

From being to becoming: reflections on the enduring popularity of Kazantzakis

Dimitris Tziovas

University of Birmingham

In this article, Kazantzakis' popularity over the years is briefly reviewed and it is argued that the two dominant approaches to his work, which could be described as ethnographic and philosophical-theological, respectively, correspond to the antithesis between being and becoming. The question addressed here is whether we can read his fiction in a new way, and pass from the ontology of being to the contingency of becoming, following the example of the process theologians who brought him closer to postmodernism.

Cavafy and Kazantzakis are the two Greek writers with the highest international presence and reputation. While Cavafy's worldwide appeal has been studied and analyzed, Kazantzakis' popularity has not received equal attention. His case is more complex. Though outside Greece his work continues to be read and appreciated by ordinary readers, scholars, theologians and film directors alike, in Greece itself he has been treated in a somewhat inconsistent fashion. On the one hand, younger critics are sceptical about his inflated style and the absence of any narrative experimentation, while, on the other hand, he continues to have a dedicated readership. These readers' passion for his work certainly undermines the view that to like Kazantzakis is to suffer from a cultural form of measles, something one catches only once and normally at an early age.¹

Peter Bien has argued that the main reason for Kazantzakis' earlier popularity was his romantic worldview, which appealed to the psychological expectations and ideological needs of a European audience after the Second World War.² This romantic worldview highlighted the uniqueness of the individual and his liberation from ordered conformity and social conventions. According to Bien, despite its associations with Nazism, this romantic irrationalism and a certain exoticism were what attracted European and

1 D. Dimiroulis, 'Ο Καζαντζάκης ενόψει του 21ου αιώνα', in *Νίκος Καζαντζάκης: Το έργο και η πρόσληψή του* (Herakleio 2006) 300; D. Dimiroulis, 'Όλα μοιάζουν μεγεθυσμένα', *Το Δέντρο* 155–6 (May 2007) 44–8.

2 P. Bien, *Nikos Kazantzakis: Novelist* (Bristol 1989) 3.

American readers to the novels of Kazantzakis at a time when they were just emerging from the painful experience of war.

Later in the 1960s and 1970s, Kazantzakis was attractive to the youth counterculture that resisted the establishment, technology, bureaucracy and rational order and found spontaneity, authenticity and romantic idealism in his work. One wonders, however, whether Kazantzakis was satisfying a demand for an alternative lifestyle based on the constant transgression of boundaries, or just a return to a simpler, more primitive and less 'rational' way of life. This is a question with wider implications, given that Kazantzakis is a writer of extremes vacillating between intellect and instinct: at the same time a reclusive writer and a man of action, Cretan patriot and cosmopolitan traveller, god-driven intellectual and atheist. His world is full of contrasts, which manifest themselves at different levels: metaphysical (freedom–death, body–spirit), ideological (Christianity–communism) or in terms of characterization (e.g., Zorba-Boss). Even when he writes on Dostoevsky he contrasts him with Tolstoy:

Sin, sensuality, passion, the 'demon' in the work of Tolstoy is naïve, normal and deep down not threatening; the strong man can struggle with him and beat him. In Dostoevsky, however, this demon is an indomitable power, dark, mysterious, one not only with our flesh, but also with our soul, perhaps one with God. Harmony is a necessity of human reason, but God is higher than reason, higher than harmony. Perhaps the deepest distinction which can be drawn between Tolstoy and Dostoevsky is this: Tolstoy has been the prophet of such harmony; Dostoevsky has been the prophet of such a God.³

According to Stylianos Alexiou,⁴ the contrast between the strong, uneducated, simple man and the intellectual lies at the heart of Kazantzakis' originality. In my view, this could be subsumed under the wider antithesis between being and becoming. Being is normally treated as an eternal essence or a structure to be recovered and as a truth or god to be discovered. In the work of Kazantzakis, being is conceived as the search for the authentic and presupposes a return to something pre-existing that is rediscovered. Being is also manifested through the celebration of the body, an extravagant emphasis on food and obsession with ancestors. Becoming, on the other hand, is associated with struggle, freedom and an open-ended process, representing the constant quest and the transcendence of limits. It could be seen as an anticipation rather than a certainty, as an adventure not a firm belief, as a world-making activity that acknowledges the constructedness and reinvention of reality. By associating 'being' with matter and 'becoming' with spirit, some have tried to overcome this opposition either by talking about the transubstantiation of matter into spirit or suggesting other kinds of synthesis. It could be argued that two

3 N. Kazantzakis, 'Θεόδωρος Δοστογιέφσκι', *Νέα Εστία* 60 (706) (1 December 1956) 1646.

4 S. Alexiou, 'Νίκος Καζαντζάκης: Από τη ζωή, τη σκέψη και το έργο του', in *Νίκος Καζαντζάκης: Το έργο και η πρόσληψή του*, 15.

approaches to Kazantzakis' work, which could be described as ethnographic and philosophical-theological, respectively, correspond to this fundamental antithesis between being and becoming.

