other groups *Ο Καραγκιόζης γιατρός* —Karagiozis Doctor— *Τα επτά θηρία,* and the Monster Abduction texts). Other stock scenes such as the domestic quarrel of Karagiozis and his wife appear to have no home but act as filler scenes in various texts (*Ο Κ. στην Αμερική* —Karagiozis in America— *Ο*

---

9. It is interesting to note here that the kind of comic material, range of comic techniques, and comic density of the performance differs from unit to unit. Preparatory or pre-action scenes are based on character humor with a lot of verbal play and comic comment. Patterned interactions upon which improvisations are worked dominate here, comic density is high, and the range of techniques used is wide. The action sequence, particularly when it is structured by the repetitive σειρά pattern, uses unstructured comic material in which improvisation dominates. Its humor is that of psychological typology and dialects. Comic density is high here, and the range of comic techniques used is limited. Post-action scenes are lowest in comic density and retain the least patterned material. Their humor is largely thematic or is related to events rather than to either character or verbal play and comment. The most limited range of comic techniques occurs here. The process in terms of forms thus moves from patterns to flexibility and then to conventions. In terms of density, it moves from dense in the first two units to sparse in the third. In terms of the range of comic techniques, it moves from the most, to less, to the least throughout the three units.

K. πλοίαρχος —Karagiozis Ship-Captain— *Ο Κ. γιατρός, Το χρυσό όνειρο* —The Golden Dream— and *Ο Κ. φούρναρης* —Karagiozis Baker).

The second group, what we shall call (II) plotted scenes, make up the action portion of a performance and are specific to the narrative line of a given text. Plotted scenes make up an essential core and remain rooted in a sequence of events that characterize the skeleton of a given text, as we see in the following skeleton of the Katsantonis text:

(A) Ali Pasa murders Katsantonis' father (murder)

(B) Veli Gekas captures Katsantonis' wife and child (capture)

(C) Katsantonis rescues his wife and child (rescue)

(D) Katsantonis murders Veli Gekas (murder-revenge)

(E) Yussuf Arapis captures Katsantonis' nephew (capture)

(F) Katsantonis and Yussuf Arapis exchange hostages (exchange)

(G) Katsantonis falls ill and is betrayed (betrayal)

(H) Katsantonis is martyred (martyrdom)

The text core is held together both by the purposeful logic of an on-going sequence of events and a balance of actions: murder balances murder; capture is balanced by rescue or exhange; illness, betrayal, and martyrdom follow each other as a necessary working out of the action. While plotted scenes may be thematically akin to archetypal scenes that inform the tradition, they do not, nevertheless, in their particular forms repeat in other texts[10].

An intermediary pattern of use appears in what we shall call (III) specified scenes. These scenes share qualities of both stock and plotted scenes as they are used to expand the action sequence of the performance but are only found in related text types which share certain themes. Specified scenes repeat significantly less frequently than non-specified scenes[11]. Specified scenes such

---

10. The Slavicist A. B. Lord holds that each performance is merely one of many multi-forms based on independently existing themes that serve as archetypes adapted to the present need of each performance. These themes serve not only as the base of multiforms but as the functional model for composition, acting as a core of elements within a frame. That frame is the logic of the narative. His compositional scheme finds an archetypal store of themes from which the player chooses and which results in the logic of the narrative serving as an external theme pattern. The internal pattern of the theme itself (the balance of its elements), the context of the theme (previous uses of the theme in the tradition), and a tension of essences between themes (their affinity for working in groups) will determine how the theme will be used in the narative. A player's choice is from between existing theme formulas whose sequence does not have to remain the same from performance to performance. (Lord. «Perspectives» 206-9; «Composition» 74; *Singer* 68, 92-97). Lord's work has more application to the Karagiozis history texts than to the comedies.

11. Of fifty-five scenes traced, only sixteen appear with significant frequency. Three appear in our sample between twenty and thirty times (two in comedy alone —Karagiozis

as Karagiozis discovering a dead relative by tripping over the body or Karagiozis caught asleep and tricked may seem to have the potential in comic effect and popularity to spring free of a single text type; yet, probably because of their usefulness as a plot device, they tend to be reserved in use for a particular text (in these instances in the Monster-Abduction texts and *Το χρυσό όνειρο*).

The use of specified scenes to expand a text can be demonstrated through a comparison of the ten versions of the *Τα επτά θηρία* text. In seven of these versions, an added scene complex appears (in Papanikolaou, Spatharis, Moustakas, Avraam, A. Mollas, Michopoulos, and Charidimos, 1969; Karambalis, Xanthos, and Charidimos, 1973, do not use it). The addition was inspired by the influence of a popular folk tale (Myrsiades, «Legend» 389). Texts with the added complex typically end with the following scenes:

(A) Alexander cuts out the tongues of the beast (new scene)

(B) Karagiozis pretends to Chatziavatis to be the slayer (core scene)

(C) Chatziavatis and Karagiozis carry off the beast (core scene)

(D) Karagiozis announces himself as the beast-slayer at the serai (new scene)

(E) Alexander exposes Karagiozis by means of the tongues (new scene)
When the addition is not to be made, the player simply omits the cutting of the tongues and ends the performance with Karagiozis and Hatziavatis carrying off the beast. When a text needs to be cut short such added scene complexes are among the first units to disappear.

Scenes in the Karagiozis performance are broken down further into smaller units which we shall call moves. In the *Τα επτά θηρία* text, not only are each of the three major frame units (the preaction, action, and post-action pieces) equivalent in terms of time, but each is constructed of essentially the same number of performance moves. These moves are discrete units of two to four minutes length by means of which the player controls the rhythm and time of his performance. The rhythms are created variously, relating the moves to one another either by contrast (excitement and relief, for example), by aggregation (a repetitive technique building up to a larger overall effect), or in a staccato

---

interrogated by a bey and Karagiozis refuses to come out of his hut— and one in histories and comedies —Karagiozis eats like a pig). Three scenes appear between eleven and fifteen times (two in comedy alone —Barba Giorgos dressing scene and Karagiozis dressing scene— and one in histories and comedies —Karagiozis pretend-dead). Ten scenes appear between five and nine times (five in comedy alone —Karagiozis on hunger, Karagiozis-Chatziavatis divide money, Karagiozis chased, Karagiozis-wife argue, Karagiozis disguises as old woman/girl —three in history alone— Karagiozis announces visitor incorrectly, Karagiozis gets Chatziavatis beaten, Karagiozis is taken for a bear —and two in histories and comedies— Karagiozis caught asleep, Karagiozis dreams).

pattern (in which the moves are isolated from each other). This montage of effects by juxtaposition is itself a relatively simple and direct technique. Adjustments are also made in the time alotted to individual moves to lengthen or shorten the performance. In the expanded text of a second Charidimos *Ta επτά θηρία* performance (1973), for example, each of the moves is individually expanded in length. Moreover, moves help retain the proportionality of the overall text, insuring that when the shorter text loses time, it loses it equally in each of the three units of the main text; thus the proportion of each of the units in terms of time remains relatively the same whether the text is lengthened or shortened[12].

Comparing ten *Ta επτά θηρία* texts by nine players for their treatment of the announcement scene in the preaction part of the performance, we find eight basic moves:

(1) Chatziavatis announces
(2) Karagiozis stops him and throws furniture
(3) Chatziavatis explains the pasha's decree
(4) Karagiozis learns how to announce
(5) Karagiozis learns what to announce
(6) Karagiozis practices on his own
(7) Veli Gekas beats Karagiozis
(8a) Karagiozis gets Chatziavatis beaten
(8b) Karagiozis and Chatziavatis divide their pay

(8a and 8b are variants of each other: either Karagiozis gets Chatziavatis beaten or the two divide their pay).

