

Angeliki Hatzimichali, *The Greek Folk Costume. Costumes with the Segouni*, Edited by Tatiana Ioannou-Giannara and Angelos Delivorias, Benaki Museum, Melissa Press, Athens 1978, pp. 399+360 colour and black and white plates+39 drawings+map.

A deluxe edition published by the "Melissa" publishing house in cooperation with the Benaki Museum, dealing with the work of Angeliki Hatzimichali in the field of greek regional costumes.

The work is introduced by Angelos Delivorias, Director of the Benaki Museum, who is also the editorial advisor of the publication. The Introduction was written by Tatiana Ioannou-Giannara who worked closely with A. Hatzimichali during the years before her death. In addition, T. Ioannou-Giannara has also undertaken the scientific supervision of the work, researching and compiling the text. The artistic supervision of this volume was carried out by Rachel Misdrahi-Capon. Contents: Following the introductory notes of A. Hatzimichali, the work presents in separate chapters the costumes of Attica and the official dress of the court of Queen Olga, the costumes of Eleusis, the costumes of Tanagra, of Atalandi, of Arachova, of Corinthia, of Argos, of Agianna, of Edipsos, of Hassia, of Paramythia, of Souli, of Pogoni, of Dropolis, of Garitsa, of Florina, and the costumes of the Sarakatsani. The work concludes with a section of notes and a glossary of names. The origins of the photographs illustrating the work are listed at the end of the volume.

Studies of Regional Greek Costumes

Those studies of regional Greek costume of any real value are few and far between. Noteworthy are the following: "Περὶ Ἀμφιέσεως" (The Attire) by A. Vernardakis, a reprint from *Imerisia*, Athens 1906, and the album *Greek National Costumes*, compiled by Angeliki Hatzimichali, with illustrations by Sperling, volumes A'-B', published by the Benaki Museum, Athens, 1948. Also important is the article written by A. Hatzimichali for *Μεγάλη Ἑλληνική Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια* (The Great Greek Encyclopedia), volume I (Greece), Athens 1934, pp. 824-845. For a study of greek regional women's costumes, I refer the reader to my article "A First Attempt at an Introduction to Greek Traditional Costume (womens)", *Ethnographica*, volume I, 1978, pp. 5-92.

Abstracted studies dealing with particular aspects of greek regional costume have been published in regional books and periodicals, scientific journals and others. Exceptionally noteworthy is the work of D. Loukopoulos, "Πῶς Ὑφαίνονται καὶ Ντύνονται οἱ Αἰτωλοὶ" (The art of weaving and the costumes of the inhabitants of Aetolia). Most important regarding our field of study is the inventory compiled by N. Yfantis "Πωγωνίστιος Γάμος" (A Pogoni Wedding), *Folklore Collections*, Athens 1972, and the two books of E. Frangaki dealing with men's and women's costumes of Crete, in her work *Κρητική Λαϊκή Τέχνη* (Cretan Popular Art), volumes I and II, Athens 1974. Also of importance is the study of the costumes, of Peli on made by K. Makris *Οἱ φορεσιᾶς τοῦ Πηλίου* (The Costumes of Pelion), Volos 1949, and the relevant chapter from his comprehensive work *Ἡ Λαϊκή Τέχνη τοῦ Πηλίου* (The Folk Art of Pelion), Athens 1976. The chapters dealing with the costumes of the Dodecannese and Cyprus written by Athina Tarsouli in the publications *Δωδεκάνησα* (The Dodecannese), volumes I, II and III, Athens 1947, and *Κύπρος* (Cyprus), volumes I and II, Athens 1955, are also very informative.