The ethnographic approach assumes the descent from the falsified surface to the genuine being, the breaking up of civilization's crust in order for the noble savage to emerge.⁵ This approach has focused primarily on the character of Zorba and involves the regression to a primordial self as the counterbalance to the erudite narrator/boss. Passages such as the following have sustained a reading of the text along these lines:

I felt, as I listened to Zorba, that the world was recovering its pristine freshness. All the dulled daily things regained the brightness they had in the beginning, when we came out of the hands of God. Water, women, the stars, bread, returned to their mysterious, primitive origin and the divine whirlwind burst once more upon the air.⁶

When I had finished reading Zorba's letter I was for a while in two minds — no three. I did not know whether to be angry, or laugh, or just admire this primitive man who simply cracked life's shell — logic, morality, honesty — and went straight to its very substance. ... When he writes, this ignorant workman breaks his pen in his impetuosity. Like the first men cast off their monkey-skins, or like the great philosophers, he is dominated by the basic problems of mankind. He lives them as if they were immediate and urgent necessities. Like the child, he sees everything for the first time.⁷

Seeking authentic existence and experience, such an approach relies on local colour, the celebration of Cretan life and the primitivism of certain characters. It has also fostered various stereotypes related to Greek masculinity, idolization of the popular culture and the mythologization of *leventia*, transforming Kazantzakis into a cultural phenomenon, reading matter for tourists and custodian of the traditional. This approach is perpetuated today not only through Kazantzakis' work, but also Theodorakis' music, the film adaptation of the novel or the countless tavernas called Zorba all over the world.⁸

The second approach (philosophical-theological) takes a variety of forms, and has been represented at different times by various philosophical, existential or theological perspectives that focus on different aspects of Kazantzakis' work. Stressing the notions of struggle, ascent (*aniforos*), or freedom, this approach questions the static rational dichotomy of body–mind and emphasizes the role of the Bergsonian *élan vital*. With

5 For a critique of this approach, see J. Politi, 'Η ιδεολογία της αυθεντικότητας και ο Ζορμπάς του Ν. Καζαντζάκη', in her book *Η ανεξακριβωτή σκηνή* (Athens 2001) 15–47.

6 N. Kazantzakis, *Zorba the Greek*, trans. C. Wildman (London 1995) 54.

7 Kazantzakis, *Zorba the Greek*, 156–7.

8 D. Papanikolaou, 'Οι μεταμορφώσεις του Ζορμπά', in Νίκος Καζαντζάκης: *Το έργο και η πρόσληψή του*, 91–108.

reference to Bergson's view of being as an abstraction of becoming, some scholars have stressed the creative impulse and endorsed 'the customary interpretation of Kazantzakis' fiction as a mythopoesis of Bergsonian vitalism'.⁹

The energy and dynamism in Kazantzakis' fiction has recently been highlighted by Roderick Beaton thus: 'To my mind the secret of Kazantzakis' success lies in his genius for catching the intensity, the physical dynamism and the spiritual energy that can drive human conflict to extremes, and for mobilizing these forces in words on the page.'¹⁰ This brief description points to the power and forward-looking momentum associated with Kazantzakis' work. In an interview published in 1956, Kazantzakis singled out three categories of writers: those who, like T. S. Eliot, depict the disintegration of the world; those who express nostalgia for the past; and those who struggle to predict the way ahead for culture and society. In the same interview, Kazantzakis declares unambiguously that he is interested in the third type of writer and that his *Odyssey* represents his most determined effort to 'prophesy the future of humanity'.¹¹ Thus, as a writer about the future, Kazantzakis is also a writer of becoming rather than of static being. It could be argued that being in Kazantzakis can be seen as a regression to the past and to a primordial self, whereas becoming, as an energizing process, looks towards the future and to constant regeneration or transgression.