A basic form of this scene complex, exhibited by four texts, involves five moves (1, 4, 6, 7, 8b); a reduced or schematic form, exhibited by three texts, involves three moves (1, 6, 7); a final elaborated version, exhibited by two texts (both by the same player), involves all eight moves[13]. The principle exhibited is one of compacting or expanding a scene off of a basic version by including or omitting moves. Those considered essential are always performed.

12.

	1969 Text		1973 Text	
	No. of Moves	Time of Unit	No. of Moves	Time of Unit
Unit A	14	20 $1/_3$''	13	26 $1/_2$''
Unit B	6	14 $1/_2$''	6	18''
Unit C	12	18 $1/_2$''	. 9	27''

13. Danforth («Tradition» 292-93) discusses functions as the components of a scene but with a different emphasis. He sees them as essentially repeated from scene to scene.

Those considered elaborations are only sometimes performed. Those considered basic are commonly performed.

II. COMPOSITIONAL TECHNIQUES

Having introduced the basic compositional units of the Karagiozis performance, we need to understand its compositional techniques. Using the two Haridimos performances of *Tα επτά θηρία* for comparison, we find that of six compositional techniques exhibited in these performances (adding — five times — expanding — 13 times — displacing — 7 times — and varying — 7 times), the two texts could be compared thirty-two times. Expansion occured more often than any other technique[14], varying and displacing were the next most frequent, and adding the least. Of nineteen scenes in one text, eight were almost identical to comparable scenes in the second text, three were equivalent, four differed but served the same purpose, and only four represented additions. One could conclude that the two texts, performed with an interval of four years between them, were thus highly comparable; a limited number of compositional techniques accounted for the differences between them; and the techniques used were relatively uncomplicated, direct, and easy to handle given the immediacy and speed of the on-going performance event.

The technique of scene substitution[15], like that of expansion, performs a significant role in the player's compositional repertoire. Referring to our analysis of scenes taken from our text sample, we find players exhibiting clear patterns of choice in their substitution of scenes. Take, for example, the entrance of Karagiozis into the screen for his opening scene with Chatziavatis (a scene which succeeds Chatziavatis' scene with a Bey which opens the

---

14. Sifakis (32-33) describes expansion in the Karagiozis performance in the following terms: «And each [performance] is capable of being longer or shorter in length, in relation to the conditions of the performance and the response of the audience. A performance expands or contracts essentially by two means. One is the repetition of the function of ridicule. In other words, we can have more or fewer figures which Karagiozis deceives, beats, throws out in the fifth stage of the development of the plot. Chiefly, however, the performance actually expands and is enriched with other types of elements —scenes, monologues, and dialogues— which we call static elements».

15. In the formalist view, although the player is left with no choice in the overall sequence of functions or the substitution of elements that depend upon one another, «the paradigmatic substitution of any one of an unlimited number of characters or variants of functions into a small number of 'slots' specified by a syntagmatic structural rule is the essential feature of the process by which new, yet traditional narrative forms are created». (Danforth, «Tradition» 288).

performance and in which Chatziavatis receives a commission that he must fulfill). The player exercises his options for dealing with this scene in any of several ways: Chatziavatis cannot get Karagiozis to come out of his hut; Chatziavatis wakes Karagiozis from his dream; Karagiozis is chased on-screen by an angry crowd and knocks Chatziavatis down. Later in the performance, if the player wishes to send Karagiozis to the café (an important social center), he has open to him one of several café scenes based on the dictates of the plot: if he is going for food for his master, Karagiozis is beaten by the café owner for not paying his bill; if he is going for a job interview, he is interrogated by a bey; if he is the guest of a bey, he orders ridiculous items. Given an opportunity to expand his performance, the player may very well even link several of these café scenes together.

Players exhibit clear patterns of choice in composition in their use of characters as well as in their use of scenes. We find such patterns in five Charidimos texts in which the player uses a repetitive sequence of scenes, the σειρά, to structure his main action. All but two of the texts introduce figures in a different order. The two σειρές that are alike are both from performances of the same text, *Τα επτά θηρία*.

A sampling of texts was also taken representing seventeen different text types, that is, groups of texts that represent variations on a single plot skeleton. (The group of ten *Τα επτά θηρία* texts discussed here make up one text type, for example)[16]. The plot skeletons of texts sampled characteristically utilized the σειρά construction. In this sample, not all text types showed regularity in their σειρά; when regularity appeared within a text type, it did not show the same order shown by other text types; and when regularity was characteristic of a text type, that regularity was maintained even by players with a highly individualized playing style.

Within the *Τα επτά θηρία* σειρά, we find further evidence of a conscious pattern operating. In the nine texts in our sample, the figure Barba Giorgos tends to be introduced last in the σειρά, the old man tends to be introduced first, Dionysios floats freely throughout the σειρά appearing in any position, and the figures Stavrakas, Omorfoniòs, and the Jew generally appear one after the other as if held together by some «tension of essences»[17]. Thus, both the position of individual figures in the σειρά and the treatment of the σειρά from one text to another exhibit clear and regular patterns of use.

---

16. Appendix A, Group A, for example, is divided into fourteen text types, each of which contains several examples of variations on the plot skeleton characteristic of that type. (Propp 22).

17. This term is borrowed form Lord; see note 10.

III. TEXT CREATION

Thus far, we have described the Karagiozis performance in terms of a three-part framework with three different types of scenes which can be divided into smaller units called moves. We have seen as well the compositional techniques of expansion and substitution as well as regular patterns of choice and organization exhibited by players both in scene and character use. What has yet, however, to be explained in the composition of the Karagiozis performance is its process of text creation. The player Savvas Gitsaris, for example, reports reading a tale in a magazine one day and performing it the same night. He insists he will have written none of it down (Braithwaite Tape 2). Kostas Manos seems to suggest the presence of the same general process in his comment that he could create a Karagiozis performance by reading some work and then letting his imagination rummage about until he could perform it. A player could, in this way, he asserted, make a performance from a mere song (Rin. 69). Indeed, Manos claimed to have written as many as one hundred fifty performances (he reportedly had a total of four hundred works in his repertoire).

Approaching the issue from another point of view, the player Avraam testifies that in the case of a derivative performance, a player must faithfully repeat his original source (Rin. 65). He could himself, he claims, write Olivier's *Hamlet* as a Karagiozis performance, but ony by sticking closely to his source[18]. Vasilaros, too, (Rin. 68) who wrote sixty performances based largely upon the melodrama of live theatre, kept his works close to their original sources (to the point of being accused by Charidimos [Bra. 1-2] of having created works too «untraditional» to be called Karagiozis).

A third approach is taken by players like Antonios Mollas (D. Mollas, Rin. 67) who spontaneously improvised new works in his head and Dinos Theodoropoulos to whom works came in his sleep (Rin. 66). A means of reconciling this view with the others presented is, fortunately, provided by Charidimos' statement on creating a text:

> I can immediately transform one improvisation, two words, or something that might occur in my work, in my improvisation, into an entire performance. The whole performance

---

18. Avraam's reference to «Olivier's» *Hamlet* is indicative of the Karagiozis player's preference for adapting theatrical texts from live performances rather than print. Players rely on their memory and the general outline of the performance when they adapt literary texts. The general principle of adaptation from literary sources is discussed by Degh (160-61) where she concludes that oral structure dominates literary structure in its own mileau. (See Fotiadis 245 on this question in relation to Karagiozis).

that results will be correct, classical, that is to say, that which I seek. You see? [The classical performance] is so deeply rooted in me that it emerges by itself. My work gives it birth. (Bra. 1-2).