Comments on the Introductory Notes of Angeliki Hatzimichali

In her introductory notes to the work under discussion, A. Hatzimichali divides the regional costumes of Greece into three categories. Costumes with the *sigúni*, costumes with

the *kavádi*, and those costumes characterised by the *foustáni*. The author herself provides no grounds for such arbitrary classification. T. Ioannou-Yiannara, in her introduction to the work, explains that the system of classification is based upon the 'form' (morfi) of the costumes involved. However, she does not satisfactorily define what she means when she uses the term 'form', which leaves the reader free to interpret this as meaning the general impression created by each individual costume. Such a method of classification is subjective, and can not be adequately dealt with using three general categories of dress. How, for example, can the average reader accept the implication that the costume of Attica is identical in 'form' with those of the Sarakatsani. Even were one to accept the division of Greek regional costumes into three categories, and that by 'form' one meant 'design', such a division would nonetheless remain arbitrary and unconvincing. For if that were the case, to which category would the costume of Lesvos belong, or those costumes characterised by the *foustáni-tsoúkna* (Meta-xádes, Karoti, etc.), or the Tsakoniá costume (also referred to by T. Ioannou-Yiannara), or even the arkadian type of costume (*navrofóustana*, *asprofóustana*), characterised by both the *foustáni* and the *yiourdí*, or *sigúni*. Should the material used in the costumes be accepted as the criteria for the above-mentioned system of classification, once again three categories of costume alone would not suffice.

The *sigúni* is prepared from a washed woolen fabric called *sayiáki*, closely related to the material known generically as *tsókha*, a rough felt. However, in many instances, the *foustáni* and the *kavádi* are fashioned from either *tsókha* or *sayiáki* (Episcopi, Naooussa, and Lintzouria, northern Epiros). We are of the opinion that any classification of the different regional costumes of Greece, for the moment, should be based on their design, i.e. their cut, criteria leading to a far more certain division into definitive categories of dress. However, insofar as the study of traditional regional costume in Greece is presently at a rudimentary stage (inventory, in-depth study, comparative study), we feel that the classification of women's costumes in our country should be made in terms of two basic characteristic groups. One group would consist of those costumes clearly Byzantine in origin (reflecting the development and evolution of the 'tunica' and related designs such as the *kavádi*, the *sigúni*, the *tsoúkna*, etc.), while the second category would include those costumes reflecting the influences of the Byzantine era and the dress modes of the western European Renaissance (such as the *foustáni*. See *Ethnographica*, volume I, 1978).

A. Hatzimichali refers next to the several elements making up the costumes with the *sigúni*, or thick woolen overcoat, and analyses only two of the more obvious components: the *poukámiso* and the *tzákos*. As far as the *poukámiso* is concerned, A. Hatzimichali believes that it was originally a sleeveless article of clothing, and she refers to it as *chiton* without ascertaining whether she relates it to the ancient greek *chiton* or to the roman *tunica*. We do not believe that the modern greek *poukámiso* has evolved from the ancient greek *chiton*, which was fashioned from a single piece of material, without any seams, the width of which served as the overall length of the garment. It appears far more reasonable to assume that the modern greek *poukámiso* has as its prototype the roman *tunica* excepting, of course, certain *poukámisa* which can be traced back to Asia Minor. In its post-Byzantine form, the *tunica* depends upon the length of the material, fashioned from several pieces of material sewn together, and has ample sleeves. The *poukamiso* was originally a basic article of clothing with sleeves. It became a sleeveless garment when other articles of clothing with sleeves were worn over it. In those instances when the sleeved outer garment disappeared, then the *poukamiso* returned to its original sleeved form.

As far as the *dzáko* is concerned, A. Hatzimichali believes that it was transformed from

an inner garment to an outer garment, and that it arrived at this final stage of development in the era of the costumes of the court of Amalia. However, we do not understand why queen Amalia choose an inner garment of which only the sleeves would be visible when the costume was complete, rather than another type of long sleeved outer garment more familiar to her, such as the *zipoúni*, already worn with the *foustani*. The urban *kondogoúni* introduced and established in Greece by queen Amalia, I consider to be derived from the island *zipoúni*, which is an essential element of the costumes of Hydra, Spetse, Aegina, and Psara, in the form they had before Amalia came to Greece.

