

tried to overthrow it. Thus, Kitsikis comes to the amazing conclusion that the difference between Andreas and Papadopoulos was not over the substance or the essence of the coup of April 21, 1967, but the methods followed by the Army.

Kitsikis, in his attempt to «coolly» assess the Papadopoulos era, repeats the Tsakonas view that the Colonels were not reactionaries, but «anti-establishment children of the village», and concludes along with Dendrinis and Georgalas that Papadopoulos failed because he had no ideology and ended up being corrupted and coopted by the establishment he failed to destroy. His disappointment over Papadopoulos' failure shows clearly when he emphasizes that the dictator was an exponent of a «HellenoTurkish federation», an idea best expressed in his now famous *Millet* interview of May, 1971. The fulfillment of this ideal failed once more because of the opposition of the chauvinists and the Communists and the loss of some of its warmest supporters following the death of Patriarch Athenagoras and Panayotis Pipinelis.

The volume concludes that the «HellenoTurkish» ideal has existed since the Medieval era, long before the U.S., Russia or Britain developed interests in the region. This ideal will likely continue to exist and will be established when it is based on the true foundation of the common «HellenoTurkish civilization» and not the interests of the superpowers.

This work, like the earlier volume, is likely to evoke scepticism on the part of the reader, unless he or she happens to share Kitsikis' premise of «HellenoTurkism». I do *not*. Moreover, the assumptions he makes about the 1928-73 period are tenuous and amount to a search for examples to justify the unjustifiable. More disturbing is the author's attempt to assess the Papadopoulos era in a way that downplays its disastrous effects on Greek society and politics. His sensitivity for Papadopoulos' regime may be due to the implicit assumption that had the dictator «stayed the course» of an anti-establishment eastern populism, «HellenoTurkism» could have triumphed. Noone doubts the need for an objective treatment of the history and politics of Greco-Turkish relations. Professor Kitsikis makes a sincere effort to do so. But his effort runs astray in a futile search for a horizon that never existed and was never lost.

*Indiana University-Purdue
University, Fort Wayne*

VAN COUFOUDAKIS

U. P. Arora, *Motifs in Indian Mythology, their Greek and Other Parallels*, New-Delhi 1981.

Dr. U. P. Arora's book makes a valuable contribution to the growing field of comparative mythology. Hitherto we have been accustomed to European scholars who have approached Indian mythology after a special training in this field. Now this young Indian scholar follows the opposite path. Having a complete background of Indian mythology, he has acquired a solid knowledge of classical mythology and tradition. In his book he examines the similarities and interactions of the Indian and Greek mythologies.

Arora is free from any preconceived theories which dogged many earlier scholars who wrote on Indo-Greek contacts in the field of mythology. Nevertheless, his ambition to include the study of many widely spread myths in his work makes his task extremely difficult. This is especially true in his first chapter where he discusses some cosmogonic myths, i.e., «the Creation of the World», «the Four Ages of Hindus» and «the Great Flood». These myths appear not only in India and Greece, but also in the Near East. The author discusses in a balanced view their diffusion into various countries, but without providing any definite answers to the problem of the exact channels of their transmission. Let it suffice here to present the well known theme of «flood».

The Theme of Flood

Arora discusses the theme of «flood» extensively, trying to approach it from every possible angle. After stating that floods could occur in any place of the world, and therefore legends about them could be created in many places, he correctly assigns the origin of the great catastrophic flood, commonly known to us through the Biblical story of Noah, to the Near East. More precisely, it seems that Mesopotamia was the place of origin. The stratigraphy of its great city-mounds manifest that of the whole Near Eastern and Western Asiatic world only in Mesopotamia did disastrous floods of great scale occur frequently. (G. S. Kirk, *Myth, its Meaning and Functions in Ancient and other Cultures*, Cambridge 1970, p. 116).

Arora meticulously describes the common points between the Greek version of the flood-Deucalion's story, mainly narrated in Hesiod and the Indian which appears mainly in *Satapatha Brahmana* and *Mahabharata*. Nevertheless, Arora does not discuss in any length how we can explain those similarities - whether they were caused either by a direct influence, or by the respective borrowing from a common Near Eastern source.