Charidimos neither allows for a predetermined form in the tradition as a model for composition, permits imitation of story frameworks from other sources, nor gives improvisation a free rein. Rather, he creates a work which is in the spirit of the performance and thus is capable of integrating with it. Moreover, as he makes clear elsewhere in his interview, Charidimos considers that untraditional texts, those which are excessively personal and improvisatory, as well as those which are literary and derivative, ultimately drop out of the tradition as invariants, rejected by the larger body of players and the Karagiozis audience.

The organizing force of text creation, like the inspiration behind text creation, is conceived of variously by different players. Theodoropoulos, for one, describes the process in terms that suggest a thematic orientation:

I take the theme and, having taken the theme, I outline the general story. So that when I have a skeleton. I can remember what comes next, I write and I know. What shall I say, that's it... (Rin. 66).

Generalis, by contrast, takes an approach that is character-based:

Each performance is my own creation. I am the director. I find the appropriate figure. I take hold of the performance, I give this performance to my colleagues, and we perform it... (Rin. 65).

The player Gitsaris comments that a young player can perform as many as fifty texts if he knows at least the figures of the prologue (although Gitsaris lists here [Bra. 2] the major recurring figures of the performance with the exception of two, the pasha and the Jew)[19]. In this view, the number of texts a player can perform is based on the number of figures he has learned to impersonate. Conceived as character-bound, texts thus expand in complexity as well as multiply in number as the number of figures expand[20]. On this issue, Gitsaris

---

19. The major recurring figures are Stavrakas, Omorfoniòs, Dionysios, Barba Giorgos, Veli Gekas, an old man, and Chatziavatis and Karagiozis.

20. The limit on the development of texts is described by Charidimos as about three hundred sixty, although he makes clear that the classic texts number sixty to sixty-five, just enough to cover the player's prime playing season, the summer.

The summer season in urban locations presently runs from Easter through October and requires at least sixty works either rotated in repertory, run as a sequence that is repeated, or run individually for several evenings each before being replaced. A player with fewer

gets some support from Theodoropoulos who, describing his reduced perfor-
mance on tour in America, explains that he reduced the number and variety of
characters he used, leaving those which both adapted more easily to the new
performance environment and which provided the greatest contrast with one
another.

Whether the process begins with the plot outline or the characters, it is
apparently a flexible process relying on the creative interaction of several
players to complete it. Charidimos indicates as much in his comment that while
the text is received and performed «according to the fantasy of the Karagiozis
player who inspired the performance», it is not considered finished at that
point:

> We dont't know which player wrote it. We only know that the second one took it from
> the one who gave it being, modified it, fixed it, performed it again and again, gave it a
> beginning and an end and now it has its [order]. Let us not depart from this process. (Bra. 1-
> 2).

The process to which Charidimos refers is that of learning the received text
from one's master and both continuing it as in the original and adapting it to
change through modification and completion as a whole. As Charidimos goes on
to explain the process, a new text must both express the «classicness» of
Karagiozis (use its traditional elements) and its fantasy (capture its spirit), but
not at the expense of dictating particular rules of combination of events, that is,
some required schematic form.

The process of text development does not in the player's view begin with a
form into which an idea is set. It does, however, need to have a shape, either an
outline, a sense of beginning and end, or the possibility of expanding or
contracting off of some base. That base might be thought of as a series of
characters or it might, as Theodoropoulos once explained (Rin. 66), simply refer

---

performances was at a disadvantage in an urban setting. The number sixty evolved from
earlier summer seasons which ran only two months.

The Turkish Karagöz performance (the prototype of the Kragiozis performance from
which the latter developed into a separate national performance) maintained a basic repertoire
of thirty performances, sufficient to cover the month-long Ramadan holiday during which
evenings the players traditionally performed. Serbo-Croatian singers studied by Parry and
Lord themselves maintained a similar number of performances, for they, too, performed on
Ramadan evenings. Like some Karagiozis players, a number of singers claimed to possess an
exaggerated number of performances, one as many as a hundred, but in both traditions such
exaggerated claims are generally disputed while, at the same time, they betray the importance
of knowing a large number of performances. (And 60-67; Jensen 63-64; Parry-Lord 243,
265; Myrsiades, «Performance»).

to dialogues, a unit which suggests both characters and scenes as compositional complements. In his American tour, Theodoropoulos in fact refers to his reduced performance as a dialogue rather than as a παράστασις (a full performance). He describes his performances further as κωμωδία, a term used for one-act texts based either on the expansion or elaboration of a scene or on the reduction of a full text. It might, as a result, be useful to examine κωμωδία further for hints of how the overall performance might have developed.

Since the term κωμωδία is used by Charidimos to refer to the prologue to the performance (a unit which has itself developed into a self-contained whole set off from the main part of the performance by an intermission), the prologue might be an effective unit to analyze. At least three earlier forms of the Greek prologue are known to the contemporary Karagiozis player. The first two are built on the idea of a debate or contest: a late nineteenth-century prologue in which Barba Giorgos and a Turkish palace guard, Veli Gekas, quarrel —called a καβγάς— and an early twentieth-century version in which Karagiozis quizzes his sons (Myrsiades, «Oral» 108-13). The καβγάς is typically expanded by adding figures to join the quarrel; the quiz scene is expanded by the addition of an opening —a march— and a closing —announcement— component as well as independent comic scenes. The third prologue form was a comic scene in which Chatziavatis attempts to get Karagiozis to come out of his hut, a form which appears to date from the third quarter of the nineteenth century.

What is of most interest here is how the tradition has integrated these three versions to make the modern prologue. Beginning with the two debate forms, the modern prologue adapted the comic scene to act as a transition between them, replacing Chatziavatis and Karagiozis with Barba Giorgos and Karagiozis' sons. This substitution permitted a smooth transition from the quarrel at the serai, through an added quarrel between Barba Giorgos and Karagiozis' sons, to the interrogation of Karagiozis' sons. Thus, isolated dialogues were developed by expansion and then organized in relation to one another to provide a smooth flow. Traditional elements are in this way thematically integrated into a whole which completes itself as a unit separate from the main performance. Theodoropoulos' suggested transformation of his performance from dialogues to scenes to whole texts seems in some sense to be replicated here.

Supportive testimony of a transition process operating between dialogues and scenes comes from Charidimos' discussion of improvisation:

I improvise and say some new καλαμπούρι [joke]. The improvisation is imprinted in the memory to add to permanent καλαμπούρια... I take it up again and use it in another performance so that the permanent καλαμπούρια of Karagiozis are preserved at the same time that they are fed. (Bra. 1-2).

As Charidimos suggests, immediate and momentary improvisations are capable of passing from spontaneous to stable forms that can link to other improvisations that have already become permanent elements of the performance. Such linkage is capable of developing mini-scenes that can be transmitted and thus passed on for use in other performances through the collective memory of the tradition.