In the latter part of her introductory notes, A. Hatzimichali supports the theory that the origins of those costumes characterised by the *sigoúni* are of Greek, and not Albanian origins. She confines her evidence to the peasant costume of the *Mesógia* villages of the region of Attica, and she often refers to the studies of P. A. Fourikis. Fourikis himself supports the Byzantine origin of the costumes of Salamina, which A. Hatzimichali places in the category of dress characterised by the *foustáni*. Actually Fourikis separates the costumes of Salamina from those of the *Mesógia* villages, the inhabitants of which he considers 'Albanian' in origin [See *Laographia* (1929), volume I, sections A and B, p. 18]. A. Hatzimichali maintains that the conclusions of Fourikis regarding the costumes of Salamina hold true for those other Greek costumes characterised by the *sigoúni*.

It is not only a matter for those interested in regional costumes to determine as far as the origins of the inhabitants of such regions are concerned, especially when the arguments are based upon the nomenclature of the different elements making up the costumes. There is no doubt whatsoever that the costumes of the Mesogia have preserved one of the Byzantine modes of village dress. In addition, the majority of terms used to describe such costumes in our country—when they are not strictly regional in origin, that is—comprise part of the Byzantine glossary of costume related terms, usually foreign in origin. Such terms, quite naturally, were in usage throughout the Byzantine world. Thus, if I am not mistaken (for after all, this is a field for linguists), not only the words "*thek*" and "*krik*" are to be considered albanian in origin, but such words as "*griz*", "*bres*" and "*kouk*" as well. The root of the word "*foúndi*" is most probably italian in origin, signifying as it does the lower part of a garment, covering the wearer's legs, the hem or lower border, or depth (*foundáro-bythísomai*, *fondo*). I believe the "*kamis*" is a derivative of the *camicia*-chemise. As far as the "*dzitzakio*" is concerned—with which Fourikis deals extensively—we are by no means convinced that it bears any relation to the *dzako*. Judging from the information available to date, the Byzantine *dzitzakion* was introduced from another part of the world (see the *Great Greek Encyclopedia* compiled by P. Drandakis, volume IA', p. 147), and we have no certain knowledge of its pattern. On the other hand, the italian *jácka* most closely corresponds to the *dzako*, which is simply a short-sleeved jacket.

General Observations

Nowhere in the text is any reference made to the time limits within which the study of Angeliki Hatzimichali was carried out. In addition, it would be very useful were one informed which villages she visited and when, and which items of information were not derived from her personal in site investigations but from the material she gathered during the festivities of August 4th.

Again, it would have been preferable had the titles of the different chapters been uniform: some chapters are entitled with the name of a particular village (Eleusis, Tanagra, Atalandi, Arachova, Argos, Agianna, Edipsos, Dropolis, Garitsa), while others are titled

with regional names (Attica, Corinthia, Hassia, Paramythia, Souli, Pogoni, Florina). In the text of course it becomes clear that the descriptions apply to regions, without any attempt made to distinguish the differences found from one village to another—the exceptions are so few as to be insignificant. It is a pity that these distinctions were not made at the time by A. Hatzimichali, as it was far easier then to denote such differences while gathering her information than it is today. For instance, in the case of the costumes of Argolidokorinthia, important differences are apparent between the old and more recent forms, and in the transitional stages from the one to the other as well (1835-1935 approximately).

In several instances, serious geographical errors are to be found in different chapters of the work. In the chapter dealing with the costumes of Hassia, the region designated by A. Hatzimichali is evident. Notation 79, together with the villages comprising Hassia, two villages from the region of Tsiarsba, Kozani (Krokos, Aiani) and another village from Elasona (Krania) are referred to erroneously.

The book *Γάμος τῶν παλιῶν καιρῶν* (Marriages in Days of Old) by Karapataki, is referred to in notes 80-85. This work refers to the villages of the region of Venzia, which he pinpoints with great precision. These regions are not related geographically to each other, and nowhere in the work is claimed they possess characteristics of dress in common. The confusion arising in the work of A. Hatzimichali becomes all the greater, as the misleading text is accompanied by a map denoting the Hassia region of Attica instead of the Macedonian Hassia dealt with by the author.