Recently, English-speaking theologians have developed a special interest in Kazantzakis, some of whom consider him as a precursor of a theological postmodernism. Darren J. N. Middleton, for example, sees some analogies between Kazantzakis and four major postmodern philosophers of religion: John Caputo (North America), Don Cupitt (England), Lloyd Geering (New Zealand) and Gianni Vattimo (Italy).¹² He has argued that, like Nietzsche, 'Kazantzakis foresaw much of what we now recognise as the postmodern turn, not in literary forms of course, but in philosophy and religion'.¹³ Kazantzakis, according to Middleton, negates the ontology of theism and underlines Jesus' human nature. Approaching life in a way that prefigures the unsettling nature of postmodernism and its current philosophical trends, Kazantzakis perceives being as an event and God as an active verb. Middleton points out that 'Kazantzakis considered metaphysics too significant to discard yet too problematic to embrace'.¹⁴

9 D. J. N. Middleton and P. Bien (eds), *God's Struggler: Religion in the Writings of Nikos Kazantzakis* (Macon 1996) 6. Middleton views 'Kazantzakis' narrative fiction as a mythopoesis of process thought', in his *Novel Theology: Nikos Kazantzakis's Encounter with Whiteheadian Process Theism* (Macon 2000) xix.

10 R. Beaton, 'Out of Crete — Nikos Kazantzakis, creator of *Zorba* and *The Last Temptation*, fifty years on', *Times Literary Supplement*, 22 June 2007, 13.

11 M. Yalourakis, 'Συνάντηση με τον Νίκ. Καζαντζάκη', *Σεργαϊκά Γράμματα*, 5–6 (1956) 161.

12 D. J. N. Middleton, 'Kazantzakis among the postmoderns: some reflections', *BMGs* 29 (2005) 71–88. This paper is reprinted as Chapter 6 ('Kazantzakis and Postmodern Theology') in his book *Broken Hallelujah: Nikos Kazantzakis and Christian Theology* (Lanham 2007).

13 Middleton, 'Kazantzakis among the postmoderns', 72.

14 Middleton, 'Kazantzakis among the postmoderns', 84.

In the place of the customary oppositions, Middleton highlights in-betweenness, undecidability and contingency in Kazantzakis, though he does not treat him as an atheist or agnostic. Instead, he presents him, as Caputo might have done, as valuing ‘openness to an unfixed future’ and arguing for a religion without conventional religion. The value of such a religion ‘lies in its asking questions whose answers do not come easily if they come at all’.¹⁵ In the same way that Kazantzakis’ life was full of restlessness and travel, similarly his thought oscillated between certainty and questioning, faith and doubt, metaphysical theistic religion and a nascent postmodern-like spirituality. Earlier theological and philosophical approaches to Kazantzakis stressed the transcendence of oppositions by the transubstantiation of matter to spirit, while the most recent ones emphasize process, a lack of synthesis and openness. In other words, not being but becoming, as a continuous dialogic process and constant agonistic renegotiation of the world.

Given that the ethnographic approach to Kazantzakis relied more on the notion of being while the more recent theological approach relies on the notion of becoming, what is happening regarding the literary approach to his work? Can we read his fiction in a new way, and pass from the ontology of being to the contingency of becoming, following the example of the process theologians who brought him closer to postmodernism? Is it possible to see his novels as open and dynamic texts rather than closed and static ones?¹⁶ This will partly depend on whether we see the outcome of the oppositions in his work as moving towards an eventual synthesis or maintaining a perpetual tension. While nobody will disagree with the view that Kazantzakis’ *oeuvre* is replete with antitheses, it is less clear whether these antitheses lead to synthesis or remain open-ended. Though it has been cogently argued and aptly illustrated that the main feature of Kazantzakis’ narrative art is the binary opposition,¹⁷ the crucial issue is not simply to identify these oppositions, but to examine whether they yield any synthesis. This is all the more important if trying to determine the closed or open nature of Kazantzakis’ fictional world.

The view of a leading authority on Kazantzakis that of all his works *Christ Recrucified* ‘is the most successful at synthesising extensive materials that are often contradictory (for example: Christianity and communism, philhellenism and misohellenism) to produce a unified whole’,¹⁸ indicates that the synthesis of diverse and opposing material is not only an aesthetic requirement, but can be used as an evaluative criterion. Where does Kazantzakis’ art lie and on what basis can it be judged successful? On the synthesis of opposites or on the perpetuation of undecidability? Given that *Christ Recrucified* could be described as a historical palimpsest, what is at stake here is a choice of perspective. Will the focus be on the fusion of historical periods, the mythical timelessness or the open process of perpetual struggle?