The contribution made to text creation by the transformation of a compositional element into another form or use is exhibited most forcibly when a scene generates a new variant, that is when it transforms itself into a new text[21]. Stock scenes and specifying scenes demonstrate such potential when they develop into short texts that serve as curtain-raisers or after-pieces to precede or succeed a short performance. At least three such texts have remained as viable performances in the tradition: *Να γελάσει τον βεζίρη* (*To Mock the Vizir*) from the contest to mock the Vizir; *Ο θάνατος του Καραγκιόζη* (*The Death of Karagiozis*) from the pretend-death of Karagiozis; and *Καλώς το αφεντικό απ' έξω* (Welcome the Master Outside) from the secret tryst of the lovers at the serai. Of interest here is the periodic appearance in the prologue to the performance of the contest to mock the vizir. Appending such scenes to the prologue suggests the possible use of the prologue as a trying ground to mediate the passage of a scene from its use in a main text to a new variant of its own. (See here, the prologue to Kareklàs' *Το κουτσομπολιό* [*Gossip*]. Generalis' *Ο Κ. στην Αμεοική* and Charidimos' *Ο Καπετάν Γκρης* [*Captain Gris*]).

In this context it is useful to look at a created text, working backwards and asking what makes it a new variant. *Ο Κ. από τη Γη στη Σελήνη* (*Karagiozis from Earth to the Moon*) —considered here in Charidimos' version (as synopsized in Bra. 1-2— is regarded by Charidimos as a classic text in spite of the fact that it was added to the repertoire most likely in the 1930s (in any case, it does not appear among synopses or texts published by players until the 1940s). Its «classicness» emanates from its use of common elements of the tradition. These appear in the form of themes borrowed from *Τα επτά θηρία* —the slaying of a beast to pass a test— *Το χρυσό όνειρο* —a dream used as a frame image so that all that appears in between, however real in appearance, is really a dream— and *Ο Κ. στη ζούγκλα* (*Karagiozis in the Jungle*) —a trip to find a fabled land. The borrowed themes of *Από τη Γη* are pulled together by a

---

21. In one sense, as Propp acknowledges (87), all tales could be seen as a great transition back to some original, with all tales comprising a chain of variants. Indeed, the constant change experienced by the oral tradition appears to confirm the idea of continuous and gradual transformations.

string of coincidences, suggesting that variants emerge from a combination of instability (which makes change possible) and stability (which orients that change). When we look at topical texts we are as likely to find a simple string-along construction of aggregated scenes (Moustakas, *Ο Κ. όμηρος στο Χαϊδάρι και στη Γερμανία* [*Karagiozis in Haidari and Germany*] or mixed texts joined by a string of coincidences (Generalis, *Ο Κ. δύο ώρες πρωθυπουργός* [*Karagiozis Prime Minister for Two Hours*]) as we are to see an adaptation of a conventional text (Avraam, *Στα νύχια της Γκεστάπο* [*In the Claws of the Gestapo*]). The *Ο Κ. πρωθυπουργός* text is a mix of themes from *Το χρυσό όνειρο* and *Δημοτικές εκλογές* (*General Elections*); *Στα νύχια* is adapted from *Ο Κ. υπηρέτης* (*Karagiozis Servant*).

The viability of string-along construction (what we shall call linear construction) as a seminal or fluid start-up form for the development of new texts is suggested not only in the development of individual new texts but in the whole process of text development across the tradition. We find, for example, linear constructions appearing significantly in each of the three major groups of comic texts. (Karagiozis is made up of a body of older derivatively Turkish comic texts and native Greek history texts added later in the tradition). If linear construction is to be considered the process responsible for creating new text variants, then a text group replete with linear contructions should be rich in text variants[22]. In fact, when we classify texts in related text groups we find many linear constructions and a high number of variants in one group of texts (Group A, Karagiozis Role-Player) and many linear constructions as well as highly individualized variants, although not a high number of variants, in a second group (Group C, Karagiozis Table-Turner). A third group, however, (Group B, Karagiozis Servant) shows many linear constructions and few variants.

Thus, linear construction can be said to function as a necessary but not a sufficient cause of variants, that is, if there are variants a linear construction will be present but the presence of linear construction does not insure there will be variants. The function performed by linear constructions thus appears to be that of a change agent which, through its loose connection of scenes and its coincidental thematic relationships, makes possible variation and growth. Since it does not, however, provide a clarifying structure which can be transmitted with stability, it also produces a high number of invariants which drop out of

---

22. For the purpose of this discussion, see Appendix B in which text types are described by the dominant structure appearing among its variants.

the tradition. Linear constructions may serve a seminal function but do not by themselves move the tradition forward in a developmental pattern of growth.

A stabilizing function is thus needed to complement the change agent function if we are to consider text development across the tradition. The ability to link groups through scene and theme sharing together with schematic plot construction that will transmit with predictability represent the qualities needed in a stabilizing agent. Of the three comic groups, the one which displays the highest degree of scene and theme sharing is Group A. It is the most interactive of all the comic groups in terms of both the number of overall links with groups and the number of groups interacted with. Group A is, as well, the group with the highest number of texts using a schematic structuring technique (the σειρά construction of repeated scenes with variation using a full range of comic characters). Moreover, more than any other comic group, Group A interacts highly in theme sharing with a fourth group of texts, the tragi-comic text group D (Monster-Abduction texts). This latter group, Group D, represents a new Greek addition to the derivatively Turkish comic texts and leads through other thematic sharings to the history texts which were the last to develop in the tradition, that is Groups E and F (Myrsiades, «Nation» and «Traditional»). Both Groups A and D are characterized by schematic constructions (D by an agon construction of balanced oppositions between clearly defined heroes and villains) and both are highly interactive with all groups in scene sharing.

It is, finally, of interest to note that of the three comic groups, it is Group A alone which combines the virtues of change agent and stabilizing agent as it is high in variations, high in intergroup theme and scene sharing, and contains linear start-up forms and schematic σειρά constructions in equal parts. This particular group, a rich source of variants, maintains the highest number of surviving texts in the tradition (forty-two as opposed to thirty for Group C and twenty-eight for Group B in our text sample). Group D, the linking group for Group A to the new Greek history texts, has, interestingly, maintained as well a high number of surviving texts (forty in our text sample). The pattern of structural stability combined with affinity with other text groups that we see in Group A represents, it seems, a necessary complement to the fluidity that comes with many text variants (the result of a fluid linear start-up form). This explanation helps us understand how the tradition as a whole moved forward continuing to develop and grow as times changed.

SUMMARY

This paper did not intend to describe a theory of composition for the Karagiozis performance nor to deny that such an undertaking is possible. What it intended to do is view the Karagiozis performance from the point of view of the player himself and how he understood his performance as he played it. To summarize, the actual process of composition viewed from the player's perspective is structured by a three-part framework of introduction, main action, and close. Within that framework, scenes are used to serve three different functions: stock, plotted, and specifying functions. The first group serves a variety of text types and can be found either before or after the main action in a text. These scenes can be substitued and are easily, if loosely, linked together in various orders. Scenes in the second group are specific to a given text and appear in the main action of the text. These scenes are thematically related to one another as an essential core of that action and cannot be interchanged, although they can be omitted. The third group's scenes are interchangeable with other text types but only among thematically related groups of text types. They appear in the main action of the text and are used to expand that action. As a result of their tentative relationship to the action, they are easily omitted.

Scenes are themselves structured by short two to four minute moves by means of which the player controls the rhythm and time of his performance. Moves can be related by contrast, aggregation, or in a staccato pattern of repeats. They are most useful in helping the player mark his place in performance and keep proportional balance between the main framework units.