In the chapters entitled "The Costume of Paramythia" and "The Costume of Souli", the question arises as to whether the author is indeed writing of the village Paramythia, for it is certain that the Grammenohoria are not found in Paramythia, or whether she is dealing with the region instead. Is she writing of the village of Souli or of the region bearing the same name, and in terms of what chronological period. In 1928, for example, the province of Souli was comprised of four villages. In 1974, the same province consists of a municipality (Paramythia) and some thirty communities. In 1928, the province of Paramythia consisted of forty-three villages. In 1974, there no longer exists such a province. The confusion quite naturally found its way into the text and accompanying photographs of A. Hatzimichali's work. In this particular instance, photograph 240, taken in the 'stadium' during the 4th of August celebrations, depicts the back of a young girl wearing a costume I can neither discern clearly nor identify. At her side, with her back turned towards the camera, stands another girl wearing a costume from the village of Aghioi Pandes, region of Filiata, while facing the camera are another two girls, one of which is certainly wearing the dress of the city of Filiata. Photograph 241 shows a group of women from Paramythia, today's province of Souli, formerly known as the region of Paramythia. The origin of the costume depicted in photograph 239 is unclear; from which village of Souli does it come. From which village of Paramythia is photograph 235 taken? Or perhaps it is from the villages known as the Grammenohoria?

In the *Journal of the Benaki Museum*, the costumes from Aghioi Pandes and those villages sharing identical characteristics of dress are referred to as the traditional costume of Souli, and the observations made in the text are even less valuable than the misleading information given on p.p. 232-233 of A. Hatzimichali's work. Should this particular costume come under discussion, and should the Benaki Museum and the Museum of Popular Art have no examples of this particular dress in their collections, as is apparently the case, according to the author's text, with very little effort on their part the responsible parties would have found out that the "Lyceon ton Ellinidon" has twelve such costumes in its collection,

and the Peloponnesian Folklore Foundation an additional two such costumes. As a matter of fact, the Peloponnesian Folklore Foundation's collection of Greek traditional costumes includes several examples of the white old costumes of that period. Apart from the above mentioned sources, the costume of Aghioi Pandes can also be inventoried and catalogued even today. The "Lyceon ton Ellinidon" of Athens in addition added to its collection of traditional Greek costume a dress of the type represented in photograph 251 as long ago as 1954.

In the chapter dealing with the costumes of Florina, (Greek text), the village Scopiá is referred to as Skópiá the latter of course, is to be found in Yugoslavia, and not in northern Greece.

In addition, the chapters of the work of A. Hatzimichali are very uneven in terms of the amount of information provided, and several even consist of already published material. For example, the chapters dealing with the costumes of Corinthia and Argolida were published in 1963 in the periodical *Peloponnesiaki Protochronia*; this is mentioned neither in the text nor in the notes of the work under discussion. The same oversight appears in the chapters referring to the costumes of Paramythia, of Souli and of Garitsa. On the other hand, the chapters dealing with the costumes of Sarakatsani, Attica, Agianna, Edipsos, Eleusis and Tanagra are invaluable. Following in terms of their importance are the sections dealing with the costumes of Pogoni and Dropolis, Hassia, Atalandi and Arachova. The chapter covering the traditional costumes of Florina essentially refers to the particular village of Antartiko and those villages sharing identical characteristics of dress. As far as the other costumes of Florina are concerned, it would have been preferable had the 'authors' not attempted to write anything, as they are not included in the notes of A. Hatzimichali. (See the commentary accompanying photographs 300, 303, 304, 307, 308, 309, 311, 287).

The old photographs in themselves are wonderful, especially those taken in the villages; the more recent photographs shot in the field are equally interesting. Objections can be made concerning photographs 82, 111, 231, and 318, and to certain other photographs, which, compared to such gems as 350, 239, etc. appear rather ludicrous. Especially invaluable are those photographs depicting the wonderful pieces to be found in the collection of the Benaki Museum. It is a pity that the majority of the articles of costume represented are not ascribed to their respective villages of origin. We fully understand the difficulties involved: the majority of the articles of such collections both in Greek museums and in museums abroad suffer from a lack of clues indicative of as their origin. However, a corresponding effort must be made in each case to compensate for such shortcomings.