15 Middleton, ‘Kazantzakis among the postmoderns’, 83.

16 Middleton, e.g., refers to ‘Zorba as a symbol of process, not a static repose’ in *Novel Theology*, 182–3.

17 S. N. Philippidis, ‘Σημειωτικές και αφηγηματικές αντιθέσεις στα μυθιστορήματα του Κασαντζάκη’, in his book *Τόποι: Μελετήματα για τον αφηγηματικό λόγο επτά νεοελλήνων πεζογράφων* (Athens 1997) 31–60.

18 Bien, *Nikos Kazantzakis*, 28.

A metaphysical reading of the novel based on the transubstantiation of matter into spirit favours a linear development, a symbolic reading presupposes the timelessness of being, while an agonistic reading promotes the open-ended becoming, taking into account the fact that Manolios in the novel is not Christ, but becomes more ‘Christlike’, as Jesus does in *The Last Temptation*. The first reading tends to be teleological with the progressive transition from matter to spirit, the second is rather static with a re-enactment of the symbolism of the passion while the third points to something uncertain and fluid. From which perspective should we approach Kazantzakis’ novels today? I would contend that the aspect of his writing which has not been sufficiently explored is the openness of his novels.¹⁹

Though most of Kazantzakis’ novels end with death, some have more inconclusive endings: ‘And again they resumed their interminable march towards the East’ (*Christ Recrucified*), ‘He uttered a triumphant cry: IT IS ACCOMPLISHED! And it was as though he had said: Everything has begun’ (*The Last Temptation*). Do these closing statements convey a sense of mythical repetition or an endless process towards an open future? Is there a form of narrative closure at the end of *Zorba the Greek* with the narrator conforming to the values or lifestyle of Zorba? In fact, the ending remains open and ambiguous, since the narrator is not presented as somebody who learns to live according to his instincts; instead he sits down and writes a novel.²⁰ It could be said that the retelling of the Christ story and the ongoing desire to transgress, reaching a ‘post’ stage, might be seen as a form of endless becoming. Becoming in Kazantzakis should not be seen in terms of development, evolution or maturity, but as an inconclusive process of re-inventions, transgressions, retellings and even contradictions. At one time it might have been treated as a struggle, a creative progress, or the hope of ultimately reaching a higher spiritual goal. Now becoming is seen as lacking a goal and the emphasis is on open-endedness, relativity and ambiguity.

It is also interesting to note that two films based on Kazantzakis’ novels change the ending. Michael Cacoyannis’ film *Zorba the Greek* (1964) ends with Zorba teaching his boss to dance. In the book, however, the boss does not follow Zorba’s example, but finds himself liberated as an artist. The darkness of the film contradicts the optimism of the novel, which represents the endurance of the Greek people during the period of the German occupation when the book was written. The ambiguous and open ending of the novel is abandoned for an invented and conventional ending. *Celui qui doit mourir* (1956) by Jules Dassin ends with the refugees barricading themselves behind a rock and starting

19 Only recently Charitini Christodoulou highlighted the openness of *The Last Temptation* in her unpublished doctoral thesis, *Dialogic Openness in Nikos Kazantzakis’ Ο Τελευταίος Πειρασμός*, University of Birmingham 2007.

20 S. N. Philippidis, ‘Ο Λόγος του Πατρός και ο Λόγος του Υιού: Αυθεντική ζωή και αυθεντικός λόγος στο μυθιστόρημα *Βίος και πολιτεία του Αλέξη Ζορμπά* του Νίκου Καζαντζάκη’, in his book *Αμφισημίες: Μελετήματα για τον αφηγηματικό λόγο έξι νεοελλήνων συγγραφέων* (Athens 2005) 159–60.

to shoot at their oppressors. In this instance, the left-wing inclinations of the director dictated the invention of a more closed ending than that of the book.²¹

Then again, the genre of Kazantzakis texts tends to be rather ambiguous. In the prologue to *Zorba* the author wonders: 'I could not fathom what form to give this fairy tale of Zorba: novel; poem; complex fanciful narrative like *A Thousand and One Nights*', while in that of *The Last Temptation* he maintains: 'This book is not a biography, it is the confession of every man who struggles.' In the same novel he thematizes writing not as a transparent medium of representation, but as a means of exposing its problematic relationship with truth and of conferring identity.²² Thus, Kazantzakis moves between epic exaggeration, symbolic indeterminacy, metaphysical reflection and self-referentiality, making his texts hard to categorize in literary terms.