The form developed in the Karagiozis performance is, in the player's view, a flexible one capable of expanding and contracting. It begins in dialogues, grows into scenes, and then develops into full texts. It permits substitutions, requires transitions, utilizes additions and omissions. It is essentially made up, however, of expansion/contraction and substitution. We find, for example, that there exists a basic version commonly performed, a reduced version always performed, and an expanded version sometimes performed. We find, as well, that there exists a reservoir of variant scenes from among which a player can select to fit the exigencies of a given plot.

The creation of performances is controlled either by a plot outline or by the cast of characters but is open to modification from player to player, the latter process contributing the wholeness that ultimately completes the performance. Other than a beginning and end, a plot outline, and a sense of order, players reject the notion of a required form as a guide to composition.

As we have seen, it is interchangeable scenes that have the ability to break free of the main action to seed new texts. Loosely attached to the main message

of the text, they retain the capacity to attract other scenes to generate a new variant. Newly generated scenes neither adopted a schematic form nor were improvised upon freely, but were, instead, loosely organized. A combination of stability (the use of materials characteristic of the tradition) and instability (loose organization) was necessary to create a text. Directed growth required the presence in a text group of two structures: the linear string-along construction as a fluid start-up form for new texts to encourage variants and facilitate change; and schematic constructions, the σειρά and the agon, to provide structural stability and insure continuity in the tradition. Texts structured by fluid linear forms (topical texts, for example), we find, make up a large percentage of the performance's unstable invariants while those structured by schematic forms pass through the transmission process with a high degree of accuracy and stability.

Looking at the overall orientation of the player in performance, we find the player's view in some ways confirms that of the theorist. There is general agreement, for example, that there are a limited number of compositional elements and generally few, simple compositional rules. Players have limited choices and are, at the same time, reluctant to break traditional associations. There is no fixed model for composition, no preexisting form; rather, the tradition evolves through transformations of variants. The tradition itself can be said to exist as a combination of stability which protects continuity and instability which permits change.

It is not, however, possible to confirm specific theoretical concepts using the player's point of view as a point of departure. Player testimony would, for example, deny several concepts arising from the formalist theory of Vladimir Propp, as applied to the Karagiozis performance by Danforth and Sifakis. In particular, Propp's view (22, 112-13) of the text as an unalterable sequence of functions requires that the sequence of functions bring forth all new plots. This notion is countered by the player's view of the development of new texts out of loosely organized interchangeable scenes, by the process of growth from dialogues to scenes and texts, and by the generation of texts through improvisation and out of casts of characters, as well as through plot outlines. Players would have difficulty as well accepting Propp's argument (112) that the true purpose of each work is for each function to fulfill itself or the argument that a text generates only forms that resemble itself (78). Certainly, players would not weight the balance of stability and instability in the performance on the side of stability as Propp indicates the theorist would.

Above all else, what we have learned from this study is that the Karagiozis player is neither erratic nor haphazard. Neither does he rely, however, on a fixed or schematic form. He composes in performance using patterned forms

and processes to guide that composition. But he is still very much a free spirit creating new texts that are responsive to varied influences and refusing to fit his creations into a Procrustean mold, whether created for him by past performers or present theorists. He protects his tradition, but on his own terms, terms that have a great deal more to do with his audience than with high art as he insures that his performance speaks responsively, directly, and simply to that audience using techniques which are themselves characteristically un-complicated and which are responsive to pressures on the performance in progress.

APPENDIX A
TYPE CLASSIFICATIONS

NOTATION KEY:

D = dictation
P = performance tape   LP = live performance synopsis
PR = print text   S = synopsis in print

KARAGIOZIS ROLE-PLAYER (42 texts)

GROUP A

1. Karagiozis Scribe (4)

S. Gitsaris
Ο Μπαρμπαγιώργος τηλεφωνητής (P)

E. and S. Spatharis
Ο Κ. γραμματικός (PR)

D. Theodoropoulos
Ο Κ. συμβολαιογράφος (D)

Vangos
Ο γραμματικός (P)

2. Karagiozis and the Swing (2)

A. Mollas
La balancoire (S)

E. Spatharis
Η κούνια (P)

3. Karagiozis in the Army (3)

A. Mollas
Ο Κ. υποδεκανεύς (PR)

Y. Moustakas
Ο Κ. αποσπασματάρχης (PR)

M. Xanthos
Ο Κ. στρατάρχης (PR)

4. Karagiozis Innkeeper (4)

G. Charidimos
Ο Κ. ξενοδόχος (LP)

P. Michopoulos
Το καφενεδάκι του Κ. (PR)

A. Mollas
Το Χάνι του Μπαρμπαγιώργου (PR)

M. Xanthos
Η πρωτομαγιά του Κ. (PR)

5. Karagiozis Baker (5)

A. Antonaros
Ο Κ. φούρναρης (P)

G. Charidimos
Ο Κ. φούρναρης (P)

E. Spatharis
Ο Κ. μάγειρας (PR)

D. Theodoropoulos
Ο Κ. φούρναρης (D)

M. Xanthos
Ο Κ. φούρναρης (PR)

6. Karagiozis Pharmacist (4)

D. Basios
Ο Κ. φαρμακοποιός (PR)

K. Manos
Ο Κ. φαρμακοποιός (PR)

G. Papanikolaou
Ο Κ. γιατρός (D)

E. Spatharis
Ο γιατρός της γειτονιάς (P)

7. The Metamorphosis (5)

P. Michopoulos
Το στοιχειωμένο δέντρο (PR)

D. Mitsakis
Το στοιχειωμένο δέντρο (P)

A. Mollas
L'arbre ensorcelé (S)

E. Spatharis
Το στοιχειωμένο δέντρο (P)

M. Xanthos
Η μεταμόρφωσις του Κ. (PR)

8. Karagiozis Cardplayer (2)

A. Mollas
Ο χαρτοπαίχτης (PR)

V. Vasilaros
Ο Κ. χαρτοπαίχτης (D)

9. Karagiozis Lawyer (3)

A. Mollas
Οι τρεις προσκυνηταί (PR)

A. Mollas
Les pèlerins volés (S)

M. Xanthos
Ο Κ. δικηγόρος (PR)

10. Karagiozis and the Devil (1)

V. Vasilaros
Ο διάβολος κουμπάρος (D)

11. Karagiozis at the Madhouse (3)

G. Charidimos
Ο Κ. στο τρελοχομείο (LP)

N. Lekkas
Ο Κ. στο τρελοχομείο (P)

A. Mollas
Le bijoutier volé (S)

12. The Robbery (3)

A. Mollas
Η ληστεία των ανακτόρων (PR)

A. Mollas
Le serail cambriolé (S)

G. Peropoulos
Ο Κ. διαρρήκτης (PR)

13. Karagiozis at Court (2)

A. Mollas
Το ψέμμα του σαραγίου (PR)

D. Theodoropoulos
Ο Κ. στο δικαστήριο (D)

14. The Death of Karagiozis (1)

A. Mollas
La mort de Karagheuz (S)

KARAGIOZIS SERVANT (28)
GROUP B

1. The Urn (2)

K. Kareklàs
Οι ερωτευμένοι του Λουτραρχείου (P)

A. Mollas
Sept prétendants pour une fille (S)

4. The Ghost (1)

A. Mollas
Εις τον πύργον των φαντασμάτων (PR)

5. Karagiozis in America (3)

S. Generalis
Ο Κ. στην Αμερική (P)

K. Kareklàs
Το χουτσομπολιό (P)

V. Vasilaros
Βαχλατμ χουκιά (D)

2. The Shotgun Wedding (1)

G. Papanikolaou
Οι αρραβώνες (D)

6. The Lovers' Conspiracy (5)

M. Manos
Ο άσωτος αξιωματικός (P)

A. Mollas
Ο Κ. και οι λέοντες (PR)

A. Mollas
Selim enlève Khairiyè (S)

A. Mollas
Le crime mysterieux (S)

Monvanos
Ο γαμπρός στο μπαούλο

3. The Suitors (5)

G. Charidimos
Οι αρραβώνες του Κ. (P)

S. Karambalis
Ο Κ. υπηρέτης (P)

G. Kondos
Ο Κ. και οι τρεις γαμπροί (PR)

A. Mollas
Λίγα απ' όλα (PR)

D. Theodoropoulos
Η βαβυλωνία (D)

7. The Marriage of Barba Giorgos

Giannaros
Ο γάμος του Μπαρμπαγιώργου (P)