The reader would have been aided immeasurably had the articles of costume depicted in the photographs been described in terms of size. Representative of this particular handicap are the photographs of p. 64, where the scale is misleading.

In addition, it is a great pity that so many of the photographs, otherwise so excellent, should be marred by so many errors. In pointing out the following instances, the question arises as to whether or not there exist other similar errors which we do not recognise. Publications prepared by museums in general, and especially by the Benaki Museum, attributed to such a respected figure as A. Hatzimichali, even without her knowledge, should be supervised with greater care and far more research than is unfortunately the case in this particular instance.

General Observations on the Photographs

Photograph 4. The costume depicted in the watercolour is too freely drawn to serve as a good example of the everyday dress in the 'Mesogia' villages of the region of Attica.

Photographs 2, 3, 5. In all three representations the *griz* are decorated with pieces of red cloth. In the text, A. Hatzimichali does not clarify the reasoning underlying her conclusion that the *sigouni* with the green embroidery preceded the *griz* (pp. 29, 33). The more recent form and decoration of the *griz* is that found in photographs 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 36, 37, 39 and 40. The *griz* shown in photographs 12 and 13 is closer to the older type of the garment.

Photograph 5. The woman in the lithograph is wearing a woolen *lachouri* on her head and not the 'mandili louloudato' (greek text) or flowered kerchief referred to in the text on page 30.

Photograph 6. The little girl in the watercolour is not, in my opinion, from the 'Mesogia' villages of Attica. Her costume characteristics resemble more those of the villages found between Megara and Corinth.

Photograph 49. The pins of the photograph bear no relation at all to the *koptses* used to fasten the end of the *zostra* (sash, page 47), they were used to keep the head veil in position.

Photograph 51. The beaded *yiordani* in the representation is not the 'megalo yiordani' of the 'mesogia' villages (see photograph 9), but the *yiordani* of the island of Salamis. That it was also worn in the 'Mesogia' villages of Attica is nowhere mentioned in the text.

Photograph 66. The villager in the foreground of the picture is wearing a *sigouni* with *gazia*. The second woman is probably wearing the *sigouni* with *thillies*.

Photograph 104. The *dzakos* illustrated here is from the village of Livanates. All *dzakos* from this particular region differ from village to village.

Photograph 107. The type of apron represented in the illustration is not of an earlier type but is simply one of the later types to be found throughout the region. Such aprons were embroidered and sold in bazaars by the 'vlachs' of the area. (Note: This information was obtained from Stavros Goutis, dealer, who purchased several such aprons at the bazaar in Levadia in 1925. 'Vlachs' was how the local inhabitants referred to those shepherds and livestock breeders who lived on the mountains of Fthiotidophokis. Many of these garments bear the stamp of the public tax stamp on the underside).

Photograph 108. The costume of Arachova pictured here is a peculiar combination of elements of dress and it cannot possibly represent a whole listed in the catalogue/bulletins of the Benaki Museum. The older type of underdress in the photograph is combined with the more recent long sleeved *dzako* commonly found in the villages of Beotia and Attica rather than those of Fthiotidophokis; the *zonari* (sash) ought to be worn round the hips rather than round the waist; the everyday knit stockings; all provide a total picture which tends to perplex the viewer. We have serious doubts regarding the origin of the cummerbund and the knit stockings (photograph 133).

Photograph 124. It is not a *trakhilia* (shirt front) but two headbands, differing from each other as far as the embroidery is concerned.

Photograph 138. There is no doubt whatsoever that the costume depicted in this photograph comes from Perachora, Corinthia. In our opinion the apron pictured has no place in this particular costume. Women who in 1973 were approximately ninety years old and who had worn this type of costume do not remember these aprons, not even are they to be found in their trunks of clothing. Aprons like the one in the photograph and in photographs 153 and 155 have been met with in the course of our researches in the mountain villages of Argolis and Corinthia, ranging from Argolis to Stymphalia. We also came upon

a rose and blue apron in the village of Berbati, Argolis. The few women who recall this particular garment refer to them as bridal aprons, worn on the wedding day itself, for aprons were not worn with any of their costumes until after 1900. Therefore we believe that the costume in this photograph should not be presented without, such an article of dress.