The story of flood appears in the so-called «Flood Tablet» (XI) of the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, dated from the turn of the second millennium in its Akkadian version, while the fullest surviving Assyrian version, found in the library of Ashurbanipal, dates from the 7th century B.C. (J. B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, Princeton, 1955). In addition to the above-mentioned written versions, an oral narration of the story of flood circulated in the Near East and I believe that it is perhaps from the storehouse of this oral repertoire that both Greek and Indian sources drew their inspiration.

Arora, who was the first to make a detailed and comprehensive comparison between the Indian and Greek sources of the narration of the «flood», should proceed further, and expanding his research to the Near Eastern sources he can draw some definite conclusions on all relevant problems. (Useful bibliography on this topic, in addition to that mentioned by Arora, is found in E. Dhorme's book, *Les religions de Babylonie et d'Assyrie*, Paris 1945, p. 327).

In the rest of his chapters the author discusses a variety of motives, folktales and myths which are widely spread. Of special importance are the tales which appear solely in Greece and India and can be definitely attributed to the Greek influence.

Greek colonists had already settled in certain parts of India from the time of Alexander the Great. (N.N. Ghosh, *Early History of India*, rev. ed. by O. Prakash,

Allahabad 1981, p. 280ff.). Their tales were spread in India as is confirmed by archaeological discoveries. On the Greek coins of India the Greek gods Zeus, Heracles and Athena are depicted as well as some episodes from the Greek mythology. It is not, therefore, surprising that Indian art was influenced by Greek art; but it must be clarified that no Greek religious ideas penetrated into the Indian Pantheon. Greek symbols were used simply to express Indian religious ideas. Thus, Nike became an Indian female spirit, celebrating the birth of Buddha. (Arora, p. 180).

Of great interest is Arora's brief discussion on the impact of certain Greek tales from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* on the Indian epics and art. He discusses in a few lines, for example, the adaptation of the famous story of the «Trojan horse» in the *Epic of Mahabharata*, composed ca. 200 A.D. (Arora, p. 182). An adaptation of the Greek artistic representation of the «Trojan horse» is depicted on a stone relief, discovered in the Preshawar plain. (Arora, p. 180). It is regrettable that Arora did not use illustrations to show more clearly the adaptation of the story of the «Trojan horse» in Indian art, which was briefly discussed by J. Allen (*J. H. S.* 66 (1946), p. 21-23).

In the Indian relief the Trojan horse is presented on wheels. In the middle an old bearded man is thrusting his spear into the horse while behind the horse a young man is pushing it towards the city. Finally, a figure of a woman with outstretched arms, clad in Indian clothes, appears on the extreme left. Allen correctly identified the man armed with the spear as Laccoon; the young man as Simon and the woman with the outstretched arms, weeping for the fate of Troy, as Cassandra.

The scene of the exodus of the Greek warriors from the Trojan horse is not unusual on the Greek vases (see an example in Ph. Mayerson, *Classical Mythology in Literature, Art and Music*, Waltham Mass. 1971, fig. 96), but Allen has persuasively demonstrated that the artist, undoubtedly an Indian as we understand from the crudeness of the depiction and the Indian clothed Cassandra, was inspired by a Roman model, based on Virgil's *Aeneid* (II, 50-53). The exact Roman model of the Indian artist has not been found yet. The woman's figure with the outstretched arms sometimes appears in Roman art as Helen who, according to Virgil, «held a mighty torch and called the Danaans» — as it is shown in a wall painting from Pompei of the second half of the first century A.D. (Naples, National Museum, 9040). But, most probably — as Allen suggests — the one depicted in the Indian relief is Cassandra, as she appears in the scene of the well-known Capitoline *Tabula Iliaca*, where she is definitely labelled with her name. Since in this Roman relief neither Simon nor the armed Laccoon is depicted, another Roman prototype with closer resemblances must be found and the transmission channel to the Indian artist should be specified.

I believe that Arora in his next endeavour should concentrate his efforts solely on the tales which appear in Indian and Greek mythology exclusively, and make ample use of all relevant illustrations. In any case his book, as it stands, is a storehouse of valid information and is a substantial contribution to the study of Ancient World.

University of Athens

V. CHRISTIDES