P. Michopoulos
Ο γάμος του Μπαρμπαγιώργου (P)

G. Moustakas
Ο Κ. γαμπρός (PR)

V. Vasilaros
Ο γάμος του Μπαρμπαγιώργου (D)

M. Xanthos
Ο γάμος του Μπαρμπαγιώργου (PR)

8. The Master is Outside (3)

G. Charidimos
Καλώς το αφεντικό απ' έξω (LP)

A. Mollas
La marriage de Selim et Khairiyè (S)

G. Papanikolaou
Ο Κ. θα είναι παλικαράς (P)

9. Karagiozis' Shining Lesson (4)

K. Kareklas
Ο Μέϊμετάκος (P)

A. Mollas
Ένα λαμπρό μάθημα του Κ. (PR)

A. Mollas
Ο Κ. κόμης (PR)

A. Mollas
Le valet de l'amant ruiné (S)

KARAGIOZIS TABLE-TURNER (30)

GROUP C

1. Karagiozis Ship-Captain (4)

K. Kareklās
Το ναυάγιον του Μπαρμπαγιώργου (P)

S. Spatharis
Το ναυάγιον της πτωχής Μαρίας (S)

S. Spatharis
Το ναυάγιον του Μπαρμπαγιώργου (PR)

M. Xanthos
Ο Κ. πλοίαρχος (PR)

2. Karagiozis in the Jungle (3)

A. Mollas
Οι ανθρωποφάγοι (PR)

A. Mollas
Les anthropophages (S)

G. Moustakas
Ο Κ. στη ζούγκλα (PR)

3. Karagiozis Magician (8)

P. Michopoulos
Ο Κ. πνευματιστής (PR)

A. Mollas
Ο Κ. μάντης (PR)

A. Mollas,
Le faux aveugle (S)

A. Mollas
Le faux prophète (S)

M. Mollas
Ο Κ. μάγος (P)

G. Moustakas
Ο Κ. μάγος (PR)

G. Moustakas
Ο Κ. εφευρέτης (PR)

G. Moustakas
Ο Κ. και οι τρεις σπανοί (PR)

4. Karagiozis Doctor (6)

Avraam
Ο Κ. γιατρός (P)

S. Gitsaris
Ο Κ. γιατρός (P)

A. Mollas
Le medecin malgré lui (S)

G. Moustakas
Ο Κ. διά της βίας γιατρός (PR)

G. Papanikolaou
Ο Κ. διά της βίας γιατρός (D)

M. Xanthos
Ο Κ. γιατρός (PR)

5. Twenty-Nine Silver Pieces (1)

V. Vasilaros
Είκοσι εννιά αργύρια (D)

6. Karagiozis Fisherman (Golden Dream) (3)

D. Mitsakis
Ο Κ. ψαράς (P)

A. Mollas
Si j'étais vizir (S)

M. Xanthos
Ο Κ. ψαράς (PR)

7. To Mock the Vizir (4)

A. Mollas
Οι δώδεκα λίρες ή το ψέμα (PR)

A. Mollas
Οι μοσχόμαγκες (PR)

G. Papanikolaou
Να γελάσει τον βεζίρη (D)

E. Spatharis
Οι τρεις ερωτήσεις και το ψέμα στον πασά (PR)

8. Karagiozis to the Moon (1)

G. Moustakas
Ο Κ. από τη Γη στη Σελήνη (PR)

MONSTER-ABDUCTION (40)
GROUP D

1. Ali Pasha (3)

Ianaros
Ο Αλή Πασάς και η κυρά Φροσύνη (P)

G. Moustakas
Ο Κ., ο Αλή Πασάς και η κυρά Φρο-
σύνη (PR)

A. Spiropoulos
Ο Καπετάν Απέθαντος (P)

2. The Giant (5)

S. Gitsaris
Ο λήσταρχος Λαφουζάνης (P)

P. Michopoulos
Ο λήσταρχος Ντελής (P)

A. Mollas
Passadoros enlève Khairiyè (S)

A. Mollas
Η αρπαγή της ωραίας Ελένης (PR)

M. Mollas
Ο Καπετάν Αρχουδογιάννης (P)

3. Christian-Fighter (6)

A. Antonaros
Ο μαύρος της Ανατολής (P)

G. Charidimos
Ο Καπετάν Κίσσας (LP)

P. Michopoulos
Ο χριστιανομάχος (P)

A. Mollas
Le persécuteur des Grecs (S)

A. Mollas
L'ennemi des Chrétiens (S)

S. Spatharis
Γιάγκουλας Φώτης (S)

4. Captain Gris (5)

D. Alexopoulos
Η μετάνοια του ληστή (P)

G. Charidimos
Ο Καπετάν Γκρης (P)

G. Moustakas
Ο Κ. και ο Καπετάν Γκρης (PR)

M. Xanthos
Ο Καπετάν Γκρης (PR)

M. Xanthos
Ο Κ. και η ορφανή της Χίου (PR)

5. Forced Marriage (7)

P. Michopoulos
Ο Καπετάν Μαυροδήμος (PR)

P. Michopoulos
Αστραπόγιαννος και Λαμπέτης (PR)

A. Mollas
Astéro la tzigane (S)

A. Mollas
L'enlèvement de la fille du vizir (S)

S. Spatharis
Αστραπόγιαννος (S)

S. Spatharis
Γενοβέφα (S)

S. Spatharis
Η κακούργος κόρη (S)

6. Alexander the Great
and the Beast (10)

Avraam
Το φίδι (P)

G. Charidimos
Το φίδι (P)

G. Charidimos
Ο Κ., τα επτά θηρία και ο Μέγας Αλέξανδρος (LP)

S. Karambalis
Ο Κ., τα επτά θηρία και ο Μέγας Αλέξανδρος (P)

P. Michopoulos
Ο Μεγαλέξαντρος και το καταραμένο φίδι (PR)

A. Mollas
Les sept monstres (S)

G. Moustakas
Ο Κ., τα επτά θηρία και ο Μέγας Αλέξανδρος (PR)

M. Xanthos
Τα επτά θηρία και ο Κ. (PR)

7. The Riddles (4)

A. Mollas
Antiochus et le lion (S)

G. Moustakas
Ο Κ. και τα τρία αινίγματα (PR)

V. Vasilaros
Τα αινίγματα (D)

V. Vasilaros
Τα αινίγματα της βεζιροπούλας (D)

G. Papanikolaou
Ο Μεγαλέξανδρος με τον βόα της Δεξαμενής (D)

S. Spatharis
Ο Μέγας Αλέξανδρος και ο κατηραμμένος όφις (PR)

HEROIC THEMES (16)
GROUP E

1. Ransom (2)

G. Moustakas
Ο Κ. και ο Καπετάν Τρομάρας (PR)

S. Spatharis
Καραφωτιάς και Κρυστάλλω (S)

2. Recognition (2)

Avraam
Η αναγνώρισις των δύο αδελφών (P)