Photograph 139. The *poukamiso* is from the village of Aghii Theodori in Corinthia.

Photograph 140. This particular *poukamiso* is from the village of Perachora Corinthia.

Photographs 141, 142, 143. 'Vohaitika' underdresses-'Voha' is the region bordering the sea from Corinth to the town of Aegion.

Photographs 156, 157. These aprons are not characteristic of the province of Corinthia. After painstaking research we have come to the conclusion that they were probably introduced into the Peloponnese by those women who went to work in the cotton fields of Levadia (see photograph 108), or by the brides coming originally from Fthiotidophokis.

Photographs 158, 159. We would like to take this opportunity to point out that in the work 'Macedonian Folk Embroidery', from the Institute of Folklore in Skopja, Skopja 1975, p. 78, photograph no. 124, a headdress from Corinthia is pictured similar to those shown in photographs 158, 159, attributed to the Salonica District. Therefore, it is apparent that even our neighbours publish unsubstantiated information.

Photograph 166. This particular costume is not an example of the more recent modes of dress of Argos, but represents the transitional period of those costumes worn in the villages east of Argos. Even though the *dzakos* belongs to the type of costume worn in the villages of Mt. Lyrkeion, the ensemble depicted here is essential correct in terms of its basic elements. The confusion existing regarding the components of such costumes is as widespread at this stage as the weddings taking place between people of different villages. The apron depicted in the photograph is not 'as worn recently', but is simply one of the innumerable types evolved in recent years. We have come across this particular apron in the course of our researches in Arachnaio (Heli). It should be noted that the cummerbund however, is mistakenly included in the whole, as it does not come from the Peloponnese. We see it represented elsewhere in the book as the *zonari* of Beotia (photograph 92). In addition, the jewellery pictured adorning the breast of the costume is unknown in the Peloponnese.

Photograph 167. The underdress on the right in the picture is Corinthian, and was worn throughout the coastal 'Voha' region and Perachora, but principally in the neighbourhood of Athikia, Corinthia.

Photograph 176. The headdress pictured is from Perachora Corinthia and not from the Argolis.

Photograph 177. The apron in the photograph is from Fthiotidophokis (see comment re: photograph 107). How such an apron appeared in Mani remains a mystery to me. On the other hand why an apron from Mani in the chapter of Argos?

Photograph 178. The chemise in the photograph is to be found in most villages between Stymfalia and the region of Kyparissia. An underdress similar to the one in the picture belongs to an old family of Mani.

Photograph 193. The detail of the silk head scarf depicted in the photograph is from Edipsos and not Agia Anna.

Photograph 192. The jewellery depicted in the photograph is better known as *daladiani*.

Photograph 179. We object to the manner in which the cummerbund is worn in

the case of the costume represented in this photograph. The *kandemi* of Agia-Anna is shaped by means of a special process and when worn properly, the two decorated ends hang down, in equal length, one end to the right and the other to the left.

Photographs 218, 219, 220, 221, 229, 230. No reference is made as to which villages saw these photographs taken. It would have been an easy matter, as they were made as recently as 1963.

Photograph 242. Exactly what is the girl in the photograph supposedly wearing? Apart from the incorrectly tied *fakioli* (surely this should have been arranged by a woman from the region familiar with the costume), the combination of elements making up the costume pictured here represents neither everyday wear, nor bridal dress, nor anything else for that matter. The *tzouloufia* (the curls dangling from the temples) are worn by young women only on their wedding day, on which occasion the headdress is radically different from that pictured here. The *doulamas* (the short, silk sleeved jacket) is worn over the *seyiaki* or *sigouni* (the long, white sleeveless overdress of the photograph) by both married and single women. The *panoseyiako*, resembling neither the *seyiaki* or the *sigouni*, is a garment worn over all of the other garments making up the costume. Such errors are all the more distressing when one considers the wonderful old photographs accompanying the text, photographs depicting the original costumes in their proper form, and revealing the care with which such costumes should be assembled and worn.