Many consider that Kazantzakis is closer to the nineteenth-century novelists than to the twentieth-century ones,²³ but there are a number of critics who have emphasized his early aestheticist experimentation in *Serpent and Lily*,²⁴ or argued that *The Last Temptation* 'demonstrates an awareness of Modernist innovations in narrative technique',²⁵ or compared him to twentieth-century writers such as D. H. Lawrence²⁶ and Jorge Luis Borges,²⁷ or treated him as a precursor of magic realism.²⁸ For a writer to be related to

21 P. Bien, 'Nikos Kazantzakis's Novels on Film', *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 18 (2000) 161–9.

22 R. Beaton, 'Writing, identity and truth in Kazantzakis's novel *The Last Temptation*', *Κάμπος: Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek* 5 (1997) 1–21; G. Farinou-Malamatari, 'Kazantzakis and biography', *Κάμπος: Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek* 6 (1998) 19–34.

23 Vrasidas Karalis, in his editorial note to a special issue on Kazantzakis, talks about 'outmoded literary devices', as if Modernism had never existed, which 'make his work something of an unexpected challenge to the reading habits and aesthetic addictions of the postmodernized cultural subject' (*Modern Greek Studies (Australia & New Zealand)* 8–9 (2000–2001) 7; see also S. N. Philippidis, 'Ο Λόγος του Πατρός, 156, 171).

24 A. Kastriaki, 'Ο Νίκος Καζαντζάκης και ο αισθητισμός: έλξη και άπωση' in *Νίκος Καζαντζάκης: Σαράντα χρόνια από το θάνατο του, Περριχμμένα Επιστημονικού Δημέρου* (Chania 1998) 127–53.

25 M. P. Levitt, *The Cretan Glance: The World and Art of Nikos Kazantzakis* (Columbus 1980) 79.

26 Kimon Friar has argued that: 'A revealing parallel may be drawn between Kazantzakis and D. H. Lawrence. Both were Dionysian, demon-driven men, placed instinct and the promptings of the blood above the ordered deductions of the mind, celebrated the primitive and atavistic origins of the human spirit, were insatiable travelers who in landscape and inscape discerned the contours of God's or Nature's purpose, turned to the physical universe for their imagery and away from urban mechanics and subtleties, extolled strife and crucifixion as the unavoidable and necessitous law of life and even of love, were impatient with refinements of craft and entrusted themselves to the demonic outpourings of creative inspiration, placed the prophet above the man of letters, were obsessed with messianic drives and dreams' (K. Friar, *Modern Greek Poetry* (New York 1973) 32).

27 R. Beaton, 'The temptation that never was: Kazantzakis and Borges', in D. J. N. Middleton (ed.), *Scandalizing Jesus* (New York 2005) 85–95.

28 S. N. Philippidis, 'Λαϊκότροπα στοιχεία στα μυθιστορήματα του Καζαντζάκη', in *Τόποι*, 229. Middleton also argues: 'Now, most literary critics acknowledge Kazantzakis's modernism. I am one of them. But as I established in chapter six, his work also points forward to the ideas and themes we associate with postmodernism' (*Broken Hallelujah*, 126).

realist, modernist and postmodernist writers at the same time is in my view unique. It is often hard to classify an earlier writer into a particular mode of writing, but one can argue that a writer has the potential to be read from a particular perspective. Therefore, I am not arguing that Kazantzakis is a postmodernist writer, but that he can be read in this way.

In the past, Kazantzakis' novels have been read as Cretan epics, or as representations of the Cretan glance or heroic masculinity. Today they are read in a way that highlights the ambiguities and instabilities of identity, erotic fears and demonic fantasies. Kazantzakis' novels are no longer seen as the texts of a great and uncompromising visionary, but as those of a vulnerable and fragile man.²⁹ In the past, the epic character of his narrative might have been emphasized, but now it is the vicissitudes of his writing that attract attention. As *The Last Temptation* reminds us, what matters are the versions and not the aphorisms, the interpretations and not the certainties.