S. Gitsaris
Ο μαύρος αφίλιωτος (P)

3. Raise the Flag (2)

Athinaios
Το λάβαρον του 1821 (LP)

K. Kareklàs
Η γκρεμάλα του πατριάρχου (P)

4. Rescue (4)

Avraam
Ο μαύρος γκιαούρης (P)

D. Giannoulis
Ο Κ. και ο γεροδράκος ο Σουλιώτης (PR)

S. Spatharis
Κολοκοτρώνης εις Τρίπολιν (S)

S. Spatharis
Κολοκοτρώνης εις θάνατον (S)

5. Conversion (2)

Giannaros
Ο Μάρκος Μπότσαρης (P)

Monvanos
Ο μαύρος αετός (P)

6. Elections (4)

D. Alexopoulos
Δημοτικές εκλογές (D)

S. Generalis
Ο Κ. δύο ώρες πρωθυπουργός (P)

S. Spatharis
Αι δημαρχιακαί εκλογές (PR)

V. Vasilaros
Οι βουλευτικές εκλογές (D)

HEROES (10)
GROUP F

1. Katsantonis (4)

S. Gitsaris
Ο Κατσαντώνης (P)

K. Manos
Ο ήρως Κατσαντώνης (PR)

A. Mollas
Ο Κατσαντώνης (PR)

A. Mollas
Le héros Katsandonis (S)

2. Athanasios Diakos (3)

Vangos
Ο Αθανάσιος Διάκος. Η μεγάλη μάχη στην Αλαμάνα (P)

Vangos
Ο Διάκος (P)

M. Xanthos
Ο Αθανάσιος Διάκος (PR)

3. Odysseus Androutsos (3)

N. Lekkas
Το χάνι της Γραβιάς (P)

M. Manos
Το χάνι της Γραβιάς (P)

G. Moustakas
Ο Κ. και ο Καπετάν Ανδρούτσος (PR)

APPENDIX B

STRUCTURAL CATEGORIES

GROUP A	GROUP B	GROUP C	GROUP D	GROUP E	GROUP F
1. S	1. S	1. S-P	1. A-P	1. A	1. P
2. S	2. L	2. S-P	2. A	2. A-P	2. P
3. L-S	3. S	3. L-S	3. A	3. A	3. A-P
4. S	4. P	4. L-P	4. A-P	4. A	
5. S	5. L	5. L-P	5. A	5. A	
6. S	6. L-P	6. L-P	6. S-P	6. A	
7. S	7. L-S	7. L-P	7. S-P		
8. L	8. L	8. L			
9. L-P	9. L				
10. L					
11. L					
12. L					
13. L					
14. L					

KEY: L = linear; S = σειρά; A = agon; P = progressive

APPENDIX C

PLAYERS' BIOGRAPHIES

Avraam (real name Antonakos) —a player of the islands Hydra, Spetsa, and the Cyclades, he is a student of Manolopoulos and Kefallonitis, but largely of Kostas Manos, with whom he studied as both a player and a folk painter. Close to retirement, he has been performing in Koulouri, Salamina. He made five performance tapes and an oral autobiography for the Rinovolucri Collection and an oral autobiography for the Braithwaite Collection.

Charidimos, Giorgos —born in 1924 in Kifissia, he is the son and student of Christos Charidimos. He was also influenced by Miltiadis Lambros, a player who, in his later years, worked with Christos Charidimos. He was nine times President of the Karagiozis Players Association and is one of the few remaining full-time players in Greece. He has performed in Piraeus for thirty years and is now located in the Plaka section of Athens in the summers. Haridimos made four performance tapes and an oral autobiography for the Rinovolucri Collection and an oral autobiography for the Braithwaite Collection.

Generalis, Stamatis —a younger player who performed in Piraeus and was considered talented. He performs irregularly as he cannot make a living as a Karagiozis player. He made two performance tapes and an oral autobiography for the Rinovolucri Collection.

Gitsaris, Savvas —born in 1922, he studied with Manolopoulos and Stravothodoros, with whom he played for twelve years. Gitsaris is a village player who performs in

the Korinth province during the summer and tours schools and cinemas with Spiropoulos and Athinaios in Northern Greece during the winters. He made three performance tapes and an oral autobiography for the Rinovolucri Collection and two performance tapes and an oral autobiography for the Braithwaite Collection.

Kareklàs (real name Kostas Damadakis) —born in 1904, he travelled and played with his brothers Giorgaros and Panagiotis Damadakis until 1924. They had all studied with Theodorellos. Kareklàs performed in the Peloponnesos throughout his career and has maintained a theatre in Loutraki for forty years. He made four performance tapes and an oral autobiography for the Rinovolucri Collection and an oral autobiography for the Braithwaite Collection.

Mollas, Antonis (real name Papoulias, nicknamed Thriskia for the religious feeling he had for his art) —born 1880 in Athens, he died in 1949. Mollas was one of the most important players. in the tradition, having studied with the great master of the form, the Patran player Mimaros. Mollas published thirty-three works, was the subject of a study by the French folklorist Louis Roussel, and has seen one play translated into French and two into German. The organizer and first President of the Karagiozis Players Association, he studied under Goranitis and Rulias.

Mollas, Mimis —the son of Antonis Mollas, Mimis is well-educated and has had difficulty establishing himself as a player. He now plays with Kareklàs in Loutraki, but has performed on and off in Athens. He made two performance tapes and an oral autobiography for the Rinovolucri Collection.

Theodoropoulos, Dinos (real name Kalogeràs) —from Athens, he played in America from 1918 to 1928 and made a number of recordings there. He was literate and modernized his performances. Born in 1890, he claimed to have no real master but was greatly influenced by Manolopoulos. He travelled throughout Greece but located himself largely in Patras. He died in 1975, having taped four dictated performances and an oral autobiography for the Rinovolucri Collection.

Vasilaros, Vasilis (real name Andrikopoulos) —born in 1899 in Aegion, he went to the third year of high school. He studied with Theodorellos, Bekos, Pangalos, Sotiropoulos, and Bobotinòs, but claims to have learned most from Manolopoulos. He performed throughout the provinces of Greece and retired in 1966. He made four dictated tapes and an oral autobiography for the Rinovolucri Collection and an oral autobiography for the Braithwaite Collection.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

And, Metin, *Karagöz: Turkish Shadow Theatre*, Ankara, Dost Yayinlari, 1975.

Avraam, Το φίδι. Tape no. 5, Rivonolucri Collection. Center for the Study of Oral Literature, Harvard University 1969.

— Στα νύχια της Γκεστάπο. Tape no. 54, Rinovolucri Collection. Center for the Study of Oral Literature, Harvard University 1969.

Bauman, R., Verbal Art as Performance, *American Anthropologist* 77 (1975) 290-311.

Becker, H., Art as Collective Action, *American Sociological Review* 39 (1974) 767-776.