Photograph 280. The kerchief of the photograph is not arranged in the proper manner.

Photograph 287. The costumes of the young girls in the group of dancers from Amyndeon are the most recent type of dress of the village of Andartiko, Florina. I do not understand why the girls of Amyndeon in the photograph wear costumes of the Andartikon village instead of their own.

Photograph 300. The combination of elements making up the costume in the photograph is unacceptable. The stockings are part of the recent type of Andartiko costume. The chemise, apron and knitted sleeve ends (which in fact are knitted leggings) belong to the costume of Aghia Paraskevi and those villages with similar characteristics of dress. The kerchief when embroidered with predominant yellow patterns, belongs to Aghia Paraskevi etc.; if in black patterns then it belongs to Alona or Acrita. The belt buckle is one of those flooding the touristic market during the last few years- its origin unknown. The jewel on the wearers chest is characteristic of Scopià and those villages with similar dress modes. And yet another perplexing feature of the costume in the photograph: why is the model wearing shoes similar to those of photographs 300, 280, 263 and that of the book's jacket—with or without pom-poms. In those cases where a particular pair of shoes such as those pictured in photographs 218, 235, 276, 315 and 319 cannot be had, then it is far preferable to substitute with such nondescript footwear as that of photographs 1, 80, 108, and 138.

Photograph 303. This is not an example of sleeve endings but of knitted leggings.

Photographs 303, 304, 307. This clothing comes from Aghia Paraskevi Florina and the villages with similar characteristic of dress. The embroidery and woven aprons of Boufi (Akritis) are never orange or yellow. These items belong to the same group as the items on photographs 289-292.

Photographs 308, 309. The hood pictured is called 'sokai'. This particular one is incomplete. Half of its embroidered part is missing as well as its fringed ending. We do not know from which group of villages it comes from but it cannot belong to all three villages mentioned, as Boufi and Alona belong to one group and Scopià to a completely different

one. The most probable case is that it belongs to none (colour scheme, design, quality of jewels).

Photograph 311. This photograph is not from the Florina district but from the village Orini in Serres.

Photograph 319. In this particular Saracatsani costume, the underdress should not hang below the 'foustani'.

Conclusions

The publication of the material left behind by Angeliki Hatzimichali is a necessity for those who are concerned with the study of Greek folk tradition. In that respect, the initiative taken by the Benaki Museum to publish a part of the volume of material bequeathed them is certainly praiseworthy, and we sincerely hope the efforts of those responsible parties will continue in the future. We would like to take this opportunity to express our regret that the publication of the remaining volumes of the work "Sarakatsani" has been delayed for so long, a delay that is no longer justifiable. However, the posthumous publication of the notes of a scientist of the calibre of A. Hatzimichali should have been prepared with greater care, with far more extensive and critical research than was the case in this instance. It is our opinion that the notes of A. Hatzimichali should have been published in their original form, with a judicious and enlightened commentary/admendments made by a specialist in the particular field, whose editorial role would include informing the reader of each and every intervention and ammendment made to the original body of material. This would include the critical evaluation of information and sources, a carefully researched list of sites discussed in the work, the incorporation of any new material and changes arising from more recent studies in the field, the meticulous charting of geographical changes that have taken place over the years since the original material was compiled, and the views and opinions of other specialists in the field regarding certain aspects of Greek regional costumes which present difficulties to the researcher even today. It is obvious that especial care should be taken to seek out, modify and incorporate all new findings in the field arising from recent research into the text in such a manner as to prevent any possible confusion on the part of the reader as to what material is what—this could be done through the use of different types, punctuation, different coloured print, etc—and, parallel to the above, critical annotations, commentary, etc.