In his autobiography *Report to Greco* (described on the cover of the English translation as an 'autobiographical novel'), Kazantzakis blurs the distinction between truth and falsehood, or confession and invention by presenting reality as constructed through narrative and imagination:

I began therefore to mobilize words, to regurgitate the poems, saints' legends, and novels I had read. Pillaging involuntary from this one and that, I started to write. But the very first words I placed on paper astonished me. I had nothing like that in mind. I refused to write such a thing; why then had I written it? ... Lies, all lies, and yet as I enumerated these lies now on the sheet before me, I began to understand to my astonishment that I had indeed tasted great pleasure with her. Were they really true, then, all these lies? Why had I not been aware of this pleasure in the course of experiencing it? Why, now that I was writing it down, did I become aware of it for the first time?

I swaggered as I wrote. Was I not God, doing as I pleased, transubstantiating reality, fashioning it as I should have liked it to be — as it should have been? I was joining truth and falsehood indissolubly together. No, there were no longer any such things as truth and falsehood; everything was a soft dough which I kneaded and rolled freely, according to the dictates of whim, without securing permission from anyone. Evidently there is an uncertainty which is more certain than certitude itself.³⁰

In postmodern fashion, Kazantzakis questions the ontological solidity of reality (being) and perceives it as a subjective creation (becoming). Following Nietzsche he declares: 'The world is my own creation. Everything, both visible and invisible, is a deceptive dream.'³¹ In

29 See D. Tziovas, 'The poetics of manhood: Genre and self-identity in *Freedom and Death*', in his book *The Other Self: Selfhood and Society in Modern Greek Fiction* (Lanham 2003) 153–74.

30 N. Kazantzakis, *Report to Greco*, trans. Peter Bien (London 1973) 144–5.

31 Kazantzakis, *Report to Greco*, 322.

32 Kazantzakis, *Report to Greco*, 450.

a way reality does not exist outside the individual mind since the creative power of the artist contributes to its shaping:

I kept divining the creator's responsibility with ever-increasing clarity. Reality, I said to myself, does not exist independent of man, completed and ready; it comes about with man's collaboration, and is proportionate to man's worth. If we open a riverbed by writing or acting, reality may flow into that riverbed, into a course it would not have taken had we not intervened. We do not bear the full responsibility, naturally, but we do bear a great part.³²

Kazantzakis' radical aestheticism anticipates postmodern relativity. The truthfulness and sincerity of the autobiography is challenged by references to fantasy and legend. The credibility of narrative gives in to the reality of lying and the pleasures of writing. In his 'autobiography', Kazantzakis prioritizes flux over permanence and fiction over truth, pointing to the ephemeral nature of the latter: 'Is there anything truer than truth? Yes, legend. This gives eternal meaning to ephemeral truth.'³³ In *Report to Greco* truth is relativized and fictionalized as doubts are raised in the minds of its readers as to where fact begins and fiction ends or vice versa.

Truth is seen as relative and unstable since Kazantzakis appears not to believe in truth (being), but like the postmodernists he constructs it (becoming) or in the words of Paul in *The Last Temptation*: 'I create the truth, create it out of obstinacy and longing and faith. I don't struggle to find it — I build it.'³⁴ In his play *Christopher Columbus*, he also blurs the distinction between truth and falsehood through the words of his main character: 'Are there only two things completely separate in the world: truth and falsehood? Maybe there is something else whose form is like water, fluid and transformed; it is *no longer* falsehood but not *as yet* truth. I don't know how to depict it, it doesn't have a name, it doesn't exist ...'³⁵ Perhaps the transience and relativity of truth can provide the link between his theological 'postmodernism' and his literary reassessment as a novelist of becoming and not of being; or in Kazantzakian terms of ink and not of blood. And this transition might explain his enduring popularity and his protean image as a novelist.

33 Kazantzakis, *Report to Greco*, 471; see also C. Dounia, "'Με αλήθεια και φαντασία": Ο Καζαντζάκης αυτοβιογραφούμενος', in Νίκος Καζαντζάκης: *Το έργο και η πρόσληψή του*, 255–70.

34 N. Kazantzakis, *The Last Temptation*, trans. Peter Bien (London 1975) 488.

35 N. Kazantzakis, *Θέατρο, Τραγωδίες*, III (Athens 1956) 222–3.