Biris, K. I., Ο Καραγκιόζης: Ελληνικό λαϊκό θέατρο, *Νέα Εστία* 52 (1952) 846-53, 924-28, 1064-70, 1128-34, 1220-28, 1269-75, 1374-78, 1434-39.

Braithwaite, Ms., *Taped performances and interviews with seven Karagiozis players.* Nine
    tapes. Greece 1971. On deposit, Center for the Study of Oral Literature, Harvard
    University.
Charidimos, G., Το φίδι. Tape no. 55-56, Rinovolucri Collection. Center for the Study of
    Oral Literature, Harvard University 1969.
—   Ο καπετάν Γκρης. Tape no. 10-11, Rinovolucri Collection. Center for the
    Study of Oral Literature, Harvard University 1969.
—   Ο Καραγκιόζης, τα επτά θηρία και ο μέγας Αλέξανδρος. Taped by L. S.
    Myrsiades. Athens 1973.
Danforth, L., Humour and Status Reversal in Greek Shadow Theatre, *Byzantine and
    Modern Greek Studies* 2 (1976) 99-111.
—   Tradition and Change in Greek Shadow Theatre, *Journal of American Folklore*
    96 (1983) 281-309.
Degh, L., *Folktales and Society: Story-Telling in a Hungarian Peasant Community.* Trans.
    E. M. Schossberger. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1969.
Fotiadis, A., *Καραγκιόζης ο πρόσφυγας,* Athens, Gutenberg, 1977.
Generalis, S., *Ο Καραγκιόζης δύο ώρες πρωθυπουργός.* Tape no. 25-26, Rivovolucri
    Collection. Center for the Study of Oral Literature, Harvard University 1969.
—   *Ο Καραγκιόζης στην Αμερική.* Tape no. 24-25, Rinovolucri Collection. Center
    for the Study of Oral Literature, Harvard University 1969.
Georges, R., Toward an Understanding of Storytelling Events, *Journal of American
    Folklore* 82 (1969) 313-28.
Jensen, M. S., *The Homeric Question and the Oral-Formulaic Theory,* Copenhagen, Museum
    Tusculanum Press, 1980.
Joyner, C. W., A Model for the Analysis of Folklore Performance in Historical Context,
    Journal of American Folklore 88 (1975) 245-65.
Karambalis, S., Ο Καραγκιόζης, τα επτά θηρία και ο μέγας Αλέξανδρος. Tape no. 19,
    Rinovolucri Collection. Center for the Study of Oral Literature, Harvard Univer-
    sity 1969.
Kareklàs, K., Το κουτσομπολιό. Tape no. 35, Rinovolucri Collection. Center for the Study
    of Oral Literature, Harvard University 1969.
Kiourtsakis, Y., *Προφορική παράδοση και ομαδική δημιουργία: Το παράδειγμα του Καρα-
    γκιόζη.* Athens, Kedros, 1983.
Lord, A. B., Composition by Theme in Homer and South Slavic Epos, *TAPA* 82 (1951)
    71-80.
—   Perspectives on Recent Work on Oral Literature, *Forum for Modern Language
    Studies 10,* no. 3 (July 1974) 187-210.
—   *The Singer of Tales,* 1960; rpt. New York, Atheneum, 1965.
Manousakas, M. I., Και πάλι το τραγούδι για το βασιλιά Ερρίκο της Φλάντρας, *Λαογρα-
    φία* 15 (1953-1954) 336-70.
Michopoulos, P., *Ο Μεγαλέξανδρος και το καταραμένο φίδι. Πέντε κωμωδίες και δύο
    ηρωικά.* Athens, Ermias, 1972.
Mollas, A. «*Les sept monstres». Karagheuz ou un théâtre d'ombres à Athènes,* ed. Louis
    Roussel, Vol. II, Athens, Raftanis, 1921.
Moustakas, Y., *Ο Καραγκιόζης, τα επτά θηρία και ο Μέγας Αλέξανδρος. Ο Καραγκιόζης
    παράστασις αυτοτελής.* Athens, Angyra, [1945].
—   *Ο Καραγκιόζης όμηρος στο Χαϊδάρι και στη Γερμανία. Ο Καραγκιόζης παράστα-
    σις αυτοτελής.* Athens, Angyra, [1945].

Myrsiades, L. S., A Bibliography of Primary Materials for the Study of Karagiozis, *Manta-toforos* 21 (1983) 15-43.

—   The Karaghiozis Performance in Nineteenth-Century Greece, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 2 (1976) 83-99.

—   Legend in the Theatre: Alexander the Great and the Karaghiozis Text, *Education-al Theatre Journal* 27 (1975) 387-95.

—   Oral Composition in the Karaghiozis Performance, *Theatre Research Internation-al* 5 (1980) 107-21.

—   Nation and Class in the Karaghiozis History Performance, *Theatre Survey* 19 (1978) 49-62.

—   Performance Composition and Culture-Carriers, *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook*, 1986. Forthcoming.

—   and Kostas Myrsiades, Texts and Contexts: A Primer for Translating from the Oral Tadition, *Translation Review* 11 (1983) 45-59.

—   Traditional History and Reality in the View of the Karaghiozis History Perfor-mance, *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook*, I (1985) 93-108.

Ortutay, Gyula, Principles of Oral Transmission in Folk Culture, *Acta Ethnografica* 8 (1959) 175-222.

Papanikolaou, Y., *Ο Μεγαλέξανδρος με τον βόα της δεξαμενής*. Tape no. 2-4, Whitman Collection. Center for the Study of Oral Literature, Harvard University 1962.

Parry, M. and Lord, A. B., *Serbo-Croatian Heroic Songs*. Vol. 1. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1954.

Propp, V., *Morphology of the Folktale*, Austin, University of Texas Press, 1968.

Puchner, W., *Σύντομη αναλυτική βιβλιογραφία του θεάτρου σκιών στην Ελλάδα*, *Λαογραφία* 31 (1979) 294-324.

—   *Συμπλήρωμα στην αναλυτική βιβλιογραφία του θεάτρου σκιών*, *Λαογραφία* 32 (1979-1981) 370-78.

Rinovolucri, M., *Taped performances and interviews with twenty-two Karagiozis players*. Seventy-four tapes. Greece 1969. On deposit, Center for the Study of Oral Literature, Harvard University.

Romaios, K., *Δύο περίεργα ιστορικά τραγούδια*, *Αρχείον Θρακικού Γλωσσικού και Λαο-γραφικού Θησαυρού*, 18 (1953) 337-74.

Sifakis, G., *Η παραδοσιακή δραματουργία του Καραγκιόζη*, *Ο Πολίτης* 5 (1976) 25-39.

Spatharis, S., *Ο Μέγας Αλέξανδρος και ο καταραμένος όφις. Ο Καραγκιόζης των Σπαθά-ρηδων*, Athens, Nefeli, 1979.

Veloudis, G., *Der neugriechische Alexander*. Munich: Institut für Byzantinistik und neu-griechische Philologie der Universitat München, 1968.

Whitman, C., *Taped performances with four Karagiozis players*. Eight tapes. Greece 1963. On deposit, Center for the Study of Oral Literature, Harvard University.

Xanthos, M., *Τα επτά Θηρία και ο Καραγκιόζης. Ελληνικόν Θέατρον του Καραγκιόζη*, Athens, Saravanos-Vouniseas, [1924].

Widener University   LINDA SUNY MYRSIADES
Chester, PA.