In the case of the publication of the Benaki Museum, it is not made clear just how much of the text was written by A. Hatzimichali and which parts consist of her original material, and which is the fruit of the efforts of T. Ioannou-Giannara. In the Prologue written by Angelos Delivorias and the Introduction written by T. I. Giannara, it is evident that certain intrusions have been made in the original, without it being clear where the hand of A. Hatzimichali leaves off and that of T. I. Giannara takes up the text. The many errors plaguing the book do not help Mrs Giannara. In addition, the publication of the notes in conjunction with the presentation of the invaluable collection of the Benaki Museum in its incompleteness and the errors of identification does a grave injustice to both A. Hatzimichali and the museum's collection. Necessary as it is that the notes of A. Hatzimichali be published, it is equally important that the treasures of the Benaki Museum be *catalogued and labelled scientifically and accurately*. Scientific methodology is conspicuously absent as far as the scientific supervision of the work at hand is concerned, and there all too frequently appears to be a serious lack of knowledge of the subject dealt with by the editor. This, despite the fact that T. Ioannou-Giannara demonstrates in her introductory notes a sensitivity to be

lauded. Therefore who is responsible for the deplorable errors in the text and photographs we have discovered and pointed out?

It is our opinion that Angelos Delivorias should have been more careful in his prologue, and his enthusiasm for the work in general cooled by the light of scientific reasoning. It is fitting to point out at this time the serious error—hopefully typographical—attributing the researches of A. Hatzimichali to the year 1900. At that time, she was barely five years old.

Apart from the above mentioned shortcomings, the work in general is certainly praise-worthy, and by all means it should be continued. We sincerely hope that those responsible for the subsequent volumes will take into account those of our criticisms they deem reasonable and worthwhile.

As far as the technical and typographical pains taken to produce the work in question we are in to position to judge their value; let it be said, however, that this particular publication is certainly qualitatively inferior to corresponding works produced by the National Bank of Greece. Finally, we believe that a comprehensive bibliography of the work of A. Hatzimichali should be included in the second volume of *The Greek Folk Costume*, currently being prepared by the Benaki Museum.

IOANNA PAPANTONIOU
(Translated by CHRIS KLINT)

Zamfira Mihail, *Terminologia portului popular românesc în perspectiva etnolingvistică comparată sud-est europeană* (La terminologie du costume paysan roumain dans la perspective de l'ethnolinguistique comparée du Sud-Est européen), București, Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1978, 253 pp.+38 cartes.

C'est une double lacune que cet ouvrage se propose de combler: d'une part l'absence de synthèses portant sur l'histoire du costume paysan chez les peuples sud-est européens et d'autre part, le manque d'ouvrages concernant la terminologie du costume paysan de cette zone. L'auteur a dû étudier d'abord la terminologie du costume dans chaque langue européenne, afin de pouvoir dégager ensuite leurs éléments communs et leurs traits spécifiques.

Si dans un projet d'avenir Zamfira Mihail compte consacrer un volume spécial à la terminologie du costume paysan dans les langues sud-danubiennes, pour le moment, c'est aux réalités roumaines qu'elle s'arrête. En partant de ces réalités—corroborées avec les résultats de l'ethnographie—elle procède aussi à une comparaison avec les autres langues de cette région.

Un premier chapitre, intitulé *Prémises et Sources* nous renseigne sur les limites de ses recherches et ses sources linguistiques et ethnographiques, ce livre se situant dans le domaine de l'ethnographie linguistique. Les sources de cette enquête sont vastes et variées: iconographie, témoignages écrits et sources linguistiques surtout. Ces dernières sont particulièrement intéressantes, puisque l'auteur met à profit les réponses du questionnaire folklorique-ethnographique dressé par l'historien roumain B. P. Hașdeu en 1884-1885, récoltées dans environ 700 localités et couvrant plus de vingt mille pages, qui ont permis à Z. Mihail de dresser les premiers cartogrammes de la linguistique roumaine reproduisant des réalités linguistiques du XIX-e siècle.

Le caractère permanent du costume paysan, élément de sa continuité et L'acculturation, élément de la diversité du costume paysan sont les principales prémises de ce travail. L'